Associate Professor Maria Denisa VASILESCU, PhD
E-mail: maria.vasilescu@csie.ase.ro
The Bucharest University of Economic Studies
National Scientific Research Institute for Labour and Social Protection
Professor Erika MARIN, PhD
E-mail: erika.marin@csie.ase.ro
The Bucharest University of Economic Studies
Professor Liviu-Stelian BEGU, PhD
E-mail: liviu.begu@csie.ase.ro
The Bucharest University of Economic Studies
Andreea-Oana ENACHE, PhD Student
E-mail: enache_oanaa@yahoo.com
National Institute of Economic Research "Costin C. Kiritescu"
Romanian Academy

PERCEPTIONS ABOUT IMMIGRANTS AND THEIR INTEGRATION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

Abstract. International migration is a topic of great interest on the agenda of researchers and policy makers because it is a global phenomenon that has strong effects on both the country of origin and the country of destination. In order to enhance the benefits of migration, a considerable role is played by the successful integration of immigrants. The aim of this paper is to investigate the perception of European Union citizens regarding the integration of immigrants, focusing on the differences of opinion and characteristics between natives, immigrants and the second generation of immigrants. We used the Kruskal-Wallis test and logistic regression and demonstrated that there are significant differences between the views of the three groups regarding the integration process and the important actors in this process. We also showed that, compared to the natives, immigrants are in a relatively vulnerable position on the labour market, although the level of education is not lower than that of national workers.

Keywords: immigration, migrant integration, second generation immigrants, logistic regression.

JEL Classification: F22, J61, C12, C35

1. Introduction

International migration is a topic of intense debate for a long time, but without being able to exhaust the many aspects it involves and without ceasing to

_____

be important through the many challenges it raises. The changing needs on the labour market, technological progress, demographic evolution, geopolitical conflicts, climate change, large differences in development between countries, all these make international migration a phenomenon that will continue in the coming years. Thus, it is essential to focus on the aspects that enhance the benefits of migration, both for the countries of origin and for the host countries.

One of the factors that contribute significantly to the benefits of the migration phenomenon is the successful integration of immigrants. The integration process depends on many factors, related to the individual (age, gender, education, employment, family status, country of origin, language skills), the macroeconomic context (economic growth, minimum wage, occupational sectors, education system, welfare system, the housing market), but also to public opinion (discrimination). The specific migration policies in the destination country also play a major role in the integration process: language training, information campaigns, integration courses, labour market policies that target immigrants (employment services, activation measures and unemployment benefits), social benefits, and naturalization policies (Huddleston et al., 2013).

A decisive role in the successful integration of immigrants is finding a suitable job, which assures the integration into the labour market. But in relation to the labour market, immigrants are still a vulnerable group compared to the natives. Labour market participation rates are generally lower than that of natives, being concentrated in certain sectors (OECD, 2001). Immigrants have a lower level of employability than natives, this being determined by several factors: the language is not properly understood/spoken, the need for a period of adaptation to society and knowledge of institutions' procedures, qualifications and experience that do not always match the demands on the labour market, as well as discrimination, all these make the integration of immigrants on the labour market more difficult.

Although the immigrant profile changes over time, a good picture of the long term immigrant integration process is obtained from the analysis of the second generation of immigrants. They can be considered a kind of buffer between the culture and characteristics specific to immigrants and those specific to the host country. In general, second-generation immigrants have a higher level of education, speak the language fluently, and can find work more easily (Portes and Rumbaut, 2006). On the other hand, there are situations in which traditions prevail, so that even the second generation of immigrants do not feel that they belong to the host country (Foner, 2008). But the great diversity of immigrant characteristics, as well as the national contexts and policies make generalizations difficult.

The present paper aims to investigate the perceptions of European Union citizens regarding the phenomenon of immigration, with a focus on the successful integration of immigrants. The analysis will target the differences between natives, immigrants and second-generation immigrants. More precisely, our research hypotheses are:

H_1: There are significant differences between the natives, the immigrants and the second generation immigrants both in terms of socio-demographic profile (level of education, standard of living, occupational status) as well as in terms of their perceptions of immigration as a phenomenon.

H_2: Immigrants have less skilled jobs compared to natives, being in a relatively vulnerable position.

H_3: The role of the government and other institutions in the host country, as well as the specific measures for the integration of immigrants are perceived differently: immigrants are expected to be helped in the integration process and locals believe that the responsibility of those who come is to make efforts to adapt.

2. Literature review

Immigrant integration is not a new topic, but the issue remains an important aspect, as highlighted by the Agenda 2030, more precisely the Sustainable Development Goals 8 and 10 which point out the need for effective integration policies (ILO, 2016).

But policies differ greatly between states and their effectiveness is very difficult to prove. Broadly speaking, there are two main theories: assimilation - which requires immigrants to adapt to the culture of the host country, and multiculturalism - which emphasizes maintaining cultural diversity (Lutz, 2017). There is still no consensus on the effects of integration policies: some researchers argue that they facilitate the integration of immigrants, others say that these policies are rather obstacles, and some consider them to have very small effects (Goodman, 2015).

The integration of immigrants is not easy to quantify, because there is no universally accepted measure of a successful integration. Thus, researchers approach different methods to evaluate integration. Some studies have focused on the qualitative side (Favell, 1998, Schain, 2008), but more recently there has been a lot of emphasis on the use of indices. For example, Harder et al. (2018) used survey data and built a composite index that takes into account 6 dimensions of integration: psychological, economic, political, social, linguistic, and navigational. Although composite indices provide much more information in the field of integration policies, there are conceptual issues that are frequently subject to criticism (Wright, 2011; Goodman, 2015).

Lutz (2017) used a distinct, actor-centred methodology and considered that integration policies provide incentives and opportunities, and immigrants are conceptualized in the form of aspirations and capabilities. Thus, the success of integration policies is found at the intersection of these four key aspects, practically achieving a matching between immigrants and policies.

The main categories of indicators of immigrant integration used in the methodology developed by the OECD and the European Commission are: education and language skills, participation in the labour market, job quality,

_____

poverty, housing, health and well-being, host country nationality, and social inclusion (OECD-European Commission, 2018).

Zubikova (2020) analysed the level of immigrant integration from 11 new member states of the European Union, using data from 2009-2018. Based on five integration indicators (activity rate, tertiary education, poverty, overcrowding rate and health), the results indicated a high level of heterogeneity in terms of immigrant integration in the analysed countries.

A distinct approach was taken by Sobolewska et al. (2016) who studied the successful integration of immigrants from the perspective of the citizens in the host country. Using survey data from the UK and the Netherlands, the findings indicated that individuals consider that the most important aspect is the cultural integration.

Although much of the research on this topic is conducted from the perspective of the destination countries, there are analyses conducted by researchers from countries of origin aiming to study how citizens integrate, especially in relation to the likelihood of return migration (Karolak, 2020; Roman and Goschin, 2014)

Regarding the second generation of immigrants, the studies focus on economic, educational, social and cultural outcomes as indicators of integration, only recently being also taken into account aspects of identity and sense of belonging (Chimienti et al., 2019). Most of the time, empirical research focuses on comparing them with immigrants and/or natives.

Sweetman and van Ours (2014) analysed the second generation of immigrants in Europe from several perspectives, but with an emphasis on education and labour market. They concluded that integration policies also influence the second generation of immigrants: the policies of selecting immigrants (low versus high skilled) and encouraging family reunification have a strong effect on the level of education of the second generation immigrants. Also, the educational system, more precisely the degree of openness to immigrants through specific catch-up programs or language courses, has a strong effect on educational outcomes. Regarding the labour market, the authors concluded that the most important factors of success are education and language proficiency.

An important component of the immigrant integration process is having a stable job. Numerous studies use wages, unemployment rates and participation rates as indicators of labour market performance (Borjas, 1995, Chiswick et al, 1997, Zorlu and Hartog, 2012). But the disadvantages of immigrants compared to natives go even further: the concentration of immigrants in certain sectors, occupations and types of work has consequences on the quality of jobs, earnings, job security and career prospects. Liu et al. (2019) concluded that immigrants have a significantly higher level of job insecurity compared to domestic workers, and although the difference decreases as the number of years of residence in the host country increases, the differences remain significant up to 11 years after the moment of immigration. Moreover, Xu (2018) used individual data for the period

1996-2013 to analyse the position of immigrants in the labour market compared to native workers, the results indicating that immigrants are the first to be fired in times of economic crisis, the low-skilled being the most vulnerable.

3. Data and methodology

The data used in this analysis come from the Eurobarometer 88.2 - Integration of immigrants in the European Union and corruption (European Commission, 2017). The database contains information for all Member States, with a sample of approximately 1000 respondents aged 15 or over for each country. In total, the database contains 498 variables and 28080 observations. The sampling procedure was probabilistic multistage and the data were collected through face-to-face interviews and Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing in October 2017.

Kruskal-Wallis test

The Kruskal-Wallis test is a non-parametric test often used as an alternative to ANOVA in cases where the assumption of normality is not acceptable. It is used to test whether k independent samples (k ≥ 3) come from the same population, or from populations with identical characteristics. The Kruskal-Wallis test is a generalization of the Mann-Whitney test; when k = 2 the two tests are equivalent.

We assume that we have *k* independent random samples (k ≥ 3) and we denote by $L_i(X)$ the distribution of the random variable X over the population of order *i* with $1 \leq i \leq k$ (Bertrand and Maumy, 2011).

The Kruskal-Wallis test is used to test the following hypotheses:

H_0: $L_1(X) = L_2(X) = \dots = L_k(X)$

H_1: $L_1(X), L_2(X), \dots, L_k(X)$ are not all the same. There is at least one pair of (i, j) such that $L_i(X) \neq L_j(X)$.

For calculating the test statistic, we will use the rank $R_{i,j}$ of $X_{i,j}$ among the *n* values, the sum of the ranks associated with each sample $R_{i,\cdot} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} R_{i,j}$ and average of the ranks of each sample $\overline{R_{i,\cdot}} = R_{i,\cdot}/n_i$.

The test statistics is calculated is follows:

$$KW = \frac{12}{n(n+1)} \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i \left(\overline{R_{i,\cdot}} - \frac{n+1}{2} \right)^2 = \frac{12}{n(n+1)} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{R_{i,\cdot}^2}{n_i} - 3(n+1)$$

If the null hypothesis is rejected, it is not possible to know which specific group is statistically different from other, because the test only indicates that there are significant differences between at least two groups.

Logistic regression

The logistic regression is used when we want to explain a binary response variable Y by an explanatory variable X (or several explanatory variables X_1; X_2; …; X_k) when Y is 0 (failure, the phenomenon does not occur) or 1 (success, the event occurs) (Cornillon et al. 2010).

We have Y = f (x$_1$, x$_2$, …, x$_k$), with (y$_i$, x$_i$) the vector of the realizations of (Y$_i$, X$_i$). But f cannot be a linear function because Y takes only two values, therefore we will use the logistic function:

$$f(x) = \frac{\exp(x)}{1 + \exp(x)} = p$$

Thus, $0 < f(x) < 1$ and $E(Y) = 0$ or 1.

Y follows a Bernoulli law with parameter p. The application of the logit transformation allows us to work with values between $[-\infty; +\infty]$:

$$logit(p) = ln\left(\frac{p}{1-p}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ik}$$

Let P be a probability; its odds is defined by:

$$Odds_P = \frac{P}{1-P}$$

When interpreting the results of the logistic regression, the odds ratio (OR) values are frequently used. For a model with a single explanatory variable, the odds ratio is:

$$OR = \frac{\frac{P(Y_i=1|X=1)}{1-P(Y_i=1|X=1)}}{\frac{P(Y_i=1|X=0)}{1-P(Y_i=1|X=0)}} = \frac{exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1)}{exp(\beta_0)} = exp(\beta_1)$$

The odds ratio *OR = exp (β1),* makes it possible to compare individuals who have the characteristic X with those who do not. For this, we compare the *OR* to 1: if the *OR >1,* the outcome is more likely to occur for the individuals who possess that certain characteristic.

4. Results

In order to test the H$_1$ hypothesis we used the Kruskal-Wallis test, a nonparametric test which allows us to decide if there are significant differences between three or more groups. It is similar to the ANOVA test, but it can be used for both numerical and ordinal variables, as in the present case.

We grouped the analysis of this hypothesis on three aspects: i) the study of the socio-demographic characteristics of the natives compared to the immigrants and the second generation immigrants, ii) the investigation of some general aspects regarding the immigration phenomenon and iii) analysis of the influencing factors of the integration of immigrants from the perspective of the natives, of the first generation immigrants and of the second generation immigrants.

In terms of socio-demographic characteristics, the results indicated significant differences between the natives, the immigrants and the second generation immigrants. The highest share of people with higher education was registered among immigrants (44.7%), followed by second generation immigrants, whereas only 35.8% of the natives are university graduates. On the other hand, it can be noted that the highest share of people with a low level of education is found among native citizens (16.3%), only 9.9% of second-generation immigrants have

under 15 years of schooling. These differences in education are statistically significant, according to the Kruskal-Wallis test.

Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of natives, first-generation immigrants and second-generation immigrants

	Immigrants	Second generation immigrants	Natives	Kruskal-Wallis test $\chi^2(2)$
Education				
up to 15 years	11.8%	9.9%	16.3%	
16-19 years of education	43.5%	47.8%	47.9%	102.897*
20 years or more	44.7%	42.4%	35.8%	
Type of community				
Rural area or village	25.4%	25.3%	32.9%	
Small/middle town	39.9%	42.5%	40.7%	118.000*
Large town	34.7%	32.2%	26.4%	
Difficulties paying bills				
Most of the time	8.5%	8.7%	9.5%	
From time to time	26.6%	24.9%	25.4%	1.587
Almost never/never	64.9%	66.4%	65.0%	
Social class				
The working class of society	31.1%	27.3%	28.5%	
The lower middle class of society	14.2%	12.9%	14.9%	
The middle class of society	46.0%	50.5%	48.9%	9.074*
The upper middle class of society	7.9%	8.7%	7.0%	
The higher class of society	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	
Occupation				
Self-employed	8.0%	6.3%	7.2%	
Managers	11.6%	12.1%	10.8%	
Other white collars	11.4%	11.9%	12.3%	
Manual workers	24.7%	20.4%	20.3%	
House persons	6.4%	3.9%	5.1%	19.582*
Unemployed	6.5%	6.4%	5.3%	
Retired	26.2%	29.1%	33.6%	
Students	5.4%	9.9%	5.4%	

*Note: * statistically significant at 5%*
Source: Authors' computations using IBM-SPSS Statistics 21

The type of community in which people choose to live is again a feature that shows significant differences between natives, immigrants and second-generation immigrants. Large cities are home to 34.7% of immigrants, 32.2% of second-generation immigrants and only 26.4% of natives. It is interesting that the lowest share of natives is recorded for large cities, while both immigrants and second-generation immigrants obtained the minimum shares for rural areas, about a quarter.

109

In order to analyse the level of income, we used as proxies the difficulties in paying the bills and the social class declared by the respondent. Most people never or almost never have difficulty paying bills, with less than 10% declaring that they often have financial difficulties of this type; from this point of view, there are no significant differences between natives, immigrants and second-generation immigrants. In terms of social class, the Kruskal-Wallis test indicated statistically significant differences between the analysed groups, the immigrants being found in a higher proportion in the working class of society, and the second-generation immigrants registering relatively higher percentages for the middle class and upper middle of society compared to the other groups.

Analysing the occupation, the results once again indicated significant differences between natives, immigrants and second-generation immigrants. The relatively high share of pensioners stands out, 33.6% of the natives being retired. On the labour market, it is observed that 24.7% of immigrants are manual workers, compared to only 20.3% of natives. On the other hand, it is worth mentioning that the highest share registered in the category of managers is for second generation immigrants (12.1%). The largest share of students (9.9%) belongs to the second generation of immigrants, compared to 5.4% natives or immigrants.

We continued the analysis with the investigation of the general opinion about the phenomenon of migration from the perspective of natives, immigrants and the second generation of immigrants. The results indicated statistically significant differences of opinion between the three analysed groups (see Table 2).

The first aspect investigated was related to discrimination against immigrants. We have noticed that, in general, natives feel considerably less comfortable to have immigrants around them. Only 67.8% of native citizens said they feel comfortable having an immigrant as family member, compared to 86.9%, the percentage registered for the immigrants. Also, only 68.5% of natives feel comfortable having an immigrant as their manager. A higher tolerance is observed in labour relations that do not involve hierarchical subordination, 80.2% of natives being comfortable working with an immigrant colleague. Very interesting is the fact that the degree of discrimination against immigrants is relatively low among immigrants, average among the second generation of immigrants and relatively high among natives. In other words, there is a tendency of the second generation of immigrants towards the lifestyle and thinking of the natives, which can be considered a sign of integration.

The analysis of the opinions regarding the impact of immigration on the destination country revealed interesting results. We found that 70.9% of immigrants believe the overall impact is positive, while this view is shared by 57.4% of second-generation immigrants and only 49.2% of natives. Similar proportions for the three groups were obtained for the statement that immigrants bring new ideas and boost innovation, or that immigrants enrich the cultural life. The negative aspects of immigration are obviously supported more by the natives: 64.2% of the natives consider that immigrants are a burden on the welfare system,

_____

compared to 53.9% of the second generation immigrants and 48.4% of the immigrants. Also, 63% of natives believe that immigrants worsen the crime problems, but it is interesting that more than half of immigrants and second-generation immigrants agree with this statement. The smallest difference of opinion between the three analysed groups was recorded for the statement "immigrants help to fill jobs for which it's hard to find workers in the country": 81.7% of immigrants, 76.6% of second-generation immigrants and 71.8% of natives have this opinion.

Table 2. The opinions of natives, first-generation immigrants and second-generation immigrants about immigration

	Immigrants	Second generation immigrants	Natives	Kruskal-Wallis test $\chi^2(2)$
Feeling comfortable having an immigrant as				
manager	87.5%	78.4%	68.5%	519.777*
work colleague	91.9%	88.4%	80.2%	395.658*
neighbour	89.6%	84.7%	76.4%	446.162*
doctor	88.7%	83.4%	73.3%	461.996*
family member	86.9%	80.3%	67.8%	557.806*
The impact of immigrants in the country of destination				
Immigrants have an overall positive impact on the national economy	70.9%	57.4%	49.2%	467.674*
Immigrants are a burden on the welfare system	48.4%	53.9%	64.2%	281.334*
Immigrants take jobs away from native workers	32.8%	32.3%	44.1%	228.365*
Immigrants help to fill jobs for which it's hard to find workers in the country	81.7%	76.6%	71.8%	144.36*
Immigrants bring new ideas and boost innovation	70.2%	58.7%	49.9%	388.114*
Immigrants enrich the cultural life	75.9%	67.9%	58.8%	348.173*
Immigrants worsen the crime problems	50.1%	53.4%	63.0%	196.561*

*Note: * statistically significant at 5%*
Source: Authors' computations using IBM-SPSS Statistics 21

The successful integration of immigrants and the perception of natives, immigrants and second-generation immigrants on this subject were analysed in Table 3. The results indicate that 63% of immigrants consider that the integration process, at national level, is a success, compared to 47.5% of second generation immigrants and 45.4% of natives with the same opinion. At the regional level things are a little better: the majority of respondents (even 56.1% of the natives) say that immigrants are successfully integrated into the city or area where they live.

_____

However, there are significant differences of opinion between the three groups, statistically confirmed with the Kruskal-Wallis test.

Table 3. The opinions of natives, first-generation immigrants and second-generation immigrants about integration of immigrants

	Immigrants	Second generation immigrants	Natives	Kruskal-Wallis test $\chi^2(2)$
The integration of the immigrants was a success				
in the city or area of the respondent	68.8%	62.0%	56.1%	181.258*
in the country of the respondent	63.0%	47.5%	45.4%	247.028*
The successful integration of immigrants is related to				
sharing national cultural traditions	81.6%	75.0%	76.3%	43.392*
feeling like a member of the society	90.5%	90.5%	89.3%	18.728*
being able to speak the language	94.8%	94.7%	95.0%	6.081*
accepting the values and norms of the society	91.6%	91.5%	92.0%	3.385
being active in associations, organisations or taking part in local elections	75.7%	64.4%	66.4%	74.283*
contributing to the welfare system by paying the taxes	94.4%	95.1%	94.6%	0.979
having native friends	85.0%	82.9%	84.4%	22.180*
having educational qualifications and skills that are sufficient to find a job	90.1%	90.7%	91.9%	0.981
acquiring citizenship	68.3%	65.9%	69.5%	6.866*
A major obstacle for the successful integration of immigrants could be the				
discrimination against immigrants	59.6%	64.7%	58.8%	21.015*
limited efforts by immigrants to integrate	61.3%	66.6%	66.9%	26.333*
difficulties in accessing long term residence permits	57.1%	60.4%	57.2%	7.542*
difficulties in finding a job	62.0%	66.7%	63.2%	11.630*
limited access to education, healthcare and social protection	50.3%	55.9%	52.1%	11.190*
limited interactions between immigrants and native citizens	49.0%	53.9%	51.1%	11.874*
negative portrayal of immigrants in the media	51.6%	54.7%	51.2%	6.009
difficulties in bringing in family members	47.9%	51.4%	49.8%	5.588

*Note: * statistically significant at 5%*
Source: Authors' computations using IBM-SPSS Statistics 21

The aspects that facilitate the integration of immigrants, mentioned by over 90% of the respondents, without significant differences between groups are: accepting the values and norms of the society, contributing to the welfare system by paying the taxes and having educational qualifications and skills that are

_____

sufficient to find a job. For all other factors that facilitate integration, differences of opinion were obtained between natives, immigrants and second-generation immigrants. It is worth mentioning that obtaining citizenship was the factor with the lowest values recorded: 69.5% of the natives considered that this aspect is related to the successful integration of immigrants and only 65.9% of the second generation immigrants.

Regarding the obstacles in the successful integration of immigrants, the only aspects for which there were no differences of opinion between natives, immigrants and the second generation immigrants were the negative portrayal of immigrants in the media and the difficulties in bringing in family members, around half of the respondents agreeing with these statements. The largest difference of opinion was observed for the statement "limited efforts by immigrants to integrate", 66.9% of the natives having this opinion, compared to only 61.3% of the immigrants. A frequently mentioned obstacle is related to jobs: 66.7% of second generation immigrants consider that the difficulties in finding a job represent a major obstacle in the successful integration of immigrants.

In order to test the H_2 and H_3 research hypotheses we used a logistic regression model. The dependent variable quantifies the quality of immigrant versus native, taking the value 0 if the respondent was born in the country where he was interviewed, respectively the value 1 if the respondent was born in another country.

The explanatory variables considered in the model were: *i)* socio-demographic characteristics: age, gender, education, marital status, type of community, occupation, income (using as proxy the difficulties in paying bills and the social class), internet use; and *ii)* important actors and policies for a successful integration – binary variables with value 1 if the respondent agrees with a certain statement.

The results of the econometric estimation are presented in table 4. Regarding the socio-demographic variables included in the model, it is observed that only gender and marital status are not statistically significant. When analysing age, we chose as reference category individuals 55 years or older, and the results indicated that people between 25 and 39 years are more likely to be immigrants compared to the elderly.

The results obtained for education are extremely interesting: immigrants are 1.4 times more likely to have higher education than a low level of education. This result contradicts to some extent what we obtained for the occupation in the labour market. From this point of view, immigrants are less likely to be managers or other white-collar workers, compared to being manual workers. Specifically, there is a 37% lower chance of being a manager and a 33.8% lower chance of being other white-collar worker compared to being hired as a manual worker.

Table 4. The results of the logistic regression estimation

Variables: socio-demographic characteristics	B	Wald test	Exp(B)	Variables: important actors and policies for a successful integration	B	Wald test	Exp(B)
Gender	-0.106	1.938	0.900	The immigrants themseleves	-0.483	5.894**	0.617
Age: 55 years and older (ref)	-	-	-	Native citizens	0.307	3.156***	1.360
Age:15 - 24 years	0.157	0.528	1.170	The governement of destination country	-0.256	2.078	0.774
Age: 25 - 39 years	0.233	4.337**	1.262				
Age: 40 - 54 years	0.157	2.154	1.170	The EU institutions	0.080	0.421	1.083
Low education (ref)	-	-	-	The authorities at local and regional level	-0.114	0.391	0.893
Medium education	0.038	0.051	1.039				
High education	0.360	4.134**	1.434	Education institutions (pre-schools, schools, universities)	0.226	1.263	1.254
Marital status	0.106	1.438	1.112				
Occupation: manual worker (ref)	-	-	-	Employers	-0.096	0.315	0.909
Occupation: self-employed	-0.004	0.001	0.996	Providing integration measures in the countries of origin before arrival	-0.242	5.197**	0.785
Occupation: manager	-0.316	7.935*	0.729				
Occupation: other white collar	-0.292	7.875*	0.747	Better preparing the local community by providing information about immigrants	0.265	3.357***	1.304
Type of community: rural area or village (ref)	-	-	-				
Type of community: small/middle town	0.205	4.799**	1.228	Introducing or improving integration programmes for immigrants upon arrival	0.199	1.408	1.220
Type of community: large town	0.374	14.251*	1.453				
Difficulties paying bills: most of the time (ref)	-	-	-	Making integration programmes and language courses mandatory for immigrants	-0.242	3.608***	0.785
Difficulties paying bills: from time to time	0.345	4.213**	1.412				
Difficulties paying bills: almost never / never	0.341	4.341**	1.407	Supporting the enrolment of immigrants' children in preschool	-0.089	0.348	0.915
Social class: working class (ref)	-	-	-				
Social class: lower middle class	-0.186	2.230	0.831	Giving immigrants the right to vote at local elections	0.176	4.107**	1.192
Social class: middle class	-0.441	19.717*	0.643				
Social class: upper middle class	-0.434	7.428*	0.648	Introducing stronger measures to tackle discrimination against immigrants	0.275	5.745**	1.316
Social class: higher class	-0.340	0.771	0.712				
Internet use: never/no access (ref)	-	-	-	Fostering integration of immigrants is a necessary investment in the long run for the destination country	0.614	30.246*	1.848
Internet use: everyday/almost everyday	0.658	7.296*	1.930				
Internet use: often/sometimes	0.936	12.542*	2.549	Constant	-4.089	119.577*	0.017

*The parameter is statistically significant at: * 1%; ** 5%, or *** 10% level*
Source: Authors' estimation using IBM SPSS Statistics 21

We also noticed the preference of immigrants to live in cities, especially large ones. The results indicated that immigrants are 45.3% more likely to live in

_____

large cities and 22.8% more likely to choose a small or medium-sized town, compared to the rural area.

In terms of Internet use, the results showed that people who use the internet everyday/almost everyday are 1.93 times more likely to be immigrants, and those who use the internet often/sometimes have 2.5 times more chances to be immigrants compared to people who either do not have access to the internet or never use it.

For the assessment of the living standard we used two variables: the difficulties of paying the bills, respectively the social class of the respondent. Using as a reference category the individuals who face difficulties in paying the bills most of the time, we noticed that both the people who have financial difficulties from time to time as well as those who never or almost never have difficulties in paying the bills are more likely to be immigrants. On the other hand, middle-class and upper-middle-class people are 55% less likely to be immigrants than working-class people. These results indicate that immigrants have the financial means to pay current bills but consider themselves in the working class rather than the middle or upper classes of the society.

The econometric analysis also focused on the respondents' opinion on the important actors and policies for a successful integration of immigrants. The results indicated that the government, EU institutions, local authorities, educational institutions or employers do not play a decisive role in the effective integration of immigrants, the parameters associated with these variables not being statistically significant. However, the results obtained for two categories of actors should be noted: the immigrants themselves and the native citizens. The immigrants are 62% less likely than natives to consider that a very important role in the integration of immigrants is played by the immigrants themselves. On the other hand, immigrants are 36% more likely than natives to consider that a crucial role in the integration of migrants is played by native citizens. Thus, the analysis highlights the opposing views of immigrants and natives, as well as the tendency of each to attribute responsibility to the other, rather than to assume their own role in the integration process.

Next, a number of policies designed to facilitate integration were considered in the analysis. Once again, the differences between immigrants and natives are noticeable. The immigrants are more likely to consider that a successful integration would be facilitated by "better preparing the local community by providing information about immigrants", therefore the local population, the community, could ensure a successful adaptation of the immigrants. Also, the results indicated that the immigrants are more likely than natives to believe that "the right to vote at local elections" and "stronger measures to tackle discrimination against immigrants" would lead to a successful integration of immigrants. The natives, however, believe that immigrants should be prepared for the lifestyle in the host country, and especially to know the language. They are more likely than immigrants to believe that successful policies for immigrant

115

_____

integration would be "providing integration measures in the countries of origin before the arrival" and "making integration programmes and language courses mandatory for immigrants".

At the end, a general statement was included regarding the host country's efforts to facilitate the integration of immigrants. The results of the logistic regression estimation indicated that immigrants are 84.8% more likely than natives to consider that "fostering integration of immigrants is a necessary investment in the long run for the destination country".

5. Conclusions

Investigating the perceptions of the European Union citizens regarding the integration of immigrants, we managed to capture specific aspects for the natives, immigrants and the second generation of immigrants, who often have different opinions.

For a start, studying the socio-demographic profile, we noticed that a large share of immigrants have higher education, being the most educated of the three groups, the natives registering the lowest share of university graduates. Immigrants and second-generation immigrants live rather in large cities, unlike natives who mostly live in rural or small towns. However, a large proportion of immigrants are manual or self-employed, unlike the other groups, which have lower values for these occupations in the labour market. Kruskal-Wallis tests showed that there are statistically significant differences in the profiles of natives versus immigrants versus second-generation immigrants.

Next, the analysis showed that the natives have a rather negative image about immigrants: less than half of natives believe that immigration has a positive impact in the society or that the immigrants bring new ideas and boost innovation. Moreover, 64.2% believe that immigrants are a burden on the welfare system and 63% believe that immigrants worsen the crime problems. We also noticed the discrimination, around 32% of the natives not being comfortable having an immigrant as a manager or as family member.

Regarding the integration process, the most important facilitating factors are: being able to speak the language, having a job, paying taxes, and accepting the values and norms of the society, whereas the main obstacle is the difficulty of finding a job.

The logistic regression results indicated significant differences of opinion between the immigrants and the native regarding the policies and the actors involved in a successful integration. The tendency is to pass the responsibility on to others, the natives consider that it is the duty of immigrants to make every effort to integrate, and immigrants believe that the community plays an important role, and the natives should be more open to accepting and to integrate them.

REFERENCES

[1]   **Bertrand, F., Maumy, M., (2011),** *Test de Kruskal-Wallis,* IRMA, Université de Strasbourg, France ;

[2]   **Borjas, G. J. (1995),** *Assimilation and Changes in Cohort Quality Revisited: What Happened to Immigrant Earnings in the 1980s? Journal of Labor Economics*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 201–245;

[3]   **Chimienti, M., Bloch, A., Ossipow, L., de Wenden C. (2019),** *Second Generation from Refugee Backgrounds in Europe. Comparative Migration Studies,* 7, 40, https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-019-0138-2;

[4]   **Chiswick, B. R., Cohen, Y., Zach, T. (1997),** *The Labor Market Status of Immigrants: Effects of the Unemployment Rate at Arrival and Duration of Residence; Industrial and Labor Relations Review,* vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 289–303;

[5]   **Cornillon, P. A., Guyader A., Husson F. (2010),** *Statistiques avec R, Presses Universitaires de Rennes* ;

[6]   **European Commission. (2017),** *Eurobarometer 88.2: Integration of Immigrants in the European Union and Corruption; GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences;*

[7]   **Favell, A. (1998),** *Philosophies of Integration: Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship in France and Britain. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press*;

[8]   **Foner N. (2008),** *Challenges of Integration: The Second Generation in the United States and Europe;* International Migration and Development. Continuing the Dialogue: Legal and Policy Perspectives, *Ed. by J. Chamie, L. Dall'Oglio.* – Geneva: International Organization for Migration; New York: Center for Migration Studies;

[9]   **Goodman S.W. (2015),** *Conceptualizing and Measuring Citizenship and Integration Policy: Past Lessons and New Approaches. Comparative Political Studies,* 48(14):1905–1941. doi: 10.1177/0010414015592648;

[10]   **Harder, N., Figueroa, L., Gillum, R.M., Hangartner, D., Laitin, D.D., Hainmueller, J. (2018),** *Multidimensional Measure of Immigrant Integration; Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, November 6, Vol. 115, Issue 15, pages 11483-11488;

[11]   **Huddleston, T., Niessen, J., Tjaden, J., (2013),** *Using EU Indicators of Immigrant Integration*; *Final Report for Directorate - General for Home Affairs,* European Commission, Brussels;

[12]   **ILO, (2016),** *Towards a Framework for Fair and Effective Integration of Migrants into the Labour Market*; International Labor Office, OECD, the World Bank and the IMF joint paper, https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---europe/---ro-geneva/---ilo-berlin/documents/genericdocument/wcms_556988.pdf

[13]   **Karolak M. (2020),** *Returning for (Dis)Integration in the Labour Market? The Careers of Labour Migrants Returning to Poland from the United Kingdom.* In: *Hinger S., Schweitzer R. (eds) Politics of (Dis)Integration.*

_____

IMISCOE Research Series. *Springer,* Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25089-8_6;

[14] **Liu, X., Bowe, S. J., Milner, A., Li, L., Too, L. S., LaMontagne, A. D. (2019),** *Job Insecurity: A Comparative Analysis between Migrant and Native Workers in Australia. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(21), 4159, https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16214159;

[15] **Lutz, P. (2017),** *Two Logics of Policy Intervention in Immigrant Integration: An Institutionalist Framework Based on Capabilities and Aspirations*; *Comparative Migration Studies*, 5(1), 19;

[16] **OECD, (2001),** *The Employment of Foreigners: Outlook and Issues in OECD Countries***,** OECD Employment Outlook, http://www.oecd.org/els/emp/2079451.pdf;

[17] **OECD, European Commission, (2018),** *Settling in 2018. Main Indicators of Immigrant Integration***,** joint OECD-European Commission publication, https://www.oecd.org/els/mig/Main-Indicators-of-Immigrant-Integration.pdf;

[18] **Portes, A., Rumbaut, R.G. (2006),** *Immigrant America: A Portrait*, 3rd *Edition, University of California Press;*

[19] **Roman, M., Goschin, Z. (2014),** *Return Migration in an Economic Crisis Context. A Survey on Romanian Healthcare Professionals*. *Romanian Journal of Economics 3*9 (2): 100–120;

[20] **Schain, M. (2008),** *The Politics of Immigration in France, Britain and the United States: A Comparative Study*. *New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan;*

[21] **Sobolewska, M., Galandini, S., Lessard-Phillips, L. (2017),** *The Public View of Immigrant Integration: Multidimensional and Consensual. Evidence from Survey Experiments in the UK and the Netherlands; Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 43:1, 58-79, DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2016.1248377;

[22] **Sweetman, A, van Ours, J.C. (2014),** *Immigration: What about the Children and Grandchildren?; IZA Discussion Papers* No. 7919.

[23] **Wright, M. (2011),** *Policy Regimes and Normative Conceptions of Nationalism in Mass Public Opinion*. *Comparative Political Studies*, 44, 598-624;

[24] **Xu, H. (2018),** *First Fired, First Hired? Business Cycles and Immigrant Labor Market Transitions; IZA Journal of Development and Migration,* Volume 8, Article number: 19;

[25] **Zorlu, A., Hartog, J. (2012),** *Employment Assimilation of Immigrants in the Netherlands: Dip and Catchup by Source Country; International Journal of Population Research,* https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/634276;

[26] **Zubikova, A. (2020),** *Assessment of the Immigrants Integration Level in the New Member States of the EU in 2009–2018. Journal of International Migration and Integration,* https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-020-00759-0.