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Migration, immigrants and labour markets in EU countries

I. Introduction

This paper is meant to give insight in immigrant incorporation in EU-member states labour markets, as well in variations in (national) degrees of immigrant incorporation as in variables that impact the (country specific) development of policies with regard to immigrant incorporation in the labour market. A study on the labour market incorporation of immigrants cannot completely be detached from national labour market developments and labour migration needs and the ways EU-member states develop and have developed (labour) migration policies. Since a major part of the immigrants of the last two decades have arrived under other titles than legal economic immigrants, but as family members, asylum seekers or in an irregular status, the migration spectrum has to be broadened to these categories in order to understand national variations in immigrant incorporation in the labour market and in the national policy responses. In the final part of this paper research questions are presented for future investigation in EU-member states.

Immigration and the labour market

There exists no general theory on international migration, but at least we may speak of efforts to reconcile different theoretical approaches. Boyle e.s. (1998) distinguish micro- versus macro-analytical, and determinist versus humanist conceptual approaches and come forward with integrated accounts of human migration. Massey e.s. (1998) write about the insufficiency of traditional approaches, like the ‘push-pull framework’ and neoclassic theoretical explanations and try to integrate some theoretical perspectives, like the new economics of labour migration, segmented labour market theory, social capital theory, world systems theory, and the theory of cumulative causation. Although both group of authors make important distinctions between theories that might on the one hand explain the start or initiation of migration, and those that may account for the continuation or perpetuation of migration, they do not take fully account of the importance of a large part of the ‘new’ migration, i.e. the arrival of asylum seekers and refugees and irregular migrants. Unfortunately, Massey e.s. (1998) are due to a lack of theoretically based studies on Europe not able to convincingly demonstrate that migration to Europe is to be explained sufficiently by the above mentioned theoretical perspectives.

One of the elements that is not specifically taken into account is the welfare state aspect of the countries of settlement. The study of international migration in relation to the labour markets in the European countries of settlement has become more diffuse since the formal halt to the recruitment of foreign labour around 1973. International migration since then has changed form and momentum. Family members have largely joined those who primarily arrived as low- and un-skilled labour migrants, in times that labour market needs for the low- and un-skilled were dwindling. Since the mid eighties asylum seekers and refugees have arrived mostly in the North-West European welfare states, while the larger share of irregular and undocumented migrants headed for the informal labour markets in the Southern European countries with less extensive welfare systems. The relationship between the relative attractiveness of different parts of Europe for different policy-based types of immigrants has thus far not been elaborated in comparative research. Here we are concerned with the labour market integration of immigrants in an international comparative perspective.
While most of the North-West European states are faced with major difficulties to incorporate a large share of the resident immigrant population and their descendants in the labour market (Wrench a.o. 1999), new migration openings for labour migration pop up in most of the same states. On the one hand new arrivals are allowed of highly skilled personnel (often limited in numbers) and on the other hand the admission doors may be widened for temporary (often seasonal) foreign labour at the bottom of the job hierarchy.

Southern European states (King a.o. 2000) have only recently developed as countries of (de facto) immigration. Although the share of the legal foreign labour force is still of minor importance compared to those in North-West European states, labour markets may be qualified by an important high presence of often irregular immigrant labour in the informal economies. Regularizations that are being undertaken predominantly offer only temporary settlement status.

To complicate the matter, these developments in migration and integration of immigrants take place in an era wherein the demographic composition of European states is changing due to low birth rates and increased ageing of the population (UN, 2000). These demographic processes have an automatic impact on the (future) composition of the labour force and have aroused a major discussion on the live chances of extensive welfare state measures, for example with regard to the financing of the existing social security and pension systems and the financing and staffing of the existing health systems.

In a sense the aspect of immigration may roughly be divided in old and new migration patterns. The old migration patterns may be typified by recruited labour, mainly male and low- or un-skilled, and by post-colonial migration and both their follow-up migration mainly due to family reunification. Migration to a European country took mainly place with a limited number of countries within the framework of formal bilateral labour recruitment contracts or as a heritage of the colonial past. New migration patterns differ from the old ones in two aspects. Firstly, the number of countries of origin of the migrants and their heterogeneity has increased enormously, and migration is following less the well-trodden paths of the (recent) past. Secondly, migration specifically due to the arrival of forced migrants and partly by that of irregular migrants is to be explained by push factors in the countries of origin without direct labour market links in the countries of destination. This last characteristic is also applicable to the large majority of those migrants who arrived as family members of the labour migrants of the past. The increasingly restrictive migration policies of European countries are specifically addressing these developments.

Generalizations like these tend to obscure other developments. Firstly, the current intra-EEA¹ migration of EEA nationals is left out of the picture. Secondly, the large-scale immigration of ethnic Germans (Aussiedler) needs to be treated as a specific case, but at least as a category Aussiedler share the non-direct labour market link with the other categories mentioned.

Thirdly, European countries have always welcomed high-skilled immigrants from outside the current EU, and still happen to do so. New labour market needs, as in the ICT sector but also in health care, have recently eased the labour migration policies in a number of EU countries for high-skilled immigrants from non-European countries (OECD, 2002). As a consequence many European countries are faced simultaneously with high unemployment specifically among resident immigrants and their descendants, and with the need to attract quite often highly skilled new immigrant labour to work (temporarily) in specific sectors and professions.

¹ European Economic Area
Immigration, integration and the welfare state

In the European context the relationship between immigration and integration cannot be fully understood without taking the specific (national) welfare state component into account. In the former paragraph migration has already been brought in relation to the welfare state in two aspects: Firstly, migration is not always taking place in direct relation with the labour market, which makes the unemployed part of the recently arrived immigrants partly dependent on welfare state benefits and adds to the costs of immigration (immigrants in the working age may turn into clients of the welfare state instead of becoming workers). Secondly, future demographic developments that are partly becoming visible now, may cause specific labour market shortages in welfare professions like in health care. A more overall discussion turns around the issue if, and in which degree replacement migration will be needed to maintain aspects of the current welfare states.

Faist (1996) states that the integration of immigrants in welfare states depends partly on the type of welfare state. While differentiating between policy-based and market-based welfare states Faist formulates four arguments about the consequences of polities (welfare state structures) for policies regulating the selection, admission and integration of immigrants, and vice-versa whether the immigration and integration policies have changed politics in the welfare states. The four arguments (Faist 1996: 228-229) are formulated as follows:

1. Welfare states granting extensive social rights within highly-regulated labour markets (policy-based), on the one hand and welfare states that grant fewer social rights with lower degrees of labour market regulation (market-based), on the other hand, differ in how they regulate immigration and the integration of immigrants;

2. Partial convergence of immigration and integration policies is found in different receiving polities;

3. Immigration and integration policies result in (semi)permanent politicisation of welfare state politics;

4. Receiving welfare states, such as Germany, have responded to immigration and integration in two ways: they have tried to speed up the socio-economic integration of those already present, and they have also opened doors to short-term labour migrants, enforcing rotation.

Faist (1996) confronts the ‘three worlds of welfare capitalism’ (Esping-Andersen, 1990) (liberal: Anglo-Saxon countries; conservative: Continental Europe; social-democratic Scandinavian countries) with the four immigration policy regimes as distinguished by Baldwin-Edwards (1991) (semi-peripheral or Mediterranean regimes; Schengen or mainland Continental model; Scandinavian model; outlier: the UK) and notes a correspondence between the two sets of typologies. The idea of a distinctive fourth Southern European welfare state overlaps here with Baldwin-Edwards semi-peripheral model. Although the borderlines between the distinctive typologies are not always consistent, partly due to convergence in both welfare and immigration policy regimes, Faist’s above mentioned first argument is of interest for this study. The main dividing line is the policy-oriented versus the market-based welfare state. Policy-oriented welfare states may be characterized by high degrees of labour market regulation and more likely have implemented more fluctuating immigration policies (for example Germany). Market-based welfare states generally have low degrees of labour market regulation and have been more likely to use continuous immigration policies (for example the USA). Faist develops his argument in comparing Germany and the USA. Unfortunately no elaboration is given in this direction on the differentiation of both combined types of regimes within Europe.
If we accept Faist's argument in distinguishing between overlapping immigration and integration regimes and welfare state regimes in Europe, we may take the degree of labour market regulation as a central element for making distinctions. In this respect the impact of the existence of an informal economy and labour market and its relative size needs also to be taken into account. The existence of relatively important informal economies in Southern European countries has at least contributed to major flows of irregular migration, which only partly have been redressed by often repeated regularisation schemes. Since 1986 four major regularisation programmes have been launched in Italy, the last one of 1998/1999 introduced a quorum of 300,000 persons; the first major regularisation programme in Greece (1997/1998) led to 375,000 applications; regularisation programmes in Spain concerned 108,000 persons in 1991 and 21,000 in 1996 (OECD 1998/1999).

The differentiation in different European welfare state regimes overlaps with some exceptions also with labour market characteristics for the total working age population like the net participation rate (total and for specific categories) and the unemployment rate (total and specific categories) as shown in a study by the Dutch Social and Cultural Planning Office (SCP 2000). The Scandinavian countries (with the exception of Finland) have the highest net participation rate and lowest unemployment (specifically in low long term unemployment). Southern countries have the lowest net participation rate (with the exception of Portugal) and the highest unemployment. The West-European countries are in between the two extremes, while the UK comes closest to the Scandinavian countries. Also in the SCP study it is mentioned that a specific Southern European category is highly visible. In the next paragraph on demography and the labour market we will return to this issue more specifically.

One argument with a view to the impact of the welfare states on the incorporation of immigrants lies partly in the background of the newly arrived immigrants and in the degree of extensiveness of the welfare state and concomitant highly-regulated labour markets. A large share of the newly arrived immigrants consists of family members and asylum seekers and refugees. Most of them arrived without a direct linkage to the labour market and the only answer of a highly organised welfare state cannot be otherwise than to incorporate them if not as workers than as clients in the system. As long as the labour market is able to absorb these newcomers, the system works well. As soon as the labour market is not offering job opportunities any longer, the only option remains to become a client of the care aspect of the welfare state system. Something the like seems to have taken place in the Netherlands in the 1980s and early 1990s showing ever increasing unemployment rates among immigrants, while due to increased economic growth the process seems somewhat reversed in the second part of the 1990s (Muus, 2001). In Sweden a similar process seems to have taken place at a later date, but became highly visible in the midst of the 1990s with some improvement in the last part of the 1990s (Westin, 2000). Restructuring of the economy with all its consequences for the (immigrant) labour force will without doubt have had a negative employment effect in the same time, and will enlarge the difficulties of the newly arrived to enter the labour market.

We may conclude that there are indications of a relevance to include specific welfare state aspects in a European comparative study on migration and integration of immigrants in the labour market. Here we may mention, its extensiveness in covering policy realms, the degree of labour market regulation and the way it includes or excludes immigrants from social and other rights.
Demography and the labour market

The issue of immigration in European countries is recently also connected to (future) developments and changes in their demographic composition with possible consequences for the labour market and aspects of the organization of the welfare state. In this section we deal with the possible effect of demographic changes for the labour market in European countries. Two demographic developments are of importance: declining fertility and reduced rates of mortality among the elderly, together leading to ageing of the population. There are important variations in these developments between European countries, but all countries are touched by these two phenomena, in the end leading to an increased dependency of the non-working population (0-14 yrs. and >65 yrs.) on the working part of the working age population (WAP, 15-65 yrs.).

A study of the OECD published in 1991 (Migration; The Demographic Aspects) came to the following main conclusions with regard to the possible effect of increased net migration in mitigating the ageing of populations:

1. Immigration policy cannot easily be fine-tuned to precise demographic objectives due to difficulties in controlling the volume and composition of net migration;
2. Simulations of the impact of immigration show that extremely high volumes of migration, much greater than at present, would be required to completely offset ageing processes, such as growth in old-age dependency ratio’s;
3. Immigration policy is only one of a number of ways in which the economic burden of the elderly can be reduced and is unlikely to rank first among the possible means of tackling the problem.

The discussion was fuelled again in 2000 by a publication of Population Division of the United Nations called Replacement Migration. The scenario’s presented for the European Union are in a sense dramatic:
(a) if the total population of the European union is to be kept constant until 2050 it would be necessary to have 47.4 million immigrants between 2000-2050 or 949.000 immigrants per year;
(b) if the size of the population aged 15-64 is to be kept constant until 2050, it would be necessary to have 79.6 million immigrants between 1995-2050 or 1.4 million immigrants per year;
(c) if the support ratio of the persons aged 15-64 years for each person of 65 years or older is to be kept constant until 2050, it would be necessary to have 701 million immigrants between 1995 and 2050, or 12.7 million immigrants per year.

The consequences of these scenarios are highly unrealistic if we read in the same report that in the case of the last scenario Europe’s population would grow threefold until 2050 and three-quarters of the population in 2050 would consist of post-1995 migrants from outside the European Union. This would equal mass immigration even unprecedented in traditional immigration countries like the USA, Canada or Australia.

The Council of Europe (Punch and Pears (eds.) 2000) addressed the same issue in a study called Europe’s population and labour market beyond 2000 published in April 2000. The contribution of Fina-Sanglas (2000) in this publication follows mainly the same kind of reasoning as in reports of the OECD(1991, 1998). The main challenge for immigration policies will be to decide which flows of immigrants are allowed to enter the country. Whether these flows can compensate for the demographic gaps must be answered negative.
The studies cited point to a serious demographic change in European countries in the decades to come. In which way this will impact the labour markets remains inconclusive. It is easier to forecast demographic developments than labour market developments. Immigration might play a role in partly filling the demographic gap, but other factors might also be of importance. Positive changes in the fertility rates are not very likely in most European countries at the short term, but cannot be ruled out. For example France has experienced in 2000 and 2001 an important and unprecedented increase in fertility (see: Le Monde, 7 Febr. 2002). The participation rates in the working age population may be raised. The productivity of the relatively smaller labour force might be higher. High unemployment levels among nationals and immigrants might be brought down and the pension age might slightly move upwards. These are still general options, the picture might be quite different if we take important differences between European countries into account. For example: countries with high participation rates and/or low unemployment figures undoubtedly will have less room for manoeuvre if compared to countries with low participation rates and/or high unemployment.

II Labour migration needs and labour migration policies

The first aim of this study is to identify major causes for labour migration needs at the national level, and the major background variables that impact on the (country specific) development of labour migration policies.

One of the foreseeable main labour market needs for the future will be some sort of organized labour market related replacement migration to fill part of the demographic gaps of the future. As we have learned in the introductory paragraph above, the demographic changes will have an important impact on the dependency ratio’s of the working versus the non-working population, starting to become highly visible between 2010 and 2020. In the end of the 1990s some countries like Germany and Italy show slight population growth only due to the current levels of net migration. None of the EU-countries is currently carrying out an explicit migration policy based on demographic needs. One may wonder whether this is implicitly the case for the arrival of Aussiedler in Germany or for the regularisation programs in Italy, but thus far nothing points in this direction. The immigration policy of France after the Second World War has thus far been the only one in Europe with both a demographic and an economic component. Immigrants could compensate for the low population growth aggravated by the loss of lives during the war, and they could contribute to the necessary post-war reconstruction. But within two decades the economic goal became predominant, culminating in 1972 to the ‘circulaire Fontanet’: work and stay permits were only granted according to the availability of work and suitable housing (Muus and van Dam, 1998).

Direct labour market needs in relation to migration are not easily discerned. As we will see below, only a few countries follow direct labour market oriented policies and, if this is the case, they only do so for limited numbers of immigrants. Indirect measurement of foreign labour needs by measuring changes in the labour market presence of immigrants are no clear indication of new migration either. These changes may also be attributed to those immigrants who were already settled in these countries, to naturalisations and changes in immigrants’ demographic composition.

Since the introduction of the free movement of workers within the EC in 1968 (nowadays extended to countries belonging to the European Economic Area EEA) national labour migration policies relate only to non-EC/EEA labour (third-country nationals). Most of the
EU-countries have developed a kind of work permit system for new non-EEA entrees on their labour market. Although there are variations in national policies, they all are in fact highly restrictive in the sense that priority is given to the resident workforce and even EU-workforce at large before work permits are given to new non-EEA foreign labour migrants (priority ruling). The system may vary: In Germany temporary workers are granted a general residence permit and a specific type of work permit. The duration of the work permits varies depending on the country and the occupation concerned. In France, residence permits authorise people to work, while in the Netherlands, employers must obtain a recruitment authorisation, but may only hire workers with a valid residence permit (OECD, 1998: 186).

Recent OECD reports on international migration (OECD, 1998/1999) indicate a variety of national solutions, besides work-permit systems mostly in connection to priority ruling, to restrict access or stem the flows of new non-EEA foreign labour. Austria additionally maintains a quota policy governing labour market access to foreign workers, the share of foreign employment is not allowed to rise above a certain percentage of total employment (8%). France exempted restrictions on specific highly skilled personnel of new subsidiary firms of foreign companies (1996). Similar commitments were made for researchers, teachers in higher education, assemblers and technicians and performing artists. France carried out a major regularisation programme from 1997/1998 accepting for regularisation the majority of the 143,000 applicants. Germany allows the temporary entrance of contract labour and of guest workers from a number of Central and Eastern European countries, as an exception to the priority rule but sets annual quotas for each nationality and occupation. In 2000 Germany allowed a maximum of 10,000 'green cards' for temporary work for foreign ICT specialists under specific conditions. Greece annually sets a maximum on the number of work permits to foreign migrants by country of citizenship. The first regularization program in 1997/1998 resulted in 375,000 applications. Italy has additionally introduced the entry of foreigners for work related reasons in the 1998 Immigration Act by a system of preferential quotas for nationals of countries with which Italy has concluded agreements on admission in Italy and readmission in the country of origin. Italy has thus far experienced four regularisation programmes (1986, 1990, 1997 and 1998) leading for each of the last three programmes to over 200,000 applications. The Netherlands allowed in 2000 temporary work in hospitals by a limited number of nurses from both the Republic of South-Africa and Indonesia, while simultaneously demanding of the employers to increase their training facilities for nationals and resident immigrants with a view to future recruitment of personnel. Portugal eased, in its new Employment of Foreigners Act of 1998, the access to work for foreigners by lifting numerical restrictions of foreign workers in firms with five or more employees. Portugal has had two regularization programmes in 1992/1993 and 1996 concerning 39,2 and 21,8 thousand immigrants in illegal situation. Since 1993 Spain sets annually quotas for non-EEA workers of between 15 to 20 thousand persons. Research on the two major regularizations that have taken place in Spain in 1991 (108,400 permits granted) and in 1996 (21,300 permits granted) showed that part of the quotas were filled with already resident but illegal immigrants instead of new foreign arrivals. The UK demands from persons who need a work permit an adequate command of English. For temporary work the UK has additional entries for Working Holiday Makers (for Commonwealth nationals) and trainees.

This indicative summary of recent labour market related migration policy initiatives, how incomplete it may be, shows at least a few interesting points. Firstly, a number of countries does not seem to have taken any specific policy measures on top of the existing restrictive labour migration policies: the Nordic EU-member states (Denmark, Sweden and Finland), Belgium and Luxembourg. Secondly, all Southern European EU-countries (Portugal, Spain,
Italy and Greece) have introduced immigration policies and have (repeatedly) carried out major regularisation programmes for immigrants in an illegal situation. France recently joined with a major regularisation initiative. Thirdly, Austria has introduced a ceiling in the share of foreign workers in total employment, while Greece in a different way started to put an annual maximum to the number of work permits for foreigners. Fourthly, a number of countries started with alternative ways to regulate foreign employment: Germany, Spain and Italy introduced (small) annual quotas, albeit for different categories; a number of countries widened possibilities for specific categories of partly high-skilled workers (UK, Germany, Netherlands, France). This division partly reflects the composition of migration flows: more non-direct labour migration (asylum and family reunification) of non-EEA nationals to the North, and more irregular migration of non-EEA nationals to the South.

For the present study, the focus is on the immigrant incorporation in EU-member states labour markets, as well in variations in (national) degrees of immigrant incorporation as in variables that impact the (country specific) development of policies with regard to immigrant incorporation in the labour market.

Most of immigration into EU-countries takes place under different headings than labour migration. Labour migration policies are scarce and specific and new direct labour migration takes mostly place within a variety of ‘priority ruled’ work-permit systems or indirectly by all kinds of ‘regularisation’ efforts. (Temporary) non-EEA labour migration is of growing importance in steady growing economies, like the Netherlands and the UK, and the process of ageing will add without any doubt to future (specific) migration needs. For understanding the migration component of immigrant incorporation in EU-labour markets the main conclusion is that most non-EEA immigration after the mid 1970’s took place without a direct link to the (formal) labour markets: by family reunification and family formation, by asylum-seeking and by irregular migrants entering the informal part of the economies. This fact has been and still is of great impact on immigrants’ labour market incorporation, and whether or not immigrants have been successful may depend on a large number of variables on as well immigrants’ characteristics (e.g. age, skills, gender) as on the receiving society (e.g. business cycle, skills needed, general and specific labour market policies, discrimination, anti-discrimination policies etc.).
III Immigrant incorporation in the labour market, variations and policies

The degree of current immigrant incorporation in the labour markets of EU-member states varies greatly if measured by the unemployment and participation rates of the immigrant population versus the national population. Both rates may also show important changes over time.

The main question of this study is to try to identify the major causes or factors behind these current variations and to try to establish the main factors behind the development of (country specific) policies with regard to the incorporation of the immigrant population in the labour market.

Immigrant definition?

One of the issues to start with is how to define immigrants. In EU-countries there is unfortunately no common understanding or definition on the word immigrant. Even the word immigrant cannot be translated into the different European languages without semantic and even definitional problems. Who is to be included, the foreign resident, the foreign-born one? Are those who once arrived by migration but naturalised still to be counted as immigrants? What about the children of those who arrived by migration, are they included? Rea, Wrench and Ouali (1999) point to these problems of comparison in the opening chapter of the book 'Migrants, ethnic minorities and the labour market. Integration and exclusion in Europe' (Wrench a.o. (eds.) 1999). In the UK the term (im)migrant is rarely used, one prefers the term 'ethnic minorities'. In the Netherlands the term 'ethnic minorities' is used to label specific target groups of integration policy, and outside official governmental language the term 'allochtonen' has been introduced to describe the non-indigenous population. The Scandinavian countries preferably use the word immigrant, like in Sweden 'invandrare' and the term minorities is in Sweden strictly reserved to national minorities. Germany employs the word 'Ausländer' which equals foreigners in English. Southern European countries and France use the word immigrant (fr. 'immigrés') and in Italy it is common to label third country nationals as 'extracomunautari'. It is quite obvious that these different words partly describe different categories and different notions of immigrant incorporation or integration. The term ethnic minorities may include nationals as well, while this is not the case with the term 'Aussiedler'.

For practical reasons we limit the term immigrants here to the foreign resident population while comparing data internationally. Comparative data are mostly provided for foreign nationals, and for a number of countries also data are given on the foreign-born. Country specific studies rarely deviate from country specific definitions. In these cases country specific definitions are used. The reader must bear in mind that for countries with relatively easy naturalisation procedures (like Sweden, the Netherlands and France) a large part of the once immigrated population and their descendants is excluded by this definition, if compared to countries like Germany where naturalisation is more difficult and a large part of even the third generation immigrants is still foreigner (e.g. Turkish nationals in Germany).

Unemployment rates

One of the ways to compare the labour market integration of the immigrant population is by comparing the unemployment rate of the foreign resident population. EUROSTAT (2000) published for ten of the EU member states statistics on the unemployment rates of the
national, the other EU- and the non-EU-working population in 1996/1998. Table 1 shows the
given unemployment rates irrespective of gender.

Table 1 Unemployment rates by main groups of citizenship 1996/1998 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU country</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nationals</th>
<th>Other EU</th>
<th>Non-EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark ’97</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany ’98</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France ’97</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland ’97</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>5.4 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands ’97</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria ’97</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal ’97</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland ’97</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK ’98</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: European Communities (2000a) table D-1.2

Note: - Unemployment rate equals unemployed persons as a percentage of total working population of each group;
       - Spain: based on working population living in households
       - Ireland and UK: based on Labour Force Survey

* this figure is probably inaccurate, the figure for men is 13.1% and for women 14.9%

Other sources complement for data on Belgium and Sweden. 1997 Unemployment rates in
Belgium (Lannoy, 2000) are 12.6% for the total population, 11.4% for the nationals and
25.0% for the foreigners (EU and non-EU together). Unemployment rates of some of the non-
EU nationals are even higher: 41.2% for Turkish nationals and 43.4% for Moroccan nationals.
1998 unemployment rates in Sweden (Thoursie, 1999) are 5.5% for the Swedish population
excluding the naturalised Swedes, 11.8% for the naturalised Swedes, 20.2% for foreign
citizens, 8% for EU citizens and 33.6% for non-EU citizens.

The picture based on this measurement shows quite high unemployment rates for the nationals
in some of the countries and mostly dramatic unemployment rates for the non-EU citizens in
most of the countries for which data are presented. Unemployment rates among non-EU
citizens are in most countries far above the unemployment rate of the nationals. Ireland, the
UK, Portugal Spain, Austria and Germany show the least disparities (less than of about twice
the rate for nationals, the unemployment rate for non-EU citizens in Ireland is probably
inaccurate), while in the other countries Denmark, Sweden, Finland, the Netherlands and
France the unemployment rates among non-EU citizens are in between two to five times as
high as among the nationals.
Table 2  Unemployment rates of non-EU citizens by gender 1996/1998 (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU country</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark '97</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany '98</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France '97</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland '97</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands '97</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria '97</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal '97</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland '97</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: European Communities (2000a), table D-1.2
Notes: see Table 1

Unemployment rates in Belgium (1997) are higher among foreign women 31.9% than among foreign men 21.2% (Lannoy, 2000). The earlier quoted data on Sweden provide no information on gender. Westin (2000) shows for 1998 a slightly higher unemployment rate for men (22.6%) than for women (17.1%) among non-Swedes.

The unemployment rate among foreign women from non-EU countries (1997/1998) is in a number of cases slightly below or around that of foreign men. The main exceptions are France, Portugal, Finland and Belgium (in as far as countries are presented above). In these countries the unemployment rate among foreign women from non-EU countries are at least 8% higher than among foreign men. The reason of this remarkable differentiation cannot be given here.

From a different published EUROSTAT source regarding the outcomes of the Labour Force Surveys of 1999 (European Communities, 2000b) a slightly different picture arises. Definitions are based on ILO recommendations. On the basis of the published data on the employed and the unemployed, the unemployment rates have been calculated as the share of the unemployed in the labour force (=employed and unemployed). Since the Labour Force Surveys are sample surveys, data may be unreliable due to large margins of errors. In those cases EUROSTAT indicated that data are unreliable and no unemployment rates have been calculated.

The unemployment rates for non-EU citizens by gender can only be compared between table 2 and 3 (1997/1998 and 1999) for five countries: Germany, Spain, France, Austria and the UK. Differences are slight except for Spain, which shows a major reduction in non-EU female unemployment. The unemployment rate among non-EU women in Spain should even have come below the high unemployment rate for Spanish women. The 1999 unemployment rate for non-EU men in the Netherlands has also shown a major reduction compared to the 1997 figure, but the figure is still high (18.1%).
Table 3  Unemployment rates of nationals, other EU citizens and non-EU citizens in EU member states, 15-64 yrs., by gender, 1999 (%)

| EU country | Nationals |  | Nationals |  | Other-EU |  | Other-EU |  | Non-EU |  | Non-EU |
|------------|-----------|  |          |  | Men      |  | women    |  | men     |  | women |
| EU-15      | 7.9       | 10.9 | 8.3       | 9.4       | 19.1 | 20.0 |
| Belgium    | 6.3       | 9.3  | 10.9      | 18.1      | 34.6 | 39.4 |
| Denmark    | 4.3       | 5.8  | x         | x         | x    | x    |
| Germany    | 7.8       | 8.9  | 8.8       | 8.8       | 19.5 | 17.8 |
| Greece*    | 7.1       | 16.8 | x         | x         | 9.3  | 19.4 |
| Spain      | 11.0      | 23.2 | x         | 18.5      | 13.2 | 15.9 |
| France     | 9.7       | 13.4 | 10.1      | 11.1      | 27.3 | 36.3 |
| Ireland    | 6.0       | 5.4  | x         | x         | x    | x    |
| Italy      | 9.0       | 16.4 | x         | x         | x    | 12.1 |
| Luxembourg | x         | x    | x         | x         | x    | x    |
| Netherlands| 2.4       | 4.7  | x         | x         | 18.1 | x    |
| Austria    | 4.3       | 4.4  | x         | x         | 8.7  | 10.1 |
| Portugal   | 4.3       | 5.3  | x         | x         | x    | x    |
| Finland    | 10.9      | 12.3 | x         | x         | x    | x    |
| Sweden     | 8.0       | 6.4  | x         | x         | 30.2 | 27.7 |
| UK         | 6.9       | 5.1  | 7.5       | 7.1       | 12.4 | 10.6 |

Source: European Communities (2000b) Active population 15-64 yrs. table 8; unemployed 15-64 yrs. table 56; unemployment rate calculated: share of unemployed in active population (employed and unemployed) (%).

Note: Greece* data for 1998

The available data on 1999 unemployment rates for nationals, other EU citizens and non-EU citizens in table 3 show that discrepancies are least between nationals and other EU citizens. The only major exception is the high unemployment rate among other-EU women in Belgium, which is nearly twice as high as among the Belgium women. Table 3 shows again that the largest discrepancies are to be found between the nationals and the non-EU citizens. For the whole of the EU, non-EU men are nearly three times as much unemployed as the male nationals, while the non-EU women are nearly twice as much unemployed as the female nationals of the countries concerned.

Spain and Greece show the least discrepancies in the (relatively high) unemployment of their nationals and non-EU citizens. In Austria and the UK the non-EU unemployment rate is about twice the national rate; the difference between the two rates is in Germany slightly higher, while in France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Sweden the unemployment rate among non-EU citizens is three times or more above that of the respective national active population.

Employment rates

The unemployment rates tell one aspect of the relative position of immigrants on the national labour markets of the EU. In comparing different population categories we also need to know which part of the potential labour force (the population of working age between 15-64 years) is actively participating in employment. On the basis of labour force survey data EUROSTAT published the 1999 employment rates for nationals, other EU citizens and non-EU citizens in the fifteen member states. The employment rate equals persons in employment as a percentage of the population of working age. The comparison of the employment rates by these three categories and by gender shows for the EU15 as a whole that: the employment
rates are highest for men in all three categories (nationals, other EU, non EU); the employment rates for the other EU citizens are slightly above that of the nationals, while the employment rates of the non-EU citizens are for the men 11% below that of the nationals and for the women even 14% that of the nationals. In other words, a smaller part of the working age population of non-EU citizens is at work, while we have seen above they are also faced with (much) higher unemployment rates. As we will see in table 4 there is a major differentiation in the employment rates of non-EU citizens in the EU member states.

Table 4  Employment rates of the 15-64 years old, by citizenship categories and gender, 1999 (persons in employment as a % of the population of working age, living in households)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU country</th>
<th>Nationals Men</th>
<th>Nationals Women</th>
<th>Other-EU Men</th>
<th>Other-EU Women</th>
<th>Non-EU Men</th>
<th>Non-EU Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>(38.8)</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>(35.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>(69.6)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: European Communities (2000b) EUROSTAT labour force survey 1999, table 13

The data on the employment rates show a few interesting phenomena: the relatively high employment rates of women in Denmark and Sweden are also found among women from other EU countries but definitively not among non-EU women; the Southern EU member states show relatively high employment rates for non-EU men and women; Austria has a very high employment rate for non-EU men, an a relatively high rate for non-EU women; Belgium, the Netherlands and France show very low employment rates for non-EU women and also low employment rates for non-EU men; Germany, Luxembourg and the UK show lower employment rates for the non-EU citizens compared to their nationals but the employment rates of non-EU citizens are irrespective of gender still above that of the EU as a whole.

**Immigrant’s qualifications, occupational structure and sector of employment**

Comparative data on immigrants’ qualifications, occupational structure and sector of employment in the EU member states are not systematically published or made available by EUROSTAT. Summer 1999 some of these data became available in the European Unions’ Employment Observatory’s SYSDEM Trends no. 32 that was devoted to ‘ethnic minorities and immigrant groups on the labour market’. Unfortunately the available data and information are provided country-wise, and not on a systematic basis and provide as such no basis for general tables for the whole of the EU. The OECD in its annual publication *Trends in International*
Migration (SOPEMI) is generally providing information on immigrants and the labour market. In the 1998 and 1999 OECD reports on Trends in International Migration attention is paid to changes in total and foreign employment in six selected European OECD countries and to foreigners vulnerability to unemployment in these countries (OECD, 1998; OECD, 1999). In the earlier quoted study of Wrench a.o. (1999), which is mostly devoted to issues of discrimination and diversity, data are given on immigrant's occupational structure and sector of employment in only a number of the countries studied.

In the OECD (1998) report, changes in total employment and the employment of foreigners between 1973 and 1997 are studied in six European countries where foreign labour accounts for a relatively high share in total labour force (Belgium, UK, France, Germany, Luxembourg and the Netherlands). All these countries except Germany experienced in this period employment growth. The reductions in total employment in industry have been more than offset by increases in the tertiary sector. For foreigners the employment creation in the service sector has not been sufficient to compensate for losses in the industrial sector in Belgium, France and Germany. The fragility of foreigners' employment as this OECD study shows, was particularly high in the construction sector in Belgium, and to a lesser degree in France and the UK, and in mining and/or manufacturing in Germany, Luxembourg, France and the Netherlands. In the service sector the situation is quite different. In the hotel and restaurant sector, foreigners have more benefited from employment creation than nationals (except in France and the Netherlands). Except for the Netherlands this is also the case in business services sector and real estate. The employment of foreigners in the transport sector increased at the faster rate than for nationals in the UK, Luxembourg and France. The same study shows that in general foreigners are more vulnerable to unemployment than nationals. The following factors are mentioned behind different unemployment rates of foreigners and nationals: 'changes in economic performance and the nature of the jobs occupied by the different ethnic groups, the demographic structure and the order of the various waves of migration into the host country. The profile of the immigrants has an important bearing on their degree of employability: variables such as age, gender, nationality, level of education, training and experience, mastery of the host country's language and the length of stay in the host country play a non-negligible role among the factors which explain the degree of vulnerability to unemployment' (OECD, 1998:40). The OECD (1998) report continues to elaborate on the low likelihood for the low-skilled foreign workers in manufacturing to find a new job after having lost their job due to major restructuring; the preponderance of the role of family immigration in total immigration, explaining increases in employment and unemployment among female foreigners and immigrants; differences in educational attainment which will make foreign youths more vulnerable to unemployment than young nationals; and finally racial and cultural discrimination.

The SYSDEM Trends report (1999) devoted to ethnic minorities and immigrant groups on the labour markets of the EU member states, mentions in the introduction only some general and partly well known facts on immigrants' qualifications, occupational structure and participation by economic sector. Immigrant/minority groups often have a lower level of formal education, and show higher drop-out rates in further training than comparable groups among the native labour force. Immigrants still show an over-representation in low-skilled and unskilled occupations, often in blue-collar jobs with unpleasant working conditions. In many EU countries immigrant employment is concentrated in only a few sectors like certain branches of manufacturing industry, building and construction, trade and 'other services' which predominantly is in cleaning, personal care services and hotel and catering. Although the country-reports in this SYSDEM study are highly informative, they lack a common
structure which makes an overall comparison difficult, if not impossible. It can by definition not do away with existing national-idiosyncratic differences in the use of terms and definitions (like: foreigners, immigrants, minorities etc.).

Part of the explanation of the unfavourable position of immigrants and ethnic minorities on the labour market can without any doubt be attributed to a number of factors on both the demand and the supply side of the labour market and its developments in the past few decades. The restructuring of the European economies made many of the recruited labour migrants of the past redundant. Part of the explanation will be that those who arrived after the waves of labour recruitment, like the family members and later also the asylum seekers and refugees, that they did so without a direct link with the labour market, and unfortunately in many countries at a moment that unemployment was rising and job opportunities were less favourable. A downturn of the economic business cycle has caused an early rise in unemployment among the immigrants in the Netherlands in the 1980's which continued to increase in the early 1990s. Only after a strong economic improvement in the second half of the 1990s an important decrease in unemployment rates became visible, but they still are unacceptably high and they are lagging far behind the decreased unemployment rates among the native Dutch (Muus, 2001) The Swedish case showed later a similar development, due too the fact that the economic down-turn occurred later in time and shows only recently signs of strong recovery (Westin, 2000). In both cases the unemployment rates among different immigrant categories show important variations. In comparing immigrants' labour market incorporation in different EU member states it may be of importance to devote attention to this phenomenon. How comes that a rather stable order developed in unemployment and participation rates of immigrant categories with a different national or country of birth background?

**Discrimination and exclusion of immigrants and ethnic minorities on the labour market**

Wrench and others (1999) showed in all the European countries which were included in the volume that discrimination and exclusion of immigrants occurs (on young immigrants, female immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers etc.) which may vary from legal aspects of discrimination like formal access to the labour market or parts of it (like the public sector) to institutional forms of ethnic and racial discrimination and by different forms of discrimination in practice. In a number of countries data show that non-EU nationals experience more discrimination at the labour market than other EU nationals. Evidence of discriminatory practices and their effects at the labour market are in a number of countries found in direct and indirect ways. A number of EU member states have (recently) introduced anti-discrimination legislation (e.g. UK, Ireland, Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden). The UK is the example of a country with a long established legal tradition in fighting forms of racial discrimination. The anti-discrimination legislation in a country like France is part and parcel of an egalitarian approach guided by a universalistic ideology. Not all EU member states have developed anti-discrimination legislation and not all migrant categories are protected by anti-discrimination legislation. Certain categories like those at work in an irregular or undocumented way are often not in the position to claim protection from anti-discrimination legislation. Non-EU nationals cannot claim protection from the existing EU anti-discrimination legislation, which deals only with discrimination of (other) EU nationals.
Policies directed at the incorporation of immigrants in the labour market

Most of the recent policies directed at the incorporation of immigrants in the labour markets of EU member states are shortly described in the SYSDEM Trends no. 32 (1999) report. The most salient policy aspects mentioned in this report will be given below:

Belgium (Denys and Simoens, 1999) General policies are directed to weak groups at the labour market, like the low qualified and the long-term unemployed. The impact of these measures on minority groups is difficult to be known. Specific measures are taken since 1998 at the Federal and regional level. At the federal level it concerns training and employment measures as an outcome of an agreement of the social partners to consider immigrants as a specific risk group. Public service jobs are recently open for all EU nationals and in some cases for non-EU nationals. At the regional Flemish level the government and social partners agreed in 1998 on proportional and full employment of migrants in public and private labour markets. An annual Action Plan will be formulated with measurable targets. The Action Plan distinguishes three domains: affirmative action, anti-discrimination training, and the improvement of the employability of migrants. In Wallonia, regional integration centres are established mainly to improve the social integration of migrants and guiding young unemployed to the public employment services.

Denmark (Kongshoy Madsen, 1999). Migrants and ethnic minorities have access to all general labour market measures and instruments. Specific measures were developed within the ‘action plan against (ethnic) barriers on the labour market’ (1992-1996) that have partly been continued since then. Measures include guidance, language courses, training, job-search and information activities. A specific wage-subsidy scheme was developed to increase the employment opportunities for people with Danish as a second language (ice breaker scheme) as well as for academics. The improvement of language skills has been specially emphasized. Since 1-1 1999 a new obligatory three year integration scheme has been introduced for refugees. Refugees will be evenly distributed over Denmark under the responsibility of the local authorities and have to follow a three year integration program. They will receive a monthly allowance, which will be reduced if one is not actively taken part in the programme. A permanent permit will only be given after three years and having successfully followed the programme.

Germany (Vogler-Ludwig, 1999). The Federal Ministry of Labour funds policy measures to support immigrants in three areas: The most important area is the social and occupational integration of foreigners. About 40% of the available budget (1998) is spent on social care by charity institutions, about one third is spent on language training and 16% of the budget is used for vocational training and preparation for labour market entry of specific target groups, like young foreigners and young women with specific training deficits. Next to this policy are foreigners supported by the Labour Promotion Act. Special attention is given to the integration of ethnic Germans.

Greece (Petraki Kottis, 1999) Ethnic immigrants can take part in the existing active labour market programmes for disadvantaged groups. The Pontians are regarded as returning Greeks and can benefit from specific measures for their social and economic integration. Albanians are not treated as a favourable category, they can benefit from certain labour market programmes but are officially encouraged to return home. The situation of illegal foreign employment in the informal sector is in fact the dominant issue. The Greek government tries to intervene in this situation by regularisation and the issuing of temporary residence and work permits (‘green card’).
Spain (Carrasco and Toharia, 1999) Benefits from employment promotion programmes within the active labour market policies are not available for all foreigners but depend on work-permits. Foreigners are not allowed to work in the public sector. Specific vocational training courses for immigrants are sparse compared to those for other categories. In terms of passive policies are insurance-based unemployment benefits only available after one year of contribution and have non-EU foreigners no right to the assistance unemployment benefits. In 1994 a Plan for the Social Integration of Immigrants has been launched. A number of labour market related proposals are included but its effects in terms of realization are still unknown. France (Gineste, 1999) France has on the one hand a long tradition of measures to incorporate immigrants and their families with the help of the Social Action Fund (FAS). On the other hand the French policy is very much devoted to the prospect that foreigners will gain French citizenship, including the principle equality of rights in all areas. Foreign immigrants have access to all common active labour market measures for disadvantaged groups like the long-term unemployed, women, disabled and youths. Immigrants may partake in general measures like adult vocational education (AFPA) and subsidized employment in the non-commercial sector. In some cases of under-representation of immigrants in measures, like that of immigrant youngsters in training measures in the first, a specific measure is developed. The activities of the FAS are in recent years more directed at (language)training and job search support. Shortly, specific measures are developed with a view to refugees and recognized asylum seekers, the number of participants in these programmes are still low (1,300 in 1997). Ireland (Sexton, 1999) No specific information is given on the situation with regard to labour market policy measures for immigrants. This is probably due to the fact that Ireland only recently experienced immigration like other European countries. Asylum seekers are denied access to the labour market (at least until 1999).

Italy (Samek, 1999) Labour market policy issues are generally left to the local (regional and sub-regional) level and to non-governmental organisations and trade unions with large differences in the approaches and services provided. In the Northern regions policies concerned mainly housing and welfare; in the central regions, policies are more directed on training and the labour market, while in the Southern regions there is a lack of adequate policies which are partly substituted by activities of associations and trade unions. The March 1998 Immigration Act includes some labour market measures to be undertaken, and speaks about the need to develop equal opportunities and anti-discrimination policies. Like in some other Southern EU countries, illegal migration and undocumented work in the informal sector are quite dominant and influence public discussion and leads to prioritise relevant policy measures.

Luxembourg (Warner, 1999) Policy and social measures for integrating foreigners are based on the law of July 1993. A large array of policy measures is mentioned, among which measures on training and schooling and on information on labour market issues. No specific details are given. Compared to other EU countries Luxembourg is in a very specific situation. On the one hand it has relatively the largest foreign labour force, but this foreign labour force consists for 90% out of other EU-nationals.

The Netherlands (Peters and Rettab, 1999) Dutch ‘ethnic minorities’ policy has officially been established in the early 1980’s with a view to create equal access and equal opportunities between native Dutch and targeted immigrant categories (‘ethnic minorities’). This policy was reinforced in 1996 by a ‘settling down policy’ (Inburgeringsbeleid) for new immigrants. This highly decentralised policy consists of a compulsory language tuition programme and guidance towards the labour market. Mainstream labour market measures, which are open for immigrants, include a number of instruments due to the in 1998 established law on the integration of jobseekers (Wet Inschakeling Werkzoekenden, WIW). This law focuses on unemployed young jobseekers and the long-term unemployed. Evaluations show that these
measures tend to 'cream off' the labour supply, and specific measures seem to be more successful in reaching ethnic minorities. Another general measure concerns subsidized additional employment (Melkert-jobs), here 34% of the inflow came from ethnic minorities in 1997. Specific labour market policies are carried out or supported by the public employment service, the government and the social partners. The public employment service aims at proportional placement of ethnic minorities in measures and job placement. The government introduced the SAMEN law (1998) as a successor of the 1994 dated law on the enhancement of equal labour participation of allochtonous (non-natives) (WBEAA). Firms with more than 35 employees have to report yearly on the immigrant representation in their work force and on the way they try to reach the desired equal labour participation. Reporting, although it is improving, is still poor and enforcement of the law is lacking. At last, social partners have reached agreement on a number of initiatives in the field of the promotion of immigrant employment. Most recently, specific labour market measures for ethnic minorities may also be taken within the framework of 'major cities policies'. These policies are co-ordinated by the same minister who is responsible for the integration of minorities policies. Austria (Lechner, 1999) There are no specific measures for immigrants in Austria's labour market policy. Participation in labour market measures is open for all foreigners with a valid employment permit under the same conditions as for Austrians. Data show that in practice only 1% of all participants in labour market measures are foreign immigrants. Recent immigrants without an employment permit are excluded from labour market participation and have no access to labour market measures. Excepted from this rule are Bosnian refugees with a fixed-term residence permit, who have limited and fixed-term access to jobs in certain sectors. Special advisory and support centres for foreign workers have been set up to assist in obtaining a work licence and in coping with unemployment. Young foreigners have only a conditioned access to employment under the law on the employment of foreigners, which limits foreign employment to a 8% of total employment and which allows only 1% additional foreign employment by 'integrated young foreigners' and some other categories. Part of this phenomenon may be explained by the following: Unemployment benefits are granted irrespective of nationality but since 1998 foreign-born persons may have great difficulties to meet the criteria like having been in socially insured employment for eight out of the last ten years. In that case they will not receive a maintenance benefit and cannot be sure of retaining their residence right. Given the work permit system unemployed foreigners are forced to find a new job as quickly as possible. The term ethnic minorities is in the Austrian context only designated for specific groups with Austrian citizenship, like Roma and Sinti, and minorities from Austria's eastern and south-eastern border having lived in Austria for generations. Portugal (Lopes and Fiolhais). A government resolution of 1993 aims to facilitate 'the integration of immigrants, ethnic minorities and other disadvantaged groups in the existing employment policy structure'. Till 1996 immigrants were not the subject of specific measures, but were covered by the instruments for disadvantaged groups (young people threatened with exclusion, homeless, drug addicts etc.). February 1996 a High Commission for Immigration and Ethnic Minorities has been established, and in the same year a Strategic Concertation Agreement was signed by the government and social partners. The first employment policy measure was taken in January 1999 in the field of vocational education and the creation of units for integration in working life and support of local employment initiatives. Finland (Santamäki-Vuori, 1999) Foreigners permanently residing in Finland are entitled to partake in all labour market services. Active measures have mainly taken the form of labour market training (vocational and preparatory), a measure that is regularly monitored in its output.
Sweden (Thoursie, 1999) In 1975 Parliament approved the guiding principles for immigration and minority policy as 'equality, freedom of choice and co-operation'. In 1997 a new proposal was approved: immigrants are not to be seen as a special group just because they are immigrants. First and for all, all people are given equal rights and opportunities, independent of their ethnic and cultural background. A new 'Integration Board' was established in 1998, and measures of the new integration policy should target immigrants in the first two-three years of residence in Sweden, after which general welfare measures should be activated. The share of non-Nordic citizens in active labour market policy is followed closely in relation to their share in total unemployment. There are practically no specific labour market programmes for immigrants. Most common for non-Nordic citizens is to participate in some type of employment training. Besides general access to the extensive active labour market policy measures, immigrants are offered Swedish language tuition (SFI) (average 525 hours) and basic knowledge of Swedish society at the local level by their municipalities. The organizations of the social partners have only recently (1997) become involved in taken action in issues like ethnic discrimination.

United Kingdom (Meager, 1999): Active labour market schemes are not specially targeted at ethnic minorities, but the participation of ethnic minorities in the main active labour market schemes and the output is regularly monitored in comparison with white trainees. The main active measures are 'work-based training for young people' and 'work-based training for adults'. Recently (1998), two New Deals have been introduced. The first is the New Deal for Young People with compulsory participation for all 18-24 year olds who are at least 6 months unemployed. The government aims at a high level of ethnic minority participation and includes the involvement of ethnic minority organizations in the scheme. The second is the New Deal for Long-term Unemployed of 25 years or over, for those who are at least two years unemployed. This measure is less extensive than the one for young people. Race equality policies are greatly institutionalised in companies mainly due to the efforts of the 1984 established Commission for Racial Equality (CRE): nine out of ten companies with over 7,000 employees had a policy in this respect in 1993-1994.

In six of the fifteen member states anti-discrimination laws are in force: Denmark, Ireland, the Netherlands, Finland, Sweden and the United Kingdom. In Germany a ban on discrimination is embedded in the Constitution and explicitly mentioned in important labour market laws (SYSDEM Trends. No32, 1999).

Summarizing: This brief overview based on the SYSDEM correspondents reports on more recent labour market policy measures shows a number of interesting points. Policies towards immigrants and/or ethnic minorities with an immigrant background are formulated within the national political and ideological context with a view to their integration in the respective nation-state. This automatically has an impact on the phrasing or terminology used for the people concerned, be it immigrants, foreigners or ethnic minorities. It also partly explains the relative ease or uneasiness in developing specific policies and/or to designate immigrant target groups depending on overriding national values like equality (for example Sweden) or the ultimate goal of obtaining citizenship of the country of settlement (France). In this sense it is to be understood that in the formerly politically 'pillarized' Dutch society an approach called 'ethnic minorities policies' could develop, while in France the ultimate goal remained the obtaining of French citizenship with all its rights and duties. Another point of interest is that countries with a longer experience with immigration tend to have developed a more extensive policy framework to incorporate immigrants in working life and in the field of anti-discrimination. This was not always leading to the development of specific measures for immigrants or ethnic minorities, but monitoring systems might be in place. Countries which
have only recently experienced immigration, like the Southern European countries, Ireland and Finland start to develop elements of labour market oriented policies for immigrants or (start to) allow for equal access of the existing measures for immigrants and natives alike. The overview shows also, as in the case of Austria, that unemployment levels among foreign residents might as well be influenced by the specific working of the residence permit and work licence system. For further research in understanding relative employment and unemployment rates, this means that a better insight must be obtained in the working of these systems in the countries concerned. In which way the degree of the extensiveness of the welfare state impacts on the employment or the unemployment rates of immigrants cannot be concluded on the basis of this brief and partly non-historical overview. Finally in a number of countries (Denmark, Netherlands, Sweden, France) specific policy programmes have been developed to guide newcomers or refugees in the first few years of their stay in working life and society.

Cross-national comparative studies on the integration of immigrants on the labour market

The ILO published a number of cross-national comparative studies on the labour market integration of immigrants (Werner, 1994; Böhning and Zegers de Beijl, 1995; Doomernik, 1998).

The study of Werner (1994) may be seen as the first overview study in comparing the integration of foreign workers into the labour markets of France, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden. Werner systematically describes the labour market integration of foreign workers in these four countries, not without first trying to establish a concept of integration of foreign workers in the labour market and mentioning the difficulties of national terms and definitions. 'Integration' in the terms of Werner, 'can be understood as a process and at the same time as a state. The integration process proceeds in the direction of the desired state, i.e. the achievement of successful integration. The integration process has proceeded successfully if, with respect to participation in social areas of the receiving country, differences between comparable groups of nationals and foreigners/ethnic minorities no longer exist. Important areas for integration are housing, education and work. The pre-requisite for the successful integration of a person is legal security/legal equality for the migrants.' (Werner, 1994:3). In fact this concept leaves open whether both the national and the foreign population move towards each other, or that the foreign population is assimilating in the receiving society.

Successful integration in the labour market refers to the same employment structures of comparable national and foreigner groups (with regard to unemployment, earnings, activity rate etc.). The prerequisite is an equal access to occupation/work and access to education and educational schemes, housing or social security. Werner states that the integration objective is to be reached by the integration policy. This policy must start from factors that influence integration. He comes forward with a short-list of factors promoting integration and factors making integration difficult, both in the case of the migrant and in the case of the receiving country:

Factors promoting integration (receiving country)
Availability of jobs in occupations, sectors of the economy and regions with good prospects;
Access to the labour market regulated only to a small extent;
Active minorities policies;
Policy of equality of opportunity;
Willingness on the side of the national population to accept the newcomers.
Factors making integration difficult (receiving country)
Statutory discrimination;
De facto discrimination by gate-keepers such as personnel managers, job placement officers etc.;
Resistance of the society of the receiving country to the integration of foreigners;
Regulated admission to the labour market, including self-employment.

Factors promoting integration (migrant)
Qualifications: training and vocational aptitudes and skills;
Prime working age approximately 25-45 years;
Personal motivation;
Socially acceptable family income;
Fairly long duration of stay;
Durable employment;
Similar cultural origins/ties.

Factors making integration difficult (migrant)
Lasting or frequent unemployment;
Precarious employment conditions (limited service contract, involuntary part-time work, employment with sub-contractors);
Qualifications and training deficiencies;
Employment in occupations, sectors of the economy, regions which are affected by market restructuring;
Age;
Sex: female (access to the regular labour market more difficult for women)
Larger number of children;
Cultural distance.

As in this study, Werner tries to measure the integration in the labour market with the help of indicators. In his case it concerns the unemployment rate, income, the female activity rate, the degree of employment of nationals and foreigners in a-typical forms of employment, the degree of self-employment. Finally, much attention is paid to the integration policy in the four countries.

The findings and conclusions of this comparative study show that:
(a) in all four countries the unemployment rates among foreigners are considerably higher than among nationals, be it that the unemployment rates among young foreigners have fallen only in Germany probably due to demographic developments favouring the entrants of young foreigners in the dual vocational education system and in the labour market. Differing unemployment rates are found among different national/ethnic groups. The explanation given is partly to be found in the restructuring of the manufacturing industry. Job losses are only partly compensated for by employment in the service sector. Discrimination is another explanation especially if unemployment rates differ while essential labour market characteristics between nationals and foreigners are the same. During a recession employers can recruit from a larger pool of candidates, which allows for a preference for national workers;
(b) earnings differ between the national and foreign groups but foreigners do not form a homogeneous group. Similar qualifications reduce the differences in earnings, but foreigners generally tend to earn less than nationals;
(c) the activity rates among foreign women are considerably lower than those of native women, while their unemployment rates are higher. Only among EU women figures comparable to national women are found;

(d) integration policies partly depend on successful migration policies. Werner (1994) perceives Sweden as the country with the most conceptually sophisticated and most consistent immigration and integration policies, which has regulated immigration to a high degree. Equal treatment is a necessary prerequisite to integration, but may have adverse effects like in France where allocation of public housing has led to an outflow of nationals from certain neighbourhoods and increased segregation in housing, and like in the Netherlands where a generous social security system led for a long time to social security as an acceptable alternative for gainful employment. In general, a long-term absence of the labour market is seen as detrimental to human capital and will cause difficulties for re-employment. Integration policies in the four countries show signs of convergence, and with regard to the labour market have special measures lost favour instead of general measures. However, foreigners as disproportionately high potential beneficiaries in labour market measures actually participate in these measures only to a disproportionately low extent. Immigrants are mainly found in schemes that often have a ‘parking’ function.

The study of Werner (1994) is quoted here in such an elaborate way since it follows a similar kind of set-up like this study, while paying great attention to the regulative role of migration (admission) policy and the role of integration policy. But recent developments in for example the unemployment rates of a country like Sweden are difficult to be explained by the more elaborate integration policies of that country. Doomernik (1998) could not establish how effective the policy efforts are in integrating immigrants and their descendants in the labour markets and in the educational systems of France, Germany and the Netherlands. The low unemployment rate of Turkish nationals in Germany cannot be explained by differing policy efforts. Doomernik points instead to the fact that the legal position of foreigners is more insecure in Germany and that Germany continued to have a return migration policy next to an integration policy. In a thus far unpublished study by Muus (2001) where the labour market participation of Turkish migrants and their descendants in five European countries (France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany and Sweden) is compared, the possible impact of integration policies on the participation in the labour market could not be established either. The differing migration policies (admission and return) have clearly had an impact on the relative demographic growth of the Turkish immigrant population from a relative high growth in the Netherlands to a relative low growth in Germany. Naturalisation policies had also a clear impact on the share of the naturalized Turkish population in the countries concerned, where naturalization was even highest in case dual nationality was allowed (the Netherlands). Migration and naturalization policies seem to have had a much greater impact than integration policies, which may be characterized as ‘softer’ policies.

Finally the study of Böhning and Zegers de Beijl (1995) is of particular interest for this section, particularly in the contributions of Böhning. Böhning starts to elaborate on the labour market disintegration consequently showing its detrimental effects on foreigners more than on natives. According to Böhning the macro-economic parameters changed in the 1970s due to three factors: oil price rises (1973/74 and 1978/79); the ‘skill-biased’ nature of recent technological change; and finally the deeper involvement of Asian economies in the world’s economy (globalization). The resulting intensified structural adjustment processes in Europe’s economies caused some measure of general labour market disintegration and a considerable measure of disintegration for non-nationals, partly visible in unemployment, in the growth of
irregular economic activities and in return to the home countries. Böhning shows, while quoting Seifert’s (1994) study on the socio-economic mobility of migrants, that foreigners relative to Germans lost ground. German nationals left semi-skilled and skilled manual positions between 1984 and 1989, while foreign workers (first and second generation) experienced mobility almost exclusively within blue-collar jobs and a great deal was even downwards. Böhning’s (1995) conclusion is that the labour market disintegration for migrants starting in western and northern Europe in the 1970s could not be stemmed by the vast array of special measures which where meant to counter this development. The measures in itself are not questioned, without them the disintegration of the migrants would even be worse. A larger effective participation of immigrants is needed in active labour market and employment measures and a strengthening of these measures is deemed necessary. In his second contribution in the above mentioned study, Böhning takes a critical stand with regard to the sustainability of the labour import in Europe in comparison with the labour import in the United States. On both sides of the Ocean the admission of foreigners is favoured of foreigners either with high qualifications or in unskilled jobs. In Böhning’s analysis there is no room for upward mobility for migrants in European societies, if compared to what is possible in the United States, and he refers to both the underlying policy concepts and the impact these concepts have on the willingness of society to accept foreigners’ upward mobility as desirable and worthy of public support. If the current situation in Europe will continue to be like it is, the poor-rich cleavage in European societies will increasingly take an ethnic dimension with tensions between the national and the ethnic poor. The current basic policy is seen as unsustainable, and according to Böhning this potential explosive situation can only be defused by either a change towards US-like settlement orientation, or by satisfying the bottom end labour requirements with a truly temporary labour import policy.

The study of Böhning and Zegers de Beijl (1995) is of importance here since, it brings us partly back to the role of the welfare state in integration issues, at least if we may assume that socio-economic mobility in the United States is not only seen as driving force in society but that it is also to be related to a less extensive and more market-based welfare state compared to the majority of the European welfare states. Secondly, it brings us back to the relationship between migration and the labour market. It may help to shed some light on the relative rigidity of European societies, the difficulties they encounter to incorporate immigrants in European societies and in their labour markets and in the country specific way this may have been reinforced by different ideological philosophies in nation state building, which may in the end turn out to have a differential but generally negative effect on the labour market integration of immigrants.
IV How to continue from here? The development of research questions and thoughts on a relevant country comparison

4.1 Labour market needs and migration

This pre-study has shown that it is difficult to discern direct labour market needs in relation to migration, at least in the current situation and probably already since the end of the labour recruitment era in the early 1970s. Most of the migration in the past quarter of the twentieth century does not show a direct link to the formal labour markets of European countries: it concerns predominantly family reunification and family formation, forced migration (asylum seekers and refugees), the arrival of former nationals (Aussiedler) and the arrival of irregular and/or undocumented migrants. A small part of the migration is directly linked to formal labour market needs, a part which may increase in the future if a changing demographic composition of European countries may cause a need for some kind of 'replacement migration'. In most countries some kind of work permit or employment permit system is in function to regulate labour migration of non-EEA (European Economic Area) nationals. EU member states differ in the way they have taken additional measures to regulate new entrees of non-EEA labour at the labour market (see section II). Although labour migration may become more important in the near future, the priority for feasible research is more in the second aim of this project. In a later phase, but not yet here, the first aim may increasingly become an important issue.

4.2 National variations in the degree of immigrants' labour market incorporation

We have seen that in the end of the 1990s EU member states show important variations in the degree of immigrant incorporation in their labour markets if measured by indicators like the unemployment and employment rate, if possible by gender and in comparison with the national working age population (see section III). On the basis of what has been presented thus far, two schemes of analysis are presented in the next pages in a first try to relate independent variables to the dependent variables immigrant incorporation in the labour market and the development of policies with regard to immigrants' incorporation in the labour market.
A. Scheme of analysis: Factors at the macro-level which may explain variations in national degrees in immigrants labour market incorporation/c.q. participation

- **policies**
  - labour market policies
  - other welfare state p.
  - aliens policy
  - immigrant or integration policies

- **economy/labour market**
  - (un)employment
  - business cycle
  - ec. restructuring

- **immigrants labour market incorporation/participation**
  - (un)employment rate
  - sectoral employment
  - socio-economic mobility

- **demography**
  - ageing
  - need for replacement
  - WAP
  - (continued) immigration

- **immigrant characteristics**
  - nationality/country of birth
  - migration histories
  - skills/age/gender
  - language skills

- **attitudes towards immigrants**
  - favouring integration
  - discrimination
B. Scheme of analysis: Factors which may explain at the macro-level the (country specific) development of policies oriented on immigrants' labour market incorporation c.q. participation

- economy/labour market
  - (un)employment
  - business cycle
  - ec. restructuring

- Aliens policy:
  - admission
  - stay
  - work
  - return

- national ideology of civic integration of nationals and foreigners
  - ius sanguinis/soli (options for naturalization)
  - assimilation/integration/multiculturalism/segregation
  - citizenship rights (inclusion/exclusion of non-nationals)

- policies furthering immigrants' labour market incorporation
  - general/specific measures
  - target groups/all immigrants
  - obligatory/voluntary

- equality/anti-discrimination policies

- welfare state policies
  - labour market
  - social security
  - (vocational) education
  - housing

- immigrants' labour market incorporation/participation
  - (un)employment
  - sectoral employment
  - socio-economic mobility

- immigrant characteristics
  - nationality/country of birth
  - migration histories
  - skills/age/gender
  - language skills

- attitudes towards immigrants
  - favouring integration
  - discrimination
4.3 The development of specific research questions

A. Possible factors behind variations in immigrants’ labour market incorporation c.q. participation between countries of settlement

Immigrants’ labour market incorporation may be called successful if participation- and socio-economic mobility patterns between comparable categories of immigrants and natives show a high degree of similarity.

A successful immigrants’ labour market incorporation may depend on:
(1) The general development and state of the economy and labour market;
(2) Immigrants’ characteristics like the distribution of skill levels, age, gender but also of language skills;
(3) The migration history of specific immigrant groups (by nationality or country of birth), partly defining the gradual development of the groups’ specific labour market entrance and ‘niche’;
(4) The combined effects of (1) and (3), for example in the case of the restructuring of the economy, from manufacturing industries to service sector activities;
(5) The general attitude towards immigrants;
(6) The combined effects of (1) and (5), for example in times of high general unemployment, leading to greater chances of discrimination in access to work/promotion and in dismissal of immigrants;
(7) The demographic development in the country of settlement, influencing the labour market chances of specific age groups and women;
(8) The combined effects of (1) and (7) specifically in the case of a worsening labour market and continued immigration;
(9) A high degree of labour market regulation may with active labour market policies may positively effect immigrants’ labour market incorporation, depending on (1), (2), (3) and (5) (and vice versa)
(10) Immigrants’ high participation in employment may be an effect of a weak legal status in case of unemployment (and vice versa)

Research questions (9) and (10) turn around the issue of the possible effect of existing policies on immigrants’ successful labour market incorporation/participation. Here we find a complex combination of factors that may effect immigrants’ labour market participation. A careful selection of countries, with long time series of (un)employment by age and gender has to shed light upon: the possible existence of breaking points, where high labour market regulation combined with active labour market policies is not a sufficient condition for high employment rates and low unemployment rates (like in Sweden, the Netherlands etc.); or on the possible effect of the threat of loss of residence permit (in case of unemployment) on job-seeking behaviour and consequently in possible high employment rates (e.g. Austria). Other more detailed research questions may even be formulated on the possible effect of different immigrant or integration policies.

Although the relationship between policies and immigrants’ labour market incorporation needs further clarification by research, the country specific development of these policies is the subject to be treated in its own right in the next paragraph.
B. Major background variables that may impact on the (country specific) development of policies with regard to the incorporation of the immigrant population in the labour market.

National policies furthering immigrants’ labour market integration may show important variations between countries. These variations may concern the presence/absence of these policies, and in case they exist they may vary from specific to general, for targeted groups to all immigrants, from voluntary to obligatory measures etc.

The development of (national) policies furthering immigrants’ labour market incorporation may be influenced by the following factors:

(1) the general development and state of the economy and labour market. Generally, a good functioning labour market may cause less needs to develop specific policies than a less well developing labour market;

(2) a high degree of immigrants’ labour market incorporation may cause less needs to develop a (specific) policy than in case of a deteriorating or low degree of immigrants’ labour market incorporation;

(3) the composition of the immigrant population (skills, age, gender), their specific migration histories (in time, by nationality/country of birth, by type of migrant) may lead to the development of specific policies for certain (sub)categories. (Between countries of settlement an important variation exists in the above mentioned immigrant population and its migration histories);

(4) aliens policy, specifically with regard to the conditions with regard to access to the labour market, may impact on the development of policies furthering immigrants’ labour market incorporation (e.g. absence of specific policies in case work- and residence permit are linked to being employed);

(5) the national ideology of civic integration of nationals and foreigners may impact on the development of policies furthering immigrants’ labour market incorporation: in countries where the national ideology strives after the inclusion of non-nationals by naturalization (e.g. France) specific policies for immigrants will less easy be developed if compared to countries that allow for the existence of ethnic minorities or that even promote multiculturalism (e.g. Netherlands). In other cases (e.g. Germany) naturalization has long not been a possible policy option due to the national ideology (here based on ius sanguinis) what may have left labour market integration policies in a strong relation to aliens policy.

(6) the existence of equality and anti-discrimination policies may have a strong impact on the development of policies furthering immigrants’ labour market incorporation. The existence of one type of politically prioritised policy (for example a gender equality policy) may (initially) hinder the development of another policy like a diversity policy based on national or ethnic belonging. The existence of anti-discrimination policies may possibly lead to a number of policies furthering immigrants’ labour market incorporation with more obligatory elements than may be the case in the absence of anti-discrimination policies;

(7) welfare state policies stressing a more general policy approach (often in ‘assimilative’ national contexts (6)) will not easily lead to specific policies furthering immigrants’ labour market incorporation; welfare state policies which allow for the special treatment of specific categories may easier allow for the development of specific policies towards immigrants and the labour market;
(8) the effect of (4), (5), (6) and (7) on the country specific development of policies furthering immigrants’ labour market incorporation may on its turn be influenced by the state and development of the economy and the labour market (1), the degree of successful labour market incorporation of immigrants (2) and immigrant characteristics (3);

The above mentioned specific research questions (under A and B), partly formulated like work-hypotheses, must be seen as a first try in developing the elements mentioned in both schemes of analysis.

4.4 Which configuration of countries to be compared?

Firstly, in order to be able to study the variation in the observed phenomena (variation between countries in immigrants’ labour market incorporation, and variation between countries in immigrant policies) the selected countries should preferably vary in the (un)employment rates of immigrants and nationals and in (immigrant) policies. Secondly, the number of countries to be studied should be limited to those countries where one might reasonably expect that a major share of needed data will be available. A practical limitation exists in the availability of relevant researchers/research institutes in the proposed field of study.

In comparing the data on the unemployment rates of particularly non-EU nationals (by gender) and nationals in the EU member states (see section III) a differentiation is found in the end of the 1990s between countries with relatively very high unemployment among non-EU nationals (Nordic countries, Netherlands, Belgium, France), countries with relatively high unemployment among non-EU nationals (Austria, UK, Germany) and countries with comparable unemployment rates among nationals and non-EU nationals (Spain, Greece). In comparing the employment rates (see section III) we find a quite similar grouping: the highest employment rates for non-EU nationals are found in the four Mediterranean member states, in Austria, Germany and the UK. While lower employment rates among non-EU nationals are found in Belgium, the Netherlands, France, Finland, Sweden and Denmark.

If we take the existing differentiation in the realm of welfare state policies in consideration and add the Mediterranean countries as a fourth world to Esping-Andersen’s (1990) three worlds of welfare capitalism (liberal Anglo-Saxon; conservative: Continental Europe; social democratic: Scandinavian countries), a differentiation which greatly overlaps with Baldwin-Edwards (1991) four immigration policy regimes in Europe, the choice of countries should also at least represent one country of each area.

4.5 Towards a limitation of immigrant categories to be compared?

Finally we may wonder whether the study should only concentrate on nationals versus other-EU versus non-EU immigrants in general, or that a limited number of immigrant categories by type of immigration or by (former) country of nationality is added to the comparison. Difficulties may arise since not all immigrant categories (by nationality or country of birth) exist in all pre-selected countries. The choice may be a combination of type of migrant and of grouping by nationality. Depending on the final selection of countries the choice may be on immigrant workers and their family members having originally arrived in the same period (for
example Turkish immigrants); *immigrants from former colonies and overseas territories*; and finally *asylum seekers and refugees* (for example Bosnians); No direct solution is yet there how to include the same specific immigrant categories in the to be selected South European and other EU member states.
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