migration & integration

facts.figures.indicators 2011

STATISTIK AUSTRIA
Die Informationsmanager

BM.I REPUBLIK ÖSTERREICH BUNDESMINISTERIUM FÜR INNERES

Österreichischer Integrationsfonds

Kommission für Migrations- und Integrationsforschung
der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften

GfK

Demographic Conditions[1)]

As part of the National Action Plan for Integration, integration indicators were defined to enable measuring the integration process in Austria and to establish a long-term integration monitoring system. By means of the 25 defined integration indicators, particularly the five core indicators, taking into account demographic conditions as well as subjective perceptions, the current status of immigration and integration in Austria in 2011 can be summarized as follows.

Immigration Increasing Once More

- In 2010 slightly over 114,000 people immigrated to Austria, while at the same time 87,000 people left the country. This resulted in a net immigration of nearly 28,000 people. Compared to 2009, emigration basically remained constant, while immigration rose by 7,000 people, thus also leading to a net migration gain. This may be attributed to overcoming the financial and economic crisis, good economic development in Austria and an associated higher demand for labour. Cross-border migration can therefore be seen as a suitable indicator for economic prosperity or recession.

- From an influx of approximately 114,000 people from abroad, 16,000 were returning Austrians and 59,000 were EU citizens. The portion of immigration coming from the EU has thus risen once more. There was an additional migration gain of +7,000 people in comparison to 2009, 5,000 of which could be attributed to intra-EU migration, especially from Romania, Hungary, Slovakia and Poland. With almost 18,000 immigrants, German citizens still formed the largest group. In 2010, 39,000 immigrants (34%) came from third countries, with one third of these originating from the successor states of former Yugoslavia and the rest of Europe and another third each from Asia and Africa. With just over 4,000 people, immigration from Turkey was comparatively low.

- In 2010, the migration gain of +28,000 people was composed of 7,800 German citizens, around 5,000 Romanians, 2,400 Hungarians and about 1,000 people each from Slovakia and Poland. For the remaining EU and EEA countries as well as Switzerland the immigration surplus amounted to around 5,000 people. In addition, Austria experienced migration gains with regard to citizens of former Yugoslavia (around 4,000 people), Turkey (1,400 people) as well as other third countries (4,000 people). Migration losses only occurred with regard to Austrian citizens, with 20,000 leaving the country in 2010 and only 16,000 returning.

- The number of arrivals of asylum seekers also decreased. While in 2002 the number of asylum requests almost reached 40,000, it decreased to about 11,000 in 2010. Following the enlargement of the EU in 2004 and 2007, Austria is now only surrounded by safe third countries, which have to handle those asylum cases for which Austria was previously responsible. On a European level, Austria now only ranks number eight when putting the number of asylum seekers in relation to the resident population. In 2010 most asylum seekers originated from the Russian Federation (especially Chechnya), followed by Afghanistan, Kosovo, Nigeria and India.

Increase in Foreign Residents

- At the beginning of 2011 there were 928,000 foreign citizens (11% of the overall population) residing in Austria. This represented a

1) For reasons of quotability please refer to the original text in German "migration & integration – zahlen.daten.indikatoren 2011" as inaccuracies may occur due to translations.

growth of 33,000 people in 2010, which was mainly due to positive net migration and a birth surplus among foreign citizens residing in Austria. In 2010, an average of around 1.543 million people with migration background lived in Austria (18.6% of the overall population). Of these, 1.139 million were "first generation", meaning people born abroad, who later moved to Austria. The remaining almost 404,600 were born in Austria to foreign-born parents ("second migrant generation").

- As of January 1st, 2011, the largest group of foreign origin (place of birth or citizenship) was composed of almost 220,000 people from Germany, followed by 209,000 people from Serbia, Montenegro and Kosovo. Other important migrant groups included people originating from Turkey (185,000), Bosnia and Herzegovina (131,000), Croatia (70,000), Romania (68,000), Poland (60,000), Czech Republic (45,000), Hungary (41,000), and Italy (29,000).

- On January 1st, 2011, the average age of Austrian-born nationals was 41.9 years. In comparison, foreign-born people were slightly younger with an average age of 40.4 years. Foreign nationals were significantly younger (35.2 years) than those already naturalized (49.7 years). People from the EU were generally older than the total population; however, immigrants from third countries were significantly younger (for example immigrants from the successor states of former Yugoslavia with 39.9 years, from Turkey with 35.6 years and from Africa with 34.4 years).

Birth Rate and Naturalization

- In 2010 78,742 children were born in Austria, whereas 77,199 people died. Thus, the birth balance (difference between live births and deaths) was slightly positive at 1.543, whereas in 2009 it still was -1,037. Differences between nationalities are remarkable. While foreigners recorded a birth surplus of +8,917 people, there were 7,374 more deaths than births amongst Austrian nationals.

- In 2010, women in Austria gave birth to an average of 1.44 children (2009: 1.39). Austrian women bore an average of 1.32 children, while foreign-born women bore 1.87 children (Turkish-born women: 2.42 children, women born in former Yugoslavia: 1.93 children). Naturalized women converged to the average fertility level and had 1.50 children, significantly less than women with foreign citizenship (2.01). In 2010 the average age of mothers at the birth of their first child was 28.7 years for Austrian women and 26.6 years for foreign-born women. Turkish women were the youngest at the time of the first birth with 24.2 years, and women from the EU or EEA were the oldest with 28.8 years.

- Since 2003, the number of naturalizations has steadily dropped from around 45,000 to 6,135 in 2010. The primary reasons for this reduction are changes in legal conditions, which aim at the objectivity of requirements, and require an uninterrupted legal stay of at least 10 years as well as the fulfilment of the Integration Agreement and the citizenship test ("Staatsbürgerschaftstest"). In 2010 naturalized citizens primarily came from former Yugoslavia (51.4%) and Turkey (15.3%). Naturalization of people from other EU states accounted for just 9.8%.

Fields of Activity and Integration Indicators

Education and Language

People from a migrant background living in Austria exhibit a considerably different educational profile than the population from a non-migrant background. The number of immigrants in the highest and lowest education levels is above average, while an above average percentage of the Austrian population has completed mid-level education in vocational training programs. These differences in the educational structure are relatively constant over time, although there has been a considerable increase in the overall educational level for both the Austrian and the foreign population in recent decades. The increase within the foreign population between 1991 and 2010 is mainly attributed to the immigration of highly qualified workers from other EU states.

1 Education begins in kindergarten. Foreign pre-school age children attend day-care and kindergarten at a lower rate; however, the reverse is true for school-age children. Nevertheless, the differences are extremely small and over time almost unchanged.

2 The 2008 study on language status shows that 90% of the 4 ½ to 5 ½ year old German-speaking children who attended kindergarten possess an age-appropriate language level, while 58% of the 4 ½ to 5 ½ year old children whose first language was not German required additional support.

3 Pupils with foreign citizenship relatively rarely attend schools where they can earn a "Reifeprüfung"-Certificate; more often, they attend lower secondary schools ("Hauptschule") and new middle schools ("Neue Mittelschule") as well as pre-vocational years ("Polytechnischer Lehrgang"). In special needs schools the proportion of foreign children was still the highest (18.3%). Compared to 2009, there was a slight rise of the proportion of foreign children who attend a school where they can earn a "Reifeprüfung"-Certificate.

4 The number and proportion of foreign students in Austria have risen further. During the winter term of 2008/09 around 47,000 foreigners were enrolled at Austrian universities, whereas during the following winter term of 2009/10 there were already 54,000. More than two thirds of these foreign students come from EU and EEA states, and they complete their studies faster. The group of foreign students is composed of those migrating for their studies as well as foreigners already living in Austria. The amount of students with Turkish citizenship or that of former Yugoslavian successor states is considerably below average.

5 In 2010, one third of the 25 to 64-year-old population from a migrant background had a "Reifeprüfung"-Certificate or a higher degree. While only very few people from former Yugoslavia and Turkey possessed a graduate degree, people from other EU states and immigrants from other countries showed particularly high percentages of graduates. It is also noteworthy that the educational level of the "second generation" is already considerably in going with that of the Austrian population.

6 There is a need for action with young people who have only completed compulsory school or have no school leaving certificate ("Pflichtschulabschluss"). Around 14% of the non-German speaking schoolchildren who have completed the eighth school year at a lower secondary school do not continue their education (at least not in Austria). Compared to their German speaking peers, just below 4% leave the educational system before completing the ninth school year and thus do not acquire a compulsory school leaving certificate.

"Gainful Employment" as a Driving Force behind Integration

Aside from the educational system, gainful employment is considered as a driving force behind integration. It provides contacts, encounters, and is responsible for structuring everyday life. For some parts of the domestic and foreign population the "integration engine" is beginning to stutter due to accelerated structural changes in industry, business, and services and in light of economic fluctuations. Unemployment is rising, particularly among those who have minimal formal qualifications, and employment rates are dropping, also as an expression of the declining hiring capacity on the labour market. It must be pointed out that qualified immigrants from EU states of recent years are less affected by this trend than less qualified immigrants from a previous period. The findings present the following challenges:

7. People from a migrant background have lower employment rates. The employment rate of people from a migrant background was 65% in 2010 as opposed to those from a non-migrant background lying at 73%. This difference is primarily due to the lower level of participation by migrant women in the labour market. Labour participation of women from other EU and EEA states together with Switzerland (65%), as well as former Yugoslavia (62%) is almost the same as that of Austrian women from a non-migrant background (68%), but considerably different than that of Turkish women (41%). However, in the "second generation" almost no differences in labour participation can be observed.

8. In 2010, among the gainfully employed from a non-migrant background, many were salaried employees and civil servants (together 61%), only 23% were labourers. In contrast, people from a migrant background were predominantly labourers (47%). Particularly high proportions of labourers were registered among people from Turkey (66%) and former Yugoslavia (64%). Aside from the agricultural sector (a field of work with a very low proportion of immigrants) people with a migrant background were just as often self-employed as Austrian nationals (9%). In addition, it can be observed that the professional status of the "second generation" is increasingly converging with that of the population from a non-migratory background.

9. With a total unemployment rate (national definition) of 6.9% in 2010, unemployment among foreigners was considerably higher (9.7%) than among Austrian citizens (6.4%). Turkish men and women as well as nationals from other non-EU states (13.1% each) were unemployed twice as frequently as Austrian men and women. The unemployment rate of nationals from other EU and EEA states was only slightly higher than that of Austrians. People without an education beyond compulsory school showed a particularly high unemployment rate.

10. More than a quarter of the employees born abroad were overqualified (28%) in 2008. In comparison, only 10% of those born in Austria felt they were employed at a level below their education. In general, women were more often overqualified than men; this is especially the case for women from EU states that have joined the Union since 2004. The recognition of foreign degrees as a prerequisite for a job that corresponds with the qualification level poses a problem for many migrants.

11. It is noteworthy that long-term unemployment is lower among foreign citizens than among Austrians (1.6% compared to 2.9%).

12. Likewise, the findings of the Public Employment Service Austria (AMS) show only slight differences in youth unemployment according to citizenship.

Health and Social Issues: Contradictory Overall Evidence
Overall evidence in the field "Health and Social Issues" is contradictory. On the one hand, the positioning in the labour market can be viewed as a result of the lower education level of a large part of foreign residents, which only allows for a low income and, simultaneously, a higher poverty risk. In addition to this, households are larger and the rate of employment among women is lower, which further decreases the household income per head and raises the risk of poverty. However, foreign residents have a relatively long life expectancy, which does not appear to be exclusively a statistical effect. They are less likely to suffer from typical lifestyle diseases (e.g. heart-circulation, allergies), but instead from illnesses related to the physical strain of work (spine problems) or with often difficult living circumstances (depression, chronic anxiety). Overall, it can be established that:

13 The income level is considerably lower among immigrants. Foreign citizens who were employed all year earned an average of 18,367 EUR net (median) in 2009. With this they only reached around 84% of the mean net annual income in Austria. While citizens of EU states that joined before 2004 earned only slightly less than the average income, the net annual income of people from EU states that have joined since 2004, former Yugoslavia, and Turkey was around one fifth below the average.

14 Following from to the average of the years 2007/2009, 12% of the population was at risk of poverty, while 6% of it was facing an acute risk of poverty. The population with foreign citizenship (24%) is at a much greater risk of poverty than Austrian nationals (11%). The risk of poverty is slightly higher for people from former Yugoslavia and significantly higher for Turkish citizens.

15 In 2010, the life expectancy for Austrian citizens born in Austria was 77.6 years for men and 83.1 years for women. That amounts to 0.3 years more each as opposed to 2009. The life expectancy for foreigners was slightly higher for men, at 78.4 years, but about the same for women at 83.2. The increase since 2009 amounts to 0.4 years for men and 0.3 years for women. The life expectancy for people from former Yugoslavia was only slightly different from that of people of Austrian origin in 2010. Likewise, for men of Turkish origin it was comparable to that of Austrian men, at 78.0 years, but for Turkish women, with 84.5 years it was significantly higher than that of Austrian women (difference: 1.4 years). Men from other states also showed a very high life expectancy – 80.2 years.

16 People from Turkey or former Yugoslavia take a more curative than preventative approach to health services compared to people of Austrian origin. Hospital stays and visits to general practitioners are more common among people from a foreign background. Relevant deficits are imminent amongst persons of Turkish or ex-Yugoslavian background, when it comes to early stage diagnostic and preventive medical programs. In the context of the Austrian health survey, immigrants complained more often of chronic spine problems, migraines or frequent headaches, chronic anxiety and depression.

Safety: Immigrants as Victims and Perpetrators
The yearbook presents, inter alia, indicators that look at immigrants as victims and perpetrators. Attention is given to the crime rate among foreign citizens, distinguishing between suspects and convicted criminals as well as between imported crime and crimes committed by residents. Another issue is how often criminal activity against immi-

grants and xenophobic attacks take place. Immigrants are not only perpetrators; they are also victims. The details show that:

17 More than 31% of those convicted by Austrian courts in 2010 were foreigners. In terms of the population of the same nationality over 14 years old (the minimum age for court prosecution), around four times as many foreign citizens (1.6%) than Austrians (0.4%) were convicted. Adjusted for age the amount of convicted foreigners is reduced from 1.6% to 1.1%.

18 In 2010, around 20% of all victims of crime were foreign citizens. Comprising 11% of the population, immigrants were harmed by criminal offenses almost twice as often as Austrian citizens. The rate was above average for crime victims from EU states having joined the Union since 2004, Turkey, and other third country nationals.

Cramped Living Quarters and High Segregation

The unfavourable income situation for a majority of foreign households affects the living standards. The majority of foreign residents live in rented apartments and not in owner-occupied flats, cooperative, or public housing. They spend a lot on rent relative to the household income; this is less a result of overpriced rent, but rather of low income. Due to these structural conditions, foreigners largely live in segregated areas where older apartment buildings are dominant, and they are not spread evenly across the respective municipalities or Austria as a whole. In detail it is noted that:

19 In 2010, the average living space was 43m² per capita. People from a migrant background, in contrast, had around one third less living space, with 31m² per head. EU citizens had larger than average apartments with 47m² per person, while the living situation of people from former Yugoslavia with 26m² and the Turkish population with 21m² was considerably more cramped.

20 The cost of housing, or the portion of the household income that is spent on housing costs, is above average for people with a foreign background. According to the average of the years 2007/2009 a total of 16% of Austrians had to spend over a quarter of their household income on housing costs, compared to 35% of foreigners. In comparison to the average of the years 2004/2006, the proportion of people affected by high living costs amongst foreigners rose from 29% to 35%, while staying unchanged for Austrian citizens.

21 The higher housing costs for immigrants are also a result of a lower proportion of apartment ownership. In 2010, over half (56%) of the households with an Austrian man or woman as head of household owned their own home or apartment, this was only the case for 27% of households headed by someone from a migrant background. On the other hand the "second generation" migrants already showed a significantly higher proportion of apartment ownership (42% of all households) than the first generation (24%).

22 Migrants living in Austria are concentrated in only a few municipalities: More than 80% of people with a foreign background live in only 10% of all Austrian municipalities, with 40% in Vienna alone. In other words: Almost half of the population of foreign origin lives in municipalities with more than 25% of its inhabitants being immigrants. Apart from Vienna and other cities such as Salzburg, Wels, Bregenz and Traun, tourist communities such as Sölden or Bad Gastein as well as some border towns and communities with refugee facilities had a high proportion of inhabitants with a foreign background.

Social and Identificatory Dimension:
Marriage and Naturalization

The social dimension of integration includes personal relations that range from or become apparent in marriage, circles of friends, and recreational behaviour. A high level of bi-national marriages can be interpreted as an indicator of mutual acceptance. Ultimately, the proportion of naturalizations in relation to the number of those eligible is to be used as an indicator for an identificatory dimension, even when the legal conditions play a role in this. In detail it can be established that:

23 In 2010, almost 37,500 marriages took place in Austria. In almost three quarters of these cases both parties were of Austrian origin. 6,600 (18%) of these marriages were between Austrians and foreign partners. Almost 3,900 (10%) weddings were between two foreigners, which corresponds to the proportion of foreigners in the entire population. In over half of all the marriages between Austrians and foreigners, individuals from other EU or EEA states were involved (53%), although marriages to people of German origin were by far the most common (24%). Marriages between Austrians and people of Turkish origin amounted to around 8% of all the Austrian-foreign marriages, considerably less than expected based on the number of Turkish citizens.

24 Of the foreign nationals living in Austria for over 10 years, only around 1% was naturalized in 2010. Unsurprisingly, the rates for people from other EU states were very low, with the exception of Bulgarian and Romanian citizens, 2% of whom were naturalized. Only slightly more than 1% of the people from former Yugoslavia and Turkey who have been here for over 10 years were naturalized. The number of neo-Austrians from other European states (9%) and outside of Europe (4%) was significantly higher.

Subjective Perspectives

25 How can the integration atmosphere in society be described? Only 3.4% of the entire population considers integration to be working very well. Conversely, around 13% say that it is working very poorly. When the 51.5% who marked "rather poorly" are added to this, there is an overwhelming majority of the population (two thirds) that is dissatisfied with the integration process. A comparison with the survey of the previous year shows a slight and not coincidental improvement in the evaluation. While in 2010 17.9% thought that integration was working "very badly", there were only 13.1% in 2011. Integration pessimism is present in all sectors of the population, but particularly present among people aged 60 and older and among those people with low incomes, those with less qualifications, amongst un- and semi-skilled workers.

In any case, the immigrant population does not share this pessimism. When asked "Do you feel like a native or at home in Austria?" the overwhelming majority (86.5%) answered that they feel completely or largely at home. Only 7% feel less at home, and only 6.5% do not feel at home at all. The optimism about integration is irrespective of gender and age. There is a correlation with formal education and household income. Those who are female, earn more, have completed a higher level of education, are better situated in the labour market and can look back on a long duration of stay feel that they are more at home than others.

The Austrian population was asked whether they have the impression that living together in recent years has changed, and the immigrant population was asked whether their personal living situation has improved or worsened over the past five years. Again there is an optimistic and positive attitude amongst the population from a migrant background compared to Austrian nationals from a non-migrant background. Around 40% of those surveyed think that the situation of living together with immigrants has worsened and only 16% see an improvement. Of all those surveyed from a migrant background, 22.2% reported that their personal situation has worsened over the past five years in Austria, but 32.3% saw an improvement and around 45.5% expressed a relative stability. In comparison to the evaluation in 2010, pessimism among the Austrian population has gone down, while optimism among immigrants has risen.

Contact with the immigrant population has become a part of daily life. More than 55% of the people surveyed reported contact with migrants. Of those who have contact with migrants, around one third reported that they are disadvantaged ("Do you have personal contact with migrants in Austria who are at a disadvantage or treated worse than Austrians from a non-migrant background because of where they come from?") Three quarters of those asked have contact with migrants but do not see them as disadvantaged. The immigrant population has a surprisingly similar estimation of disadvantages. Around one third of those surveyed from a migrant background have the feeling that they are slightly or mostly disadvantaged because they are immigrants, but two thirds say they are not really, rarely, or never.

A fourth subject deals with the mental closeness or distance between Austrians and immigrants. The domestic population was surveyed on the amount of assimilation required and which sceptical or xenophobic attitudes are dominant. The immigrant population was asked if they agree with the way most people in Austria lead their lives.

The analysis shows a surprising result that contradicts the integration pessimism presented. Around 17% of all those surveyed completely or largely rejected scepticism of foreigners or xenophobic items, and only 2.5% (compared to still around 5% in 2010)

completely or largely agreed with them. The overwhelming majority of the population is not of the opinion that immigrants are only labourers, should be sent back to their own coutry when jobs are scarce, or should be forbidden from participting in the political process. The majority merely wants immigrants to "adapt their lifestyle better to the Austrian lifestyle".

The population from a migrant background was asked if it agrees with the lifestyle observed in Austria or if it rejects it. This question was also aimed at measuring mental distances, but this time from the perspective of people from a migrant background. Around 4% of those surveyed did not answer this question; the remaining 96% answered as follows: 19% completely agree with how most people live and the values and goals people base their lives on, a further 58% largely agree. Only 6% do not at all agree with the lifestyle in Austria.

Xenophobia, on the one hand, and a rejection of the lifestyle in Austria, on the other, follow a very similar structural pattern. No formal education or a very low level of formal qualifications make the Austrian population and the immigrant population more receptive to a clear rejection. With age, Austrians are more sceptical towards foreigners, likewise, among immigrants, the acceptance of the other lifestyle increases with age and with the length of stay. Finally, correlations with geographical origin are significant. While 89.8% of those surveyed from an ex-Yugoslavian background agree with the lifestyle in Austria, only 57.8% of those of Turkish origin agree.

Overall, the questions on the integration atmosphere document a noteworthy change, a trend which has been confirmed by the 2011 survey. Society has obviously learned and become aware that the "old model" of the guest worker – people who come, do their work, and return to their country without participating in social processes – is out-dated. The social realities resulting from the migration process are definitely noticed by the population, although the dissatisfaction with the integration process is certainly a result of the high expectations of migrants and the integration discourse.

Authors
Dr. Erika Baldaszti,
Univ.-Doz. Dr. Josef Kytir,
Dr. Stephan Marik-Lebeck,
Mag. Alexander Wisbauer
– STATISTIK AUSTRIA

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Heinz Faßmann
– COMMISSION FOR MIGRATION AND INTEGRATION
RESEARCH OF THE AUSTRIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES