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1. Introduction

As western societies’ fertility rates continue to fall and the population ages, the need for economic immigrants to fill the labour gaps increases. Principle 11 of the Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration in the European Union states that “Employment is a key part of the integration process and is central to the participation of immigrants, to the contributions immigrants make to the host society, and to making such contributions visible” (Council of the European Union, 2004). Integrating immigrants into the labour market is a challenge faced by most societies that receive significant immigration. According to the OECD employment rates of immigrants were 1% higher than the employment rate of native-born populations across the OECD states. However, when it came to the EU28 countries, the employment rates of immigrants were significantly lower than those of the native populations (OECD, 2015). This difference in outcomes is due, in part, to the 2008/2009 recession in which many European countries were hard-hit. However, it shows there is a wide margin for improvement of immigrant’s labour market integration. The importance of effective integration policy has come back into the forefront following the 2015 mass migration waves into the EU.

Labour market integration is beneficial for the host Member States as it means that they can utilize immigration to efficiently fulfill labour shortages and decrease the harmful effects of ageing populations. It also benefits the migrants themselves, as rapid labour market integration is vital in ensuring the well-being of the migrants, their families and it also speeds up their general integration into the host society, thus reducing the negative feelings of locals towards the migrants and minimizing social friction. In the EU, immigrants are more likely to experience involuntary inactivity than the native-born populations, meaning that they are willing to work but cannot find the right opportunities due in part to social and institutional barriers (OECD, 2015).

Integrating immigrants into the labour market presents interconnected challenges stemming from the skills and education of the immigrants. For example, their language skills and whether they are proficient in the host country's primary language or other languages such as English; the immigrant's level of education; and how well their educational level match the labour market needs of the local population all affect the speed and ease of integration.
Also, there are institutional challenges which may limit or encourage the ease of integrating the migrant into the host labour market. These challenges include legal issues such as their legal status of immigration; what types of jobs the immigrants are allowed to obtain; recognition of foreign credentials; as well as the effects of discrimination in hiring practices, in the workplace and the in general society. The immigrant's gender, age and reason for migration are also factors that may influence the efficiency of their integration into the labour market of the host country.

Portugal is often cited as an example of favourable labour market integration policies. In the 2015 Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) report, an international survey which measures the integration policy of 38 countries and ranks them according to the scores received, Portugal obtained second place after Sweden. Portugal ranks second in the Labour Market Mobility category as well as in the overall score. It has held this second place ranking since the first MIPEX survey in 2007. Like its predecessors, Portugal’s 2015 Strategic Plan for Migration and the resulting immigration integration programs align with the European Union’s “Global Approach to Migration and Mobility” and is thus financed mostly through European funding. This is one of the reasons why Portugal has been able to maintain its commitment to migrant integration through the rocky economic periods.

Portugal’s high MIPEX ranking is significant because it is a relatively recent receptor of immigration in comparison with European countries such as Sweden, France and Germany. The first significant waves of immigration to Portugal arrived with the collapse of the Portuguese colonies, and subsequently with socio-economic improvements reaching its peak in the mid-2000s. Up until that time, Portugal’s immigrant integration policy was practically non-existent.

Following the economic crisis, migration inflows decreased while emigration of Portuguese nationals increased. Therefore, in the latter half of this decade policymakers in Portugal have also started to consider the negative net migration flows when drafting policies and building programmes. Negative net migration flows, the challenges of an ageing population and increasing mortality all underscore the importance of sound integration policies which set the stage for attracting immigration, both of foreign citizens and of returned Portuguese emigrants, as economic conditions become favourable once
again. It also reflects the importance of integrating the immigrants the country does receive to prevent Portugal from becoming merely a transit country. In recent years, Portuguese officials have expressed unwavering support to the commitment of the country for successful immigrant integration even as support for immigration has wavered throughout most of Europe.

As the political rhetoric of immigration has turned negative in many of the European Member States in the last decade, Portugal has situated itself positively in the narrative with regards to immigration. Citizens have maintained positive attitudes towards the reception of immigrants, even in polls with regards to the regularization of irregular migrants’ status in the labour market. (Sanchez, 2016)

Portugal’s high MIPEX ranking establishes the country as an example to be followed regarding integration policy; however, the good policy may not necessarily translate into good labour market outcomes for the immigrants that it is meant to address. This thesis examines the Portuguese case in detail, delving into Portugal’s historical patterns of migration, the structure and aims of Portugal’s integration policy programs, the current immigrant situation and the performance of immigrants in the Portuguese labour market. It then leads to an analysis of the labour market outcomes of immigrants in Portugal and compares it to other southern European countries (Spain, Italy, and Greece) and to Ireland. Lastly, it concludes whether Portugal’s labour market integration policy as ranked by MIPEX is linked to the labour market outcomes of immigrants to Portugal.

1.1 Research Questions and Objectives
Policy objectives and goals do not always result in the intended outcomes. In a 2015 summary of the literature, Bilgili et al. point out that “only certain general and targeted employment policies can be directly associated with better labour market outcomes for immigrants” (p. 3). Rather, labour market integration policies examined at the macro-level appear to have an indirect effect on outcomes. However, they also state that analyzing on a per-country basis, with narrower examples of policy and of immigrants may aid in giving more precise results.

Most of the studies that examine the relationship between MIPEX and immigrant outcomes focus on countries with a long history of migration such as Germany and
Sweden. The majority of the existing research using Portugal as a case study is published in the Portuguese language, while the current research in English uses the outcomes from the 2011 and 2007 MIPEX (Correia Lopes, 2014) (Horta & White, 2009) (Horta & Gonçalves de Oliviera, 2014). In this case, the latest MIPEX report (published 2015, data from 2014) is used, and its results are correlated against the EU’s Zaragoza indicators of labour market outcomes obtained from the EU-Labour Force Survey compiled by Eurostat. Since the MIPEX last measured policies in 2014, the data collected by the EU-LFS surveys of 2016 and 2017 are relevant since there are now two additional years of EULFS and OM report data to be used for comparison.

Portugal is an interesting case study on the topic of immigrant integration. It ranks second on the 2015 MIPEX survey, and it is considered to be a “new immigration country.” In fact, immigrant integration policy in Portugal is just over a decade old. Learning whether the policy translates effectively into positive labour market outcomes is valuable for deciding if Portugal’s policy is indeed an example to be followed by other countries in the region. Measuring the policy through the lens of the MIPEX score allows for international comparisons, helping to identify and evaluate Portugal’s situation amongst that of its neighbours.

The research question of this thesis is:

*Does Portugal’s high MIPEX 2015 rating correlate with immigrants’ labour market outcomes?*

The expected result of this thesis is a limited correlation between the policies measured by the MIPEX and the labour market outcomes of immigrants in Portugal, as has been shown in previous studies of immigrant integration when considering all the countries examined. However, the author expects that as a result of Portugal's strong integration institutions the correlation between the MIPEX score and the labour market outcomes will be stronger when compared to other Southern European countries with a similar migration profile. The author also expects to find that immigrants from EU countries fare better than Third Country Nationals. The author anticipates positive developments of the outcomes, linked to better economic conditions in Portugal.
2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Integration
The Migration Policy Institute defines integration as “the process by which immigrants become accepted into society, both as individuals and as groups.” (Penninx, 2003). The definition is open-ended as the elements that define acceptance are subjective to each society's requirements. The Common Basic Principles of Integration Policy adopted by the European Union in 2004 bring some clarity to what is expected of Member States concerning integration policy. The first principle defines integration as a “dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States” (Council of the European Union, 2004). Immigrant integration is the competency of the Member States, but the EU provides support for the Member States to achieve successful integration.

Integration takes place at the individual level, how the individual is doing regarding employment, education, housing and socio-cultural adaptation, and at the collective level as in, how well the immigrant group can organize in the society. (Penninx, 2003)

Effective integration is a crucial element to maximizing the potential of both the host society and the immigrants themselves. Third country nationals (or non-EU immigrants to the EU) face many barriers of entry into the labour market, and they are at higher risk of social exclusion and poverty.

2.2 Integration indicators and measures of integration
The Zaragoza Declaration of 2010 established some indicators to be used in order to measure the success of the integration policies of the Member States. The indicators are in the areas of employment, health, education and social inclusion. Regarding employment, the indicators selected by the Zaragoza Declaration are:

- Unemployment rate
- Employment rate
- Activity rate
The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) is an international survey which measures integration in 38 countries. MIPEX describes Portugal as the only “new immigration” country to have a favourable labour market mobility framework. The indicators are classified into eight policy areas: Labour Market Mobility, Family Reunification, Health, Access to Nationality, Permanent Residence, Political Participation, Anti-Discrimination, and Education. Each of these categories has a further breakdown of indicators. For the purpose of this work, the Labour Market Mobility indicators are the most relevant, they are:

1. Access to labour markets:

   Access to the labour market is based on the legal status of the persons immigrating, as well as the reasons for why they migrate. The different categories of legal status or visas most often decide the rights available to the person. The most rights are usually reserved for citizenship holders of the country in question (or in the EU often for EU nationals). Citizens have full mobility rights, and the access to jobs in the public sector is most often reserved only for them. Migrants arriving due to family reunification and asylum reasons are often the most limited in access to the labour market. Most immigrants for economic visas will arrive seeking a visa which enables them to work in the host country freely, while others may arrive with visas that tie them to only one employer for the duration of the visa, limiting their mobility.

2. Access to general support:

   This category defines the access which migrants have to the support offered by institutions in the host country which is available to the general public such as employment counselling, vocational training and higher education. Additionally, it includes the recognition of foreign qualifications, and of foreign languages. Recognition of foreign qualifications is still quite a new area of rights, and it is not enforced in many countries.

3. Targeted Support:

   Targeted support refers to the support that host governments and institutions provide to migrants. According to MIPEX, this was the weakest category in all of the 38 countries measured. Targeted supports and policies are inadequate and often fail to address the specific needs of the immigrants they aim to help, especially those of the poorest, and
least educated. However, there are some new trends developing such as work-specific training, and employment coaching for migrants.

4. Worker’s Rights:

Worker’s rights refer to the access which migrants who have already accessed work have in comparison to the native population. According to MIPEX, normally they are allowed the same access to union support. However, migrants often do not enjoy the equal rights in terms of the social security systems in most countries measured, even when paying full supports.

2.3 Literature review

Labour mobility plays a vital role in economic growth and development. Immigrants can provide a complementary effect to a country's national labour force by way of their skills and the types of jobs that they are able and willing to do. Additionally, they can aid the host economies during an economic downturn by virtue of the more significant labour market flexibility (Kahanec & Guzi, 2017)which migrant workers exhibit. However, governments require well-established labour mobility and integration policies to ensure that the society can reap the benefits of labour migration. This section presents the most relevant academic findings to date.

Several studies have shown that immigrants play a vital role in the functioning of the host nation’s labour markets (Angrist & Kugler, 2003) (Kahanec & Guzi, 2017). Evidence demonstrates that in Europe, immigrants have a complementary effect on the native population of workers (Münz et al., 2006). They fill sectoral gaps which prevent specific industries from collapsing by doing the jobs that the native-born workers are unwilling to do such as the dirty, the dangerous, and many of the low-paid service and care jobs which are integral to a functioning society. Immigrants in Europe can also be found working in specific high-qualified areas such as in IT; areas for which the native population does not have the capacity and where training programs cannot fill the demand for labour. As such, it is evidenced that the labour market in Europe benefits from immigrants. Additionally, the labour market is highly segmented since immigrants work either in the high skilled or low skilled positions. (Münz et al., 2006, p.10). The type of labour migration is also relevant for integration, Kahanec and Zimmermann (2014) found that high labour force quality
decreases inequality in the general population, while large influxes of low-skilled immigration increase inequality.

In addition to the effect of complementarity which immigrants can have on the host’s labour market, there is also the effect that immigrants can have in dealing with changing labour market and economic conditions, as was the case during the 2009 recession. According to Kahanec and Guzi (2017) immigrants are more responsive than the native population to changing conditions such as lower wages or labour shortages. This is especially true for recent immigrants, who have been in the host country for a maximum of ten years, presumably because they still have not made strong bonds with the host country; however, this timeframe differs based on skill level. In the case of low-skilled immigrants, the time span is between six to ten years, while for high skilled immigrants it is only between one to five years. The reason low-skilled immigrants are more mobile after six years may have to do with having acquired some work and institutional experience in the host country. After six years the immigrants are likely better able to navigate the barriers to labour mobility (dealing with bureaucracy, obtained credible references and certification, and others) as well as having received residency documents, all while still being fresh enough in the country to not have made lasting bonds which would impede future mobility. On the other hand, skills, high-skilled immigrants are inherently more mobile than the low-skilled by virtue of their skills. They are more likely to find a job faster and with less difficulty, as their skills may be on demand; this means they are more inclined to respond to market and economic shocks within the first few years of their migration since the original cost of migration can still be interpreted as a sunk cost. (Kahanec & Guzi, 2017).

Across countries which host immigration, there is a persistent gap between the labour market condition of natives and immigrants, where the native populations fare better than immigrants (Kahanec, 2015). Kahanec and Zimmermann (2011) showed that despite evidence that these gaps can be reduced in relation to the amount of time spent in the host country, in other instances the gaps persist or even increase even in generations born in the host country. The determinants that have been found to be relevant to the gap are the years since the arrival, year of migration, cohort effect, country of origin, lower returns to human capital, gender and lack of citizenship rights. Kahanec (2015) explores the role of
institutions in explaining this gap by classifying the determinants into two categories: the explained and the unexplained factors. The explained factors represent the observable characteristics as listed above, while the unexplained are likely composed of non-observable factors such as differential treatment and discrimination. In this case, the explained gaps arise from outside the labour market, implying that immigrant workers only have a different set of characteristics to the natives and thus have different labour market outcomes. On the other hand, the unexplained gaps arise within the labour market when immigrant and native workers are treated differently despite possessing the same characteristics regarding skill, education, gender, and others. According to Kahanec, in order to close each of these types of gaps, governments need to implement different strategies. For the explained gaps, programs such as Active Labour Market policies are implemented; these are explained further in this section. Unexplained gaps, however, require the implementation of anti-discrimination legislation ensuring equal treatment for all in the labour market.

In his 2015 paper, Kahanec finds that typological differences matter for integrating immigrants into the labour markets using the Varieties of Capitalism (VoC) framework by Hall and Soskice (2001). According to Kahanec, coordinated market economies are less successful at attracting immigrants and at maintaining them. He finds that immigrants enjoy a higher level of success in the labour market in liberal and emerging market economies. He also finds that mixed market economies have the most favourable conditions regarding immigrant's labour force participation and permanent employment. Unemployment and low-skill employment yield mixed results which cannot be classified into one or the other (p. 29). He concludes that countries which base their economy on vocational training and education have a negative impact on immigrants because they are not able to easily transfer the skills which they acquired abroad, given that the vocational training tends to be job or industry-specific. Additionally, he concludes that under these kinds of regimes immigrants are also subjected to less equal treatment (as concerns the unexplained gap). Countries with higher exposure to international trade and with more agricultural industry base seem to exhibit lower explained gaps but higher unexplained gaps (Kahanec, 2015, p. 30).
Along the same lines of Kahanec, Angrist and Kugler (2003) find that the labour and product market flexibility can have an impact on the integration of immigrants into the receiving labour market from the point of view of the native population. Economic barriers which restrict migrant worker access can have the opposite effect to the one intended. Rather than protecting the jobs of native workers, higher entry barriers and reduced wage flexibility increase the adverse effect, leaving more native workers unemployed instead of just reducing the wage premiums to adjust for increase labour supply. This would thus mitigate the positive impact that immigrants can make in the labour market of the host society during times of economic downturn (Angrist & Kugler, 2003).

Governments use two different types of interventions to aid the integration of immigrants into the labour force; general ones which are applied to all workers, and migrant-specific interventions (Butschek & Walter, 2013). The distinction has to do with the types of institutions which are available and to which immigrants are granted or facilitated access. Countries typically make use of a few interventions with more intensity than others.

Card (2010) classifies the general ALMPs into four types:

1. Training: This type of intervention refers to programmes that build skills of job seekers to help the transition into the labour market as well as programmes aimed at reducing the gap between the capabilities of the workforce and those needed by the employers.

2. Subsidised private sector employment: These are wage subsidies programmes which encourage private sector employers to hire disadvantaged workers.

3. Subsidised public sector employment (public works): Public works programmes are organized by governments to offer job opportunities for workers who are not being met by the private sector. Most often these types of interventions are usually community services.

4. Job search assistance and sanctions: Programmes which aid workers in the search for jobs and which streamline the processes. The sanctions are typically implemented in case of a lack of job search effort by the job seekers.
The other type of programmes according to Butschek and Walter are the migrant-specific programmes which they classify into three categories (p.4-5):

1. Language training: These programs serve to allow migrants to be able to communicate in the host country and often also include other aspects which aid integration such as cultural knowledge, history, and networking with locals depending on the type of program offered.

2. Introduction programmes: These are targeted at newly arrived immigrants and include several aspects of integration. They are often a customized plan of integration with elements of job search assistance, language training, subsidized employment, and more.

3. General programmes for immigrants: This type of measures include the same as the ALMPs listed above with the exception that they are targeted at immigrants only.

To realize the maximum economic and social benefits of immigration, it is crucial to have in place a structure that helps immigrants transition into the host society. There is a significant body of literature aimed at evaluating immigrant integration policies. At the macro-level Bilgili, Huddleston and Joki (2015) gather the results of twenty-two multilevel studies which apply the MIPEX scores. In the area of labour market mobility, they find that only a few employment policies can be directly linked to the labour market integration outcomes of immigrants. According to Bilgili et al., labour market mobility policies have a somewhat indirect effect, by defining the legal framework that workers can have in the labour market and remove barriers. They suggest that policies that go beyond labour market mobility such as naturalization can have a direct effect on the labour market outcomes of certain immigrant types, especially third country nationals from developing countries.

Bilgili et al. emphasize the importance of efficiently targeting policies to particular migrant groups rather than to the general “immigrant” population as this improves the results. However, they forewarn that in empirical research the MIPEX measure of “targeted support” seems to be negatively linked to immigrant’s over-qualification. Cebolla and Finnotelli (2011) conclude that institutional arrangements and the structural conditions of the host country have an impact on the process of integration at the country-level and must
be taken into consideration during analysis. Well as carefully selecting cases and policies for research examining the links between integration policy and outcomes.

Kogan (2016) analyzed whether the integration policies of labour market training and counselling improve immigrants labour market outcomes. They mainly used the data from the Netherlands, Italy, the UK and Ireland from the MIPEX 2007 scores and the 2008 EULFS ad hoc module. They find that in the two policies are primarily ineffective although the results varied slightly in each of the countries analyzed. According to Kogan (2016) labour market counselling has better results than labour market training in relation to the planned policy goals. They conclude that a reason for the lack of overall effectiveness of the labour market counselling could be due to negative stereotypes associated with requiring that kind of institutional intervention (people who are less driven and less resourceful who need to rely on others for help). On the other hand, they conclude that the lack of positive results for labour market training is a result of ineffective targeting of program participants or ineffective training. As a result, they conclude that the policy intentions do not automatically translate into the way in which the policies are implemented and thus do not automatically relate to the intended outcomes. (Kogan, 2016, p. 353)

In a summary of the literature Rinne (2012) breaks down the immigration settlement policies into language training, introduction programs, ALMPs and anti-discrimination programs. Among the existing program evaluation literature, mostly focusing on studies conducted in the Nordic countries (Sweden, Denmark, and Finland), Rinne finds that policy programs which are most closely linked to the labour market have the best results comparatively. These are programs such as work experience and wage subsidies. Kogan (2016) notes that however, immigrants are often underrepresented in these programs and are instead most likely to be found in public sector employment and training programs. Rinne warns of the dangers of trapping immigrants into “program careers,” that is when rather than entering into the labour market after the first program is over, the immigrant carries on participating from one program to the next. This trend is more likely to happen in programs which have less direct links to the labour market such as those Kogan describes.

In answering the question of why some European countries such as Portugal maintained a commitment to investing in immigrant integration during a time of austerity during the
recession period, Elizabeth Collet (2011) identified three main “drivers of change” aside from simple politics and economics:

1. Philosophy, which she defines as an “underlying philosophical commitment to integration, based on a belief that immigrants play an important role in European society” (p. 20). Portugal is established as one of the countries considered to value the role of immigrants, which as mentioned before is evident in the political rhetoric.

2. Embeddedness defined as "the extent to which integration policies, institutions and infrastructure, are intertwined with the broader panoply of government policies." Collet goes on to say that Portugal translated its policy commitments into strong institutions and infrastructure for support which in turn makes for a sturdy and continued investments into integration policy and integration programmes.

3. The last factor Collet identifies as a driver is Fatigue. According to the observations in the report, countries which have historically had continued, and long-lasting immigration have seen a hardening of attitudes towards immigrants and demands that immigrants should be more self-sufficient. On the other hand, countries like Portugal which had only started to receive significant immigrant numbers within the last decade from the time of publication were still more willing to carry on integration measures. She speculates that one cause of this could be a lack of visible results in the more experienced countries (UK and Netherlands) as regards past immigration policy.

Despite the perceived welcoming nature and success of the Portuguese immigration and integration policies, Padilla and França (2016) criticize these policies from a historical standpoint. They point to a lack of strategic vision, as the policies seem always to be reactionary and driven by the European Union and migration trends. They look at the fact that while the ACM has a wide range of integration programmes, it holds little decision-making power. Decision making rests with the SEF which, as a border control agency, opts for surveillance and criminalization. They also conclude that the 2015 changes of the ACIME into the ACM which now groups emigration and immigration issues under the
same agency, hold the risk of decreasing the efforts of integration by placing more importance on emigration than on integration. They argue that this is an inefficient way of dealing with immigration and emigration as there are competing aspects that drive both trends.

3. Migration in Portugal

3.1 History and Patterns of Migration in Portugal
Portugal has historically been a country of emigration. As a colonial nation, Portuguese nationals have been migrating to the Americas and Africa since the 15th century. Tumultuous political environment and unfavourable economic conditions were also causes for Portuguese emigration in the 20th century. Since the 1990s, a large number of immigrants began to enter Portugal, which at one point was considered to have positive net migrations (more immigrants than emigrants). The reasons for this shift are due to increasing economic welfare in Portugal and changes in geopolitics. However, the economic recession and the Troika measures of 2011 caused a decrease in the number of immigrants and an increase in the number of emigrants. While there has been a slow-down in emigration in the last few years, net migration to Portugal remains negative. In order to understand the current migration and integration policies it is essential to examine the historical patterns of migration in and out of Portugal.

Peixoto and Sabino (2009) divide Portugal's immigration history into four main periods: (1) The decolonization period of 1975 to the mid-1980s. (2) The adhesion of Portugal to the European Economic Community (ECC) in 1986. (3) The inflows of the 1990s when immigration to Portugal began to pick up speed and lastly (4) the decline of immigration caused by the recession starting in the mid-2000s. This categorization logic is followed in the review of the historical flows.

The end of the Portuguese Empire via the 1974 revolution marked the most significant mass influx of people into Portugal. This influx cannot be fully considered as an immigration influx, as the majority of those entering the country held Portuguese citizenship. However, the flow is highly relevant in setting a precursor to Portugal's experience in integration (and re-integration) of migrants. During this period the leading countries of origin were Cape Verde, Angola and Guinea Bissau. While Portuguese
descendants were allowed to maintain citizenship after the decolonization, citizenship holders of African descent faced challenges of integration due to racism. Further, they faced discrimination due to the 1975 and subsequent 1981 nationality laws which changed the right of nationality from jus-soli (right of land) to jus-sanguis (right of blood) and stripped their Portuguese citizenship rights (Horta & White, 2009). As a result, the Afro-Portuguese population became irregular migrants, a condition which was then passed on to their children, leaving a generation of Portuguese-born colonial descendants in legal difficulties (Padilla & França, 2016). At the same time, these new laws made it easier for children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren of Portuguese émigrés to acquire citizenship, granting as well the right to dual citizenship and thus defining what it means to be Portuguese and setting a basis for future migratory flows (Horta & White, 2009).

The adhesion of Portugal to the European Economic Community in 1986 was another event which cemented the foundations of Portugal as an immigration country. While during this time Portugal received immigrants from Brazil and Western Europe (Peixoto & Sabino, 2009), this period is not so much marked by the flow of immigration but by the developments in economic growth in the service sector and public infrastructure. It meant that the country needed a readily available labour force to fulfill the vacancies created by these developments. (Padilla & França, 2016). As a result, the nation entered into the 3rd phase defined by Peixoto and Sabino; in the 1990s the country experienced the most significant and most diverse migrant inflows. During the 1990s the previous immigration patterns from the former African colonies as well as from Brazil continued, but they were also paired with immigration from Eastern Europe (Ukraine, Romania, Russia and Bulgaria). In the early 2000s, immigration from Asia (China, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal) joined the flows (Padilla & França, 2016). Particularly significant is that the latter two regions of origin (Eastern Europe and Asia) had no previous cultural, historical or linguistic ties with Portugal, thus creating the more challenging period of immigrant integration and setting the stage for more inclusive integration policy.

The economic recession of 2009 had a significant impact on Portugal’s migration flows. As well as a decrease in immigration it also marked an increase in emigration. This time the emigration flow is composed of previous immigrants, second generation and naturalized
immigrants as well as of Portuguese citizens. (Padilla & França, 2016). The net migration rate has been negative since 2011, with the lowest being in 2012 at -37.352 according to the Observatory for Migration (OM). While the trend has seen a marked improvement, net migration rates remain negatives; in 2016 the rate was -8.348.

3.2 Migration policies
Portugal first established an immigration policy in 1981, Decree-Law 264B/81 which aimed at border control and regulating immigration. According to Peixoto and Sabino (2009), this law was “benevolent”; it provided visa categories but did not seriously limit immigration or curb illegal migration as most immigrants still entered through short-term visas which they then overstayed. During the 1980s the aim of immigration policies in Portugal remained that of border control but became increasingly structured as well as stricter because of Europeanization pressures and Schengen accession (Padilla & França, 2016). The Immigration and Borders Service (abbreviated SEF, Serviço de Estrangeiros e Fronteiras, by its Portuguese initials) was formed in 1986 as a result of the adhesion of Portugal to the European Economic Community. This agency remains today as a border agency, security service and part of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. It is the body responsible for border control, foreigner’s activities and their right to stay in Portugal, and general control of migratory flows. The SEF is in control of visa and residency permits, their issuance and validity, fighting human trafficking, organized crime and illegal immigration, and decision making of asylum applications. It is also the agency that represents Portugal in the working groups of the European Union (SEF, 2018).

In the 1990s immigration policies emphasized border control mechanisms, enforcement of visa procedures as well as the regularization or expulsion of illegal immigrants. In 1993 the government made a policy of “zero immigration” by attempting to treat migration as only a temporary phenomenon and not establish permanent residency or family reunification. This policy was short-lived and relaxed in 1996. At this time, there was positive discrimination towards the native Portuguese-language speaker, who obtained residence permits at high rates (Peixoto & Sabino, 2009). The Law of 1998 (Law-Decree nº 244/98) is the first to consider family reunification as a right. This law, as well as the Government Program of the Socialist Party (PS) at the time, marks the shift from a policy focused only on the
regulation of migration flows to one which is also considerate of integration of immigrants. (Peixoto & Sabino, 2009)

During the early 2000s Portuguese migration policy, shaped by the Europeanization pressures of the EU through Directives, continued to emphasize the importance of regularization, including the regularization of foreign workers who were already present in the country and part of the informal economy. In 2007 the Foreigner Law (Law nº 23/2007) set new conditions of entry, renewal and stayed in Portugal. Importantly, it also established a program for short-term economic migration with an emphasis on highly-skilled immigration. It also allowed for regularization and new temporary types of visas. While the immigration laws of the 2000s helped to regularize immigration as well as to control migration flows, they also increasingly criminalized illegal migration, trafficking and other related crimes. (Padilla & França, 2016)

3.4 Integration framework and policies
Along with higher immigrant flows in the 1990s, so came pressures to include immigration and integration into the policy agenda. It started with lobbying from immigrant associations to comply with EU Directives. Integration did not immediately form itself as an independent priority but began in 1991 with the creation of the Secretariat for Multicultural Education Programme and the Intercultural Education Project of 1993. As can be evidenced by their names, the aim of these programmes was directed towards promoting equality, educational integration of migrant children into schools as well as intercultural dialogue (Padilla & França, 2016).

The institutional framework for integration was firmly established in the 1990s with the creation of the 1991 Commission for Equality and Against Racial Discrimination (COCAI-Concelho Consultivo para os Assuntos da Imigração), the 1993 Advisory Council on Immigration Issues, the 1991 Commission for Equality and Against Racial Discrimination and the 1996 the creation of the High Commissioner for Immigration and Ethnic Minorities (Alto Commissariario para a Imigração e Minorias Etnicas ACIME) and finally the 1999 Commission for Equality and Against Legal Discrimination (Comissão para a Igualdade e Contra a Discriminação Racial CICDR).
The High Commissioner of ACIME was established as the government representative in case of migration and as such was a member of some of the boards and organizations listed above. After some reforms in 2002, its main role was to establish a dialogue with immigrant associations, improve immigrant life standards, promote Portuguese language and culture and combat racism and xenophobia. It also reported straight to the Presidency of the Council of Ministers and served as a principal advisory board to the government.

In 2007 ACIME became the High Commission for Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue (ACIDI- Alto Comissariado para a Imigração e o Dialogo Intercultural). ACIDI brought together more aspects of integration than its predecessor institution. It included the old ACIME, Project Escolhas, the Religious Dialogue and the Entreculturas Secretariat. Under the slogan “More Diversity, More Humanity” ACIDI brought together all aspects: ministerial dialogue, education, religion and inter-cultural dialogue. The primary focus was on the implementation of public policy targeting immigrants and ethnic minorities as well as the promotion of intercultural and inter-religious dialogue. (Horta & Gonçalves de Oliveira, 2014).

Horta and Gonçalves de Oliveira (2014) regard the creation of ACIDI as a “turning point in immigration policy-making in Portugal… denoting a greater commitment to migrants and ethnic minorities” (p. 10). They summarize into four main points the principles of this integration policy (p.10):

1. “To promote equal rights and opportunities in multiple domains (economic, social, cultural and political);
2. To enhance intercultural dialogue, consensus and positive interaction amongst migrant populations and mainstream society;
3. To promote local intervention in close proximity to migrants’ daily lives;
4. To be proactive in the face of swift immigration developments”.

ACIDI and its institutional framework, as well as its policies, were the ones considered in the MIPEX Reports (latest 2014), in which it obtained results of the second best country in overall migrant integration after Sweden. As well, it was the framework which was in place
during the Eurostat Labour Survey AdHoc report which included detailed outcomes of each European country and overall measures.

Most recently, in 2014 ACIDI turned into High Commissioner for Migrations (ACM-Alto Comissariado para Migrações) which takes a holistic approach to migration by overseeing both immigration and emigration issues. This shift towards taking emigration into consideration was a timely response to the pressures of the numbers of Portuguese and foreign citizens exiting the country in large numbers. In 2015 the ACM issued the “Strategic Plan for Migration 2015-2020” which I will review, and compare to the previous integration plan in a later section.

3.5 The High Commission for Migration (ACM I.P)
The ACM was created in 2014 through the Decree-Law No. 31/2014, February 2. The Mission statement of the ACM indicates that its “central aim [is to] meet the integration needs of the different migrant backgrounds” (ACM, 2018, p. 6). It also mentions that the main missions are to “welcoming and integrating” (p.6) by providing integrated public services through support centres and offices. The ACM acknowledges the need for constant reform and adaptation of policies to meet the changing needs of migration scenarios. The following are brief descriptions of the programs and agencies working under the ACM banner.

- The National Support Centers for the Integration of Migrants (Centro Nacional de Apoio à Integração de Migrantes - CNAIM) is one of the vehicles for policy delivery of the ACM. It was created in 2004 as a one-stop-shop which immigrants can access for support. As a one-stop-shop, CNAIM serves to inform, direct, advise, and develop mediation activities. The centres have qualified multilingual mediators on-hand to provide personalized and accessible support to the clients. There are currently 3 CNAIM offices in Lisbon, Porto and Faro which are the most populated cities for immigrants (ACM, 2018).

In addition to the support provided in the main offices, the CNAIM delivers services through the following four projects (ACM, 2018):
1. Migrant Support Line: provides information about immigration in several languages, including Portuguese, English and Arabic, Creole and others. The goal is to provide immediate response to questions concerning Immigration, Law, Nationality, Health and Education. It also serves as a re-directing service by scheduling appointments and referring the migrant to the appropriate bodies. Also provides translation services. The line works through email and the telephone ensuring most migrants can access it. (p.12)

2. Telephone Translation Service: Translation services in 60 different languages. It engages the migrant and the representative of the institution as well as the translator in a telephone conference and provides immediate interpretation services ensuring maximum understanding between the parties involved. This service is valuable as it can be accessed from any part of Portugal and thus offers accessible translation for foreigners not located in the central cities (p.13).

3. Terms on the Ground: This service is provided by intercultural mediators that travel as needed to different communities, institutions, schools among others. They help immigrants by mainly clarifying issues related to documentation (access to Portuguese nationality, regularization, family reunification) as well as providing clarification on matters of access to health and education (p.13).

4. The Network of Immigrant Occupation Insertion Offices (Rede GIP Imigrante-RGI): This agency works closely with the Employment Centers and uses the Occupational Insertion Offices (Gabinetes de Inserção Profissional -GIPs) to provide support to young people and to adults looking to enter or re-enter the labour market. It operates similarly to the support given to the general public, but it is precisely targeted towards migrants. The support provided includes training opportunities, dissemination of job offers, developing entrepreneurial skills, and the placement of unemployed individuals in job vacancies, among others. It also monitors the presence and activity of those receiving unemployment benefits.

- The Local Policy Support Office for the Integration of Migrants (Gabinete de Apoio às Políticas Locais de Integração de Migrantes- GAPLIM) is another entity within the ACM. It aims to promote integration policies at the local level as well as providing
tools to ensure better domestic policies. Since the local actors are the closest institutions to the individual migrants, and since integration into the local community is key to ensuring that immigrants feel welcomed, this is a particularly interesting initiative. It promotes and engages the Network of Municipalities of Friends of Immigrants and Diversity (Rede de Municípios Amigos dos Imigrantes e da Diversidade-RMAD), manages a network that links the local services to the CNAIM and other ACM services, monitors and supports the work of the local offices and the Network of Local Support Centres for the Integration of Migrants. It also maps the best practices of local municipalities which it shares with other municipalities. Through the different initiatives, the GAPLIM encourages integrated action between the public and private sectors as well as civil society (ACM, 2018, p. 15).

- The Local Support Centres for the Integration of Migrants (Rede de Centros Locais de Apoio à Integração de Migrantes- CLAIM): These are decentralized reception and support offices. They are also linked to the previously defined CNAIM services and respond to a vast array of practical immigrant issues which include: Documentation, Family Reunification, Housing, Employment, Health, Education, Entrepreneurship, Professional training, Voluntary return, amongst others.

- Support Unit for the Integration of Refugees (Núcleo de Apoio à Integração de Refugiados -NAIR): This agency works in cooperation with CLAIM and CNAIM to provide specific care to refugee integration, acknowledging the additional layer of the difficulty of forced migration. It registers the reception of refugees in Portugal and monitors their integration as well as provides information for the general public. (ACM, 2018, p. 21)

- Migrant Entrepreneurial Support Office (Gabinete de Apoio ao Empreendedor Migrante -GAEM): This agency supports the migrant entrepreneur and also helps them to develop and execute their business idea. It has four main areas of work: (1) Training in business plan creation, (2) technical support in business plan creation, (3) dissemination of entrepreneurial activities, (4) connecting institutions that support entrepreneurs. Some of the specific projects include PEPEI– Entrepreneurship Project for International Students; REFUJOBS – Training of refugees for the development of self-employment
initiatives. It also offers the face-to-face support and guidance of migrant entrepreneurs. (ACM, 2018, p. 24)

- Intercultural Dialogue Unit (Núcleo para o Diálogo Intercultural-NDI): This is one of the most prominent services of the ACM. Its aim is to promote positive interaction between natives and migrant communities and intercultural and inter-religious dialogue. It achieves this through projects of: Intercultural Education, training in integration and intercultural learning through a nation-wide network, the Portuguese Charter for Diversity which encourages companies to implement internal policies of non-discrimination and diversity, Intercultural Mediation which works at building relationship between individuals or groups in particular areas in order to achieve social cohesion; Higher Education Network for Intercultural Mediation which creates a network of Universities and Polytechnic institutions working on migration and integration issues; and finally Inter-religious Dialogue. (ACM, 2018, p. 27)

- Mentoring Programme for Migrants (Programa Mentores para Migrantes): is an agency which works with volunteers and promotes support between citizens. It aims to bridge cross-cultural gaps showing that people experience similar struggles and challenges that can be overcome together. (ACM, 2018, p. 32)

- Portuguese for All Programme (Programa Português para Todos-PPT): Language acquisition is a primary driver of integration into all aspects of the host community for newly-arrived migrants; as such, this program is crucial. This is a joint initiative of the Presidency of the Council of Ministers, the Ministry of Labour, Solidarity and Social Security and the Ministry of Education. ACM, as the Intermediate Body of the Social Inclusion and Employment Operational Programme , is the manager of this Programme. The courses included in the PPT Programme are co-financed by the European Social Fund. Courses are free of charge for new arrivals and they are provided in schools and in the Employment and Vocational Training Institute. The courses grant participants with a language certificate at level A2 or B2 which they can then use when applying for employment, for residency, and for citizenship. There are also courses of shorter duration provided which are aimed at specific employment opportunities. Under this service, there are also initiatives aimed at training and equipping educators with tools for teaching Portuguese. Additionally, there are learning opportunities in informal
settings which are aimed at teaching Portuguese at a more basic and casual level aimed at migrants who are unable or uncomfortable to participate in a formal education setting. (ACM, 2018, p. 36)

- The Technical Support Office for Immigrant Associations (Gabinete de Apoio Técnico às Associações de Imigrantes- GATAI) supports, monitors, and promotes Immigrant Associations. It operates at the local level. The leading organizations are those of the Cape Verdean, Angolan and Brazilian communities (ACM, 2018, p. 41). This is an important initiative as immigrant communities often provide services which aid new arrivals to integrate into the larger community and they also make immigrants feel valued and welcomed by their host nation. (Schrover & Vermeulen, 2007)

- Choices Programme (Programa Escolhas- PE): is aimed at young children and it is recognized as an exemplary programme. It is in its 6th generation and 17th year; it is scheduled to run until December 2018. It is structured around five areas of integration: 1. Education and training, 2. Employability and Employment, 3. Participation, civic and community rights and duties, 4. Digital Inclusion, 5. Empowerment and Entrepreneurship. (ACM, 2018, p. 44)

- The Events, Communication and Information Office (Gabinete de Eventos, Comunicação e Informação -GECI) is the body responsible for supplying and monitoring information, both within the ACM and externally. It partners with the other bodies to issue campaigns, posters and operate the websites. (ACM, 2018, p. 50)

- Financial Support and Funding Team (Equipa de Fundos e Apoio Financeiro-EFAF) is the body responsible for financial management of the ACM.

- The Observatory for Migration (Observatório das Migrações- OM) is an integral part of the ACM as it provides the statistical data that the policies are crafted from including the flows of migrants in and out of Portugal (ACM, 2018, p. 56)

- Commission for Equality and Against Racial Discrimination (Comissão para a Igualdade e Contra a Discriminação Racial-CICDR): this body ensures and monitors that the Portuguese laws of anti-discrimination are correctly implemented. They deal with the administration behind complaints, implement fines as well as make public cases. They also disseminate information. (ACM, 2018, p. 60)
• International Relations Unit (Núcleo de Relações Internacionais - NRI) represents the ACM in international settings. It is the body which meets with international actors in international conferences. (ACM, 2018, p. 63)

• Lastly, the Migration Policy Unit (Núcleo de Política Migratória - NPM) is the body responsible for the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Migration. Additionally, it is the unit that deals with the emigrant returnees, helping them to coordinate with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It also draws up legal opinion within the framework of the mission of ACM, I.P. and accompanying national and Community legislative initiatives. (ACM, 2018, p. 66)

The ACM also includes two areas which support the integration of Roma communities into Portuguese mainstream society - the Support Unit for Roma Communities (NACl) and the Observatory for Roma Communities (ObCig). These are not described in more detail as they are not relevant to the purpose of this work.

3.5.1 The Strategic Plan for Migration
In today’s Europe, where public opinion towards migrants has severely soured due to recent mass migration flows, Portugal’s 2015-2020 plan Strategic Plan for Migration goes against the grain by offering positive rhetoric and recognizing the value of migration for the economy and social fabric of Portugal, provided that immigrants are well integrated. The Plan identifies five key challenges:

“(i) transversal combat against the demographic deficit and the stabilisation of the net migration; (ii) the consolidation of the integration and capacity building of immigrant communities resident in Portugal, continuing Portugal’s personalist tradition; (iii) the integration of new nationals, who have become naturalised or are descendants of immigrants; (iv) address international mobility, by internationalising the Portuguese economy in order to attract migrants and recognise the value of migration and talent as incentives to economic growth; (v) follow up of Portuguese emigration, by strengthening ties and conditions for the return and reintegration of emigrant national citizens.” (ACM, 2015, p. 13)
The Plan identifies the importance of creating integration policies that fit the polarized profiles of the new arrivals - low skilled and the high skilled. The Plan establishes that recruiting highly qualified individuals is beneficial to Portugal and that, in order to maximize immigrants potential, it is crucial to recognize foreign qualifications. As well the Plan identifies the importance of ensuring the integration of new Portuguese nationals, whether they have achieved this status by blood or by naturalization. Additionally, through focus (iv) the Plan establishes that it is essential to maintain positive net migration in Portugal by creating policies which make Portugal attractive to migrants and encourages locals to stay.

3.5.2 Plan for Immigration Integration II 2010-2013
The Plan for Immigration Integration of 2010-2013 (PII) was the second plan for immigration integration and an apparent continuation of the first plan which was established in 2007. The PII is the strategic plan which was measured by the MIPEX 2015.

It is significantly different from the 2015 Strategic Plan for Migration which followed. First, it has a much more optimistic view on immigration; it does not have the same emphasis on the need for immigration instead it is much more focused on integration itself. While the Strategic Plan for Migration focuses strongly on the need to regulate the balance of emigration and immigration and on the importance of immigrants and second-generation immigrants to Portugal the 2010 plan focuses more on the immigrants themselves with a more humanitarian focus. It acknowledges that the economic crisis leaves immigrants most vulnerable but it does not seem to foresee that immigrants to Portugal are also highly mobile and thus will leave the country in the future.

The PII II has nine main working areas which define quite narrowly the interventions which will be applied (ACIDI, 2010):

This list shows a critical difference between the two plans, the 2015 plan takes a more comprehensive and overarching approach while the 2010 plan takes a particular approach to each of the interventions.

Looking at the specific Active Labour Market Policies on both Plans shows the following differences:

Most obviously, since there is no one specific “Employment” section in the 2015 Plan the Labour Market objectives can be found throughout the different priority axes. Within the “Employment” aspect the 2010 PII considers: Entrepreneurship incentives; trainings for immigrants regarding their rights and duties as well as access to professional training and employment; recognition of qualifications and the creation of a database of highly qualified immigrants; protecting the residency rights of immigrants whose employers do not adhere to their Social Security obligations; inspections of employers in search of illegal immigrant workers and lastly incentives the promotion of ethical principles and diversity in employers and organizations (ACIDI, 2010, pp. 49-50)

Some of the 2015 objectives which deal specifically with ALMPs involve some overlap or continuation from the previous plan, while others present new perspectives on previous issues or add different themes. One of the overlaps is in entrepreneurship incentives; the (SPM) measures the actions taken using the same indicators of “training participants and new businesses created” as in the 2010 objectives. However, it adds broader support initiatives for immigrant entrepreneurs such as information sessions for foreign food catering establishments and information session about the rights and duties of foreign employers regarding health and safety and labour relations. It also provides more financial support for entrepreneurs. There is also overlap on the objectives which aim to promote diversity, prevent illegal and irregular migrant labour, and encourage employers to include migrant worker integration into their corporate social responsibility initiatives.

As with the general classification of the topics when compared to those of the 2010 Plan, the 2015 objectives are also overarching. These are: “Promotion of the improvement of labour conditions” which refers to immigrant integration, combatting the use of illegal workers, racial discrimination and human trafficking (ACM, 2015, p. 32). Another is the
“identification of potentially more adequate interventions to the promotion of the population integration in the work market” (p. 32). The latter objective is geared towards immigrants, but it includes flexibility in the language which applies to the general labour market and aims at streamlining the active labour market policies to make it more attractive to locals to reduce emigration. In this sense, it is less focused on migrants and more focused on the general population.

The measure of recognition of foreign qualifications involves four different objectives and several indicators; it is much more developed as a goal in the 2015 plan than in the previous plans. It involves raising awareness through the past experiences of immigrants who had their degrees recognized and through the National Immigrant Support Centres (CNAI) as well as adapting the legislation to not only include long-term degrees but also to include short-term higher education courses (p.37.) An objective which is specific and without precedent in the 2010 plan is the objective of integrating immigrants into the agricultural job market through creating a procedural guide and a list of seasonal activities.

Overall, the changes from the 2010-2013 Plan for Immigrant Integration to the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan for Migration demonstrate the effect that increased emigration and reduced immigration have had in the crafting of policy goals. The less precise integration objectives in terms of the target population and less defined action areas show the shift from accommodating and integrating immigrants, towards making Portugal a country which is welcoming and accepting of immigrants but also attractive to locals and that regulates emigration. With the added objectives of seasonal agricultural migrant work the Strategic Plan for Migration also shows a shift in what is considered acceptable and desirable migration. While in the last two decades the focus of Portugal was set in integrating long-term immigrants whose goal was to settle in Portugal, the economic hardships of the last decade show the need for a flexible (migrant) labour force who will be there as needed but will not deplete resources when there are fewer options available.

Another element which could be reflected by the changes made from the 2010 Plan to the 2015 Plan is the success of the 2010 PII. Given the shifts in Portugal's migration patterns, and reflecting the fact that a large proportion of Portugal's immigrants have become naturalized, indicative that they have most likely integrated into society, more flexible
target populations could also be interpreted as Portuguese policymakers shifting the priority away from the introductory policies to ones which target longer-term, more established migrants.

The increased emphasis on entrepreneurship present in the 2015 Strategic Plan for Migration reflects the effects of the crisis. This mentioned by the High Commissioner Pedro Calado in the ACM report (ACM, 2018, p. 5) where he, on behalf of the Portuguese government, acknowledges the value that immigrants add to the economy through business creation and by becoming employers themselves. Immigrant entrepreneurs provide labour opportunities to local residents and contribute to economic growth, factors that are essential in a Portugal which is slowly resurfacing from a recession. The 2010 PII, which came into effect while the recession was still in its early stages, mentioned entrepreneurship as a goal but was less focused on it and instead focused on employment for immigrants.

It is interesting to note that although in previous studies the use of subsidized employment initiatives is seen as the measure which yields the most substantial results concerning employability of the immigrant labour force (Butschek & Walter, 2013); this type of measure does not play a role in either the 2010 PII or the 2015 Strategic Plan. Instead, the Portuguese ALMPs take the form of training both of employers and potential employees.

**Objectives Outside of Employment**

According to research, measures which are directly targeted at enhancing employment are not the only relevant measures which positively influence labour market integration outcomes, such as language training and nationality programs. The latter is particularly necessary depending on the country of origin of the migrant, with individuals coming from poorer countries is most likely to benefit from language learning opportunities. For this reason, it is also essential to take a detailed look at the differences in the objectives between what was set in the 2010 and the 2015 plan and how that has developed with time.

In the 2010 PII, there is the specific classification of Access to Citizenship and Civic Participation. However, this category concerns immigrants’ voting rights and consumer rights rather than issues of naturalization. Instead, the measure aimed at improving the efficiency of the nationality application is found under the heading of Justice. The goal of
this measure is a 10% reduction in processing time of the nationality application as well as giving more accessible advice and responses to enquiries regarding application time.

The measures of language and education objectives are found in the 2010 PII under the heading of Culture and Language. One of these objectives aims to ensure that immigrants who undertake the Language Examinations in Portuguese do so with the possibility of it contributing to their nationality application, whether the courses are taken in Portugal or abroad during pre-departure.

With regards to access to citizenship, the 2015 Strategic Plan for Migration includes the continuation of the previously implemented VIS- Visa Information System; better procedures regarding visa and citizenship procedures mostly done through on-line systems, and engaging and encouraging descendants of immigrants to obtain Portuguese citizenship and participate actively in political and civic life. As with the other themes, there is ambiguity in the language of the measures, especially in those regarding more efficient information systems so that they may also apply to the processing of documentation for emigrants. Regarding Language Learning, there is an integrated measure which includes several objectives. The primary goal in the 2015 Plan is the "Consolidation of the learning programmes of Portuguese as a foreign language" (ACM, 2015, p. 35). Within this measure, the objectives range from training for teachers of Portuguese as a foreign language to collecting information on the success of the foreign language programming and the regulation of the programming across schools. The measure deals mostly with the Portuguese language as it regards primary school students and leaves little continuation on the goals of the 2010 measures. The 2015 Plan additionally includes an objective which aims to amend the 2009 Ordinance which created Portuguese as Second Language courses for foreign nationals. The amendment would change the rules of acquisition of linguistic proficiency required to be excused from the citizenship test. The measure was scheduled to be implemented by the beginning of 2016; however, at the time of writing, it has not yet been applied.

3.6 Current labour migration profile
According to the Migration Observatory (OM), the distance between the public perceptions and the realities of migration flows in Portugal has been growing. In 2002 the European
Social Values Survey registered a 15 point difference which rose to a 17 point difference in 2014. Regarding proportional numbers, immigrants do not represent a significant portion of Portuguese society, with only a 3.8% percent of the population registered as foreign citizens, of which 1% are citizens from EU member states and 2.7% are Third Country Nationals (Oliveira & Gomes, 2017, p. 30). This decrease is due in part to the outflow of foreign residents from Portugal as a result of the economic recession. In 2016 Portugal registered 38,273 emigrants and 29,925 immigrants, meaning that the net migration has been negative, continuing a trend existing since 2011. However, 2016 registered a less negative year than the previous ones as net migration factored in at -8,348 whereas in 2015 it came in at -10,481 people (Oliveira & Gomes, 2017, p. 10); for comparison the year with the lowest recorded net migration in of the last decade was 2012 when net migration was -37,352 people. The Observatory for Migration 2017 report cites the improving economic conditions and the more attractive employment opportunities as the reason for a decrease in emigration and a slight increase in immigration leading to more positive net migration. In 2016, the stock of foreign citizens residing in Portugal was 397,731 persons. (Oliveira & Gomes, 2017)

Along with changes in stock and flow of immigrants, the immigration profile has also changed. While the 1990s and early 2000s saw primarily economic immigration, the last decade has seen immigration for reasons of education and family reunification as making up the majority of newcomers. The gender profile of immigrants to Portugal presents a pattern that is common in most of the developed world. Labour migrants are predominantly men, while women make up the more significant share of entrants with visas for reasons of family reunification.

Portugal, like most of Europe, has an ageing population and low birthrates. For this reason, immigration positively affects population trends. The OM reports that 9% of births in Portugal were registered to women holding foreign nationality. Additionally, immigrants to Portugal also follow a tendency of being younger and more active than the national population. Thanks to these measures, the immigrants to Portugal play a decisive role in the population growth of the country, and there is an emphasis on active policies to try to attract more.
Immigrants are often accused of being a drain on the system, migrating to wealthier countries to benefit from more generous social systems without contributing back. This, however, is often a myth since migrants usually pay more in taxes and social security contributions than they receive back as benefits. This case is true for Portugal, where the contributions made by foreign workers to the social security was 454.4 million euros in 2015 and 509.5 million euros in 2016 and while they benefitted from only 99.2 million euros in 2015 and 91 million euros in 2016. This means that Portugal has had a positive balance of 355.2 and 418.5 million euros in 2015 and 2016 respectively. This has been a steady trend over the last decade, despite the effects of the economic recession; for reference in 2006, the balance reached 442.7 million euros (Oliveira & Gomes, 2017, p. 12).

Portugal is ranked by MIPEX as the top country with regards to access to nationality policy ever since the changes made by the 2007 laws. Since 2006 and until 2016 401,669 people obtained Portuguese citizenship, of which 92% were registered as residents of Portugal. Access to citizenship is an essential aspect of integration that affects the labour market integration of immigrants as well (Oliveira & Gomes, 2017, p. 203).

The countries of origin that have seen the most significant increase in immigration to Portugal from 2015 to 2016 are Brazil (+51%), Cape Verde (30%), Angola (+20) and Nepal (26.7%), with relevance in the numbers of immigrants from Ukraine, China and India. However, few of them arrived in Portugal for work reasons. The majority of Brazilians, Cape Verdeans, Angolans and people from San Tome and Principe arrived under education visas; while Chinese and Nepalese people arrived for family reunification. Most of the immigrants from the EU come as pensioners to Portugal (Oliveira & Gomes, 2017, p. 44).

There has been a decrease in the number of foreign residents returning to their home countries in the past few years after reaching its peak in 2011. In 2016 only 244 foreigners were registered in the program of Support for Voluntary Return and Reintegration, 66 of them who actually returned, which represented an 88.5% and 88.9% decrease from the 2011 figures respectively. This decrease reflects a trend which started in 2012, the 2016 values represent the lowest amount of voluntary returns since the creation of the program in
2006. Of the foreign residents who chose to return to their countries of origin (the majority males of working age and with at least high-school level education), 28.2% cited unemployment as the principal reason in 2016. Upon observation of the data, it is evident that a link exists between voluntary returnees and their economic situation. As expected, the 2016 number shows a decrease since 2015 when 31% of returnees cited unemployment as their key motivation, and an even greater decline when compared to the 51.3% of returnees who indicated unemployment as their motivation for return in 2010. Other leading reasons included difficulties of regularization of status (28.8% in 2016, 22.4% in 2015); economic difficulties (8% in 2016 and 13.9% in 2015) and to much lesser extent issues of integration and discrimination (Oliveira & Gomes, 2017, p. 50).

The education profile of foreign residents in Portugal is a relevant variable in defining the success of their integration into the labour market. According to the PISA education survey data, Portugal had the most significant improvement in secondary school performance in the area of science, mathematics and literature of foreign students between 2006 and 2015 when compared to other OECD countries. This improvement is much greater to that of the native students, showing that Portugals’ inclusive education policies have had a positive influence. However, the gap between the performance of foreign and native students in Portugal remains significant. Closing this gap will translate into foreign or naturalized residents who are best able to integrate into the Portuguese labour market, and equalize other social concerns such as the increased vulnerability of immigrants to fall into poverty.

Portugal has an overqualified immigrant labour force since the migrant waves of Eastern Europeans which began during the 1990s carrying into the 21st century. This is because the immigrants coming from Eastern Europe had higher-level qualifications than those of the historical immigrants from Africa and South America, but the labour market still absorbed them into the same kind of occupations as those of the previous migrant waves. This was the fastest way for the migrants to regularize their situation in Portugal which was the priority upon arrival (Oliviera & Fonseca, 2013).

Portugal’s initial goals were to attract low-skilled migrants to fill gaps in manual low-skilled work. As a result, there were no real schemes for the recognition of qualifications until 2007 and cases were only analyzed on a case by case basis. Since 2007, as a result of
the Decree-Law No. 341/2007 a procedure of automatic recognition of professional qualifications obtained at a reputed institution abroad which would be equivalent to the Bachelor, Masters and Doctoral degrees issued by Portuguese institutions. The goal was to ease the flow of university graduates into qualified positions. To participate in the automatic recognition, however, the foreign University or institution must already be approved by a committee or originate from a country signatory to the Bologna Process. This process is called the “registro de grau académico estrangeiro” by its name in Portuguese, translated as the registration of a foreign academic degree. In addition to this, there are two other forms to validate foreign diplomas: "equivalência" and “reconhecimento.” The “equivalência” or equivalence which is regulated by the Decree-Law nº283/83 and results in the comparison of the foreign degree against the Portuguese degree (bachelor, masters or doctoral) on the basis of length, content, and compared to the validity of the science which granted it. After being granted the equivalence, the individual may use the title of Bachelor, Master or Doctor in Portugal and perform at the same level as an individual with a Portuguese degree. The other process, "reconhecimento,” or recognition, does not grant the individual the full rights to their diploma title as if it was a Portuguese diploma. In this case, the comparison is made on the basis only of the level and scientific contribution. (Oliveira & Gomes, 2017)

Since 2008, there has been an uptake of the “reconhecimento” and the “registro de grau académico estrangeiro” and a decrease in the number of “equivalências.” This is partly due to the substitution effect, as people preferred the former procedures in lieu of the latter, in addition to the increased number of qualified foreign residents. The numbers of “reconhecimento” and “registro de grau académico estrangeiro” reached a peak in 2015 with 2047 foreign qualifications being validated and recognized (up from 169 in 2002). The majority of the degrees recognized in 2015 were Bachelor degrees (41.9%) followed by Doctoral degrees (32.2%) and lastly Master’s degrees (25.6%). Regarding the immigrants accessing this service, the majority come from other EU countries, the top 3 being Spain, UK and Italy. Ukrainians, Brazilians and Moldavians also figure within the top ten (Oliveira & Gomes, 2017, p. 107). However, for foreign residents accessing the equivalences, the majority in 2015 were validating their masters (70%) and the top
countries to access this system were in large part Brazilians, followed by a few Venezuelans, Angolans and Indians.

As mentioned previously, knowledge of the local language is another crucial element to the integration of immigrants into the labour market and also into general society. Portugal offers Portuguese language courses which can be voluntarily taken during the arrival and settlement period. It is worth noting however that the vast majority of immigrants to Portugal already speak Portuguese as a first language. Portugal has three primary programs for facilitating language learning: Portuguese as a Second Language, (PSL) which is taught in schools, Portuguese for All, and a Portuguese Online program. In the PSL program 4,129 students, mainly studying at the primary level were registered in 2015, marking a historic peak. It is recorded that a wide diversity of students have formed part of the programme, including students of Portuguese nationality (most likely born to foreign parents and thus not grown up speaking Portuguese at home). In the Portuguese for All programme, the number of students reached a peak in 2012 with 10,907 people studying, decreased to 6,185 in 2015 but rose again a little in 2016 with 6,493 students registered. However, despite the decrease in students enrolled, the 2014 year saw an increase in the number of students who went on to get their A2 or B2 certification (Oliveira & Gomes, 2017, p. 113).

3.6.1 Foreigners in the workplace

In recent years there has been growth in the areas of residency application for the reasons of entrepreneurship (6% growth from 2015 to 2016), research or highly qualified activity (334 applications in 2011 vs 2816 in 2016), and investment (20.5% growth between 2011 and 2015); there was a decrease of 14% in the area of residency for subordinated employment (Oliveira & Gomes, 2017, p. 37). The area which has seen the most significant increase is immigrants for reason of education, internship or volunteering.

Following a historical pattern, immigrant workers in Portugal are overrepresented in low skilled positions. In 2015 51% of foreigners worked in the lower professional categories in comparison to 40% of native workers. This gap has been closing over the past few years but continues to be pervasive even as the profile of immigrants changes. 2015 registered a 22% growth of migrants entering the Portuguese labour market with foreign qualifications equivalent to post-secondary diplomas and 25% growth in higher-education equivalencies
when compared to 2005. Notably, between 2005 and 2015 there has been a reduction of 77% of migrants entering the labour market with primary education level or less. There is also a discrepancy in incomes, foreign workers earn 5% less than native counterparts, but this is also a trend that has been continually decreasing (it was registered as 8% in 2014). Third country nationals (non-EU migrants) face higher levels of unemployment when compared to the native population (18.8% in comparison to 11.1% in 2016) (Oliveira & Gomes, 2017).

Immigrants in Portugal proved resilience during the economic downturn. During this time, immigrants created more jobs through their own businesses in comparison to the jobs created by the native Portuguese population. According to data collected by the Observatory for Migration, Portugal follows the aforementioned trend where foreigners are overrepresented in the lower categories. 51.3% of foreign workers in 2015 were employed in the three lowest categories as defined by the OM categories 7, 8 and 9 (9 being the lowest, had 32.3% of foreign workers) whereas only 38.8% of native workers could be found in these three categories. Immigrants are also overrepresented in the category of sales, protection and personal services, which employs 24.2% of migrants and 21.3% of natives. Along the same lines, the proportion of migrants employed in the higher, professional categories is small and underrepresented in comparison to natives. 2.1% of migrants work in director positions while 4.9% work as scientists or professional specialists, this is in contrast to 4.1% and 10.9% of natives respectively. According to the data of the OM, the economic crisis saw a decrease in the number of workers in the areas hardest hit by the recession (construction, services and sales) but since 2014 there has been an increase in the number of workers in the low-skilled, agricultural, sales and administrative categories. This represents once again an upturn in the economy and a recovery regarding both migrants works finding employment but also migrant worker arrivals into Portugal (Oliveira & Gomes, 2017, pp. 123-125).

In alignment with the over-representation of foreign employees in the lowest categories, the EU-LFS 2014 ad-hoc module on Migration and the labour market illustrates the percentage of immigrants who self-declare to be overqualified for their job, and thus underemployed. The gap is highest at the tertiary education level, where it reaches 7.2%. It is followed by
those with upper secondary or vocation education, with a difference of 6.3%. Acknowledging the fact that there is a low presence of foreign employees, and that 70.6% of foreign, skilled workers consider themselves underemployed indicates that there is still room for improvement in the uptake of foreign qualification recognition as well as perhaps other related areas such as discrimination.

![Over-qualified employees](image)

**Figure 1. Source: EU-LFS 2014Ad hoc Module. Depiction by the author**

4. **Methodology**

In order to answer the research question, the results of the MIPEX 2015 data are compared to the employment rate, unemployment rate and activity rate of immigrants in Portugal. The labour market indicators (employment, unemployment and activity rates) are obtained from the EU- Labour Force Survey 2017. To form a complete understanding of the situation of immigrants in Portugal, and to test the validity of the correlation the MIPEX vs indicators results, Spain, Greece, Italy and Ireland are used for reference and comparison. As South European countries, there are many similarities in the migration profile and history of immigrants to Spain, Italy, Greece and Portugal. The three countries have been used in previous MIPEX analyses to compare against Portugal because of their similarities, such as by Correia Lopes (2014). Ireland, although it is not part of southern Europe exhibits similar characteristics to Portugal in that they were both countries of emigration traditionally and they experienced a sudden surge in immigration in the mid-1990s to mid-2000s (Healy, 2007). All the nations listed also felt the effects of the economic downturn of 2009 stronger
than in other parts of Europe. Lastly, the countries chosen are all considered to be “new immigration countries” although they have chosen different policy structures to deal with this new immigration. For reference, some of the general analysis also includes the average labour market outcomes of the EU28 according to the Eurostat Labour Force Survey (LFS).

Three types of analyses are conducted for the purpose of this research. First, the employment, unemployment and activity rates of the five countries against each of their MIPEX 2015 Labour Market Mobility score. The second compares the gap between the employment, unemployment and activity rates of foreign-born and native-born residents in Portugal. This gap calculated by subtracting the rates of the native-born residents from that of the foreign-born is then compared to the MIPEX 2015 score.

In the analysis, the results from the most recent MIPEX and labour market indicators are also compared against those of older MIPEX surveys and LFS data. This way the author expects to be able to observe if there are any trends in immigrant integration. The data used originates from the EU-LFS surveys from 2007-2017, the MIPEX surveys of 2007, 2011 and 2015 and the Observing Migration reports of 2015, 2016 and 2017 from Portugal.

Additionally, a survey was conducted by the author in order to evaluate the satisfaction of immigrants to Portugal with regards to the labour integration programs conducted by the government. The survey was written by the author using Google Forms and disseminated using social media forums of immigrants in Portugal (Facebook, Reddit). It was disseminated in English and Portuguese from March 30th until April 25th, 2018. The exact questions asked and the format can be found in Annex 1. The responses from the different sources were compiled and analyzed by the author. The results are used to illustrate how the labour integration programs are perceived by the immigrants they aim to help.

Calculations are done using the “foreign-born” and the “native-born” categories of the EU-LFS survey, as well as the category of foreigners born in non-EU28 countries. The categories are analyzed separately, and it is specified when each one is used.

4.1 Limitations of the data
Defining who an immigrant is is an important distinction with regards to measuring immigrant integration. Eurostat, the OECD, and other research recommends that
immigrants be classified by country of birth rather than by citizenship as the latter may change during a person’s lifetime, and does not necessarily reflect the act of migrating (such as someone born and raised in a country where they do not hold citizenship, or someone who has never resided in a country holding citizenship by virtue of family tree). Due to a history of colonization and decolonization, and the structure of national institutions it is complicated to make the distinction between citizenship and place of birth when it comes to Portuguese data. The Observatory for Migration (OM) of Portugal considers immigrants based on citizenship. The OM acknowledges that this measure does not provide the most accurate account of integration given the significant rates of nationalization found among immigrants to Portugal (Oliveira & Gomes, 2017). Eurostat considers immigration based on place of birth. For the purpose of international comparison between the countries chosen, the EU-LFS data used is based on country of birth. However, some of the OM data, based on citizenship, is still used in descriptive areas referring to Portugal only. Despite the problems of comparability which result from the data of the OM, the OM is an essential resource as it includes data from administrative sources as well as statistical data. This allows for a greater scope of measurement and likely more participants. In this context, the OM data is used for describing Portugal’s situation.

Migrant integration is measured comparing the results of the selection of immigrant population against those of the native population. This method is used for the comparisons of the employment, unemployment and activity rates. While the countries examined exhibit similar labour migration profiles, there are social and economic factors which differ and which could significantly affect the labour market outcomes of immigrants besides the integration policy. The outcomes could reflect general economic hardship in the countries surveyed, as well as different standards of employment, and various institutional structures such as the Varieties of Capitalism theories. In order to minimize this bias, the differences between the outcomes of natives and foreigners have been analyzed in addition to the raw outcome data. Using the assumption that factors of economic structure affect the local population at a similar rate than those of the foreign population and therefore these factors are smoothed out by calculating the difference between the two. While this helps to minimize the effect of exogenous factors such as the general economic outlook, which could apply evenly to both migrants and natives, it does not allow to establish clear links of
causality between the policy and the level of migrant integration applicable to all countries as there is no control of other exogenous factors such as those related to the migrants themselves. Elements which may vary include the profile of the immigrants arriving (level of education, mother tongue, qualifications), the reason for arrival and the cultural distance between the home country and the host country, all of these elements affect the successful integration of migrants regardless of the public policies implemented in the host country (Oliveira C. R., 2012).

There are many limitations to the conclusions which can be reached from the survey. First of all, the survey received an insufficient number of responses (32) therefore it cannot be used to describe the total population of immigrants in Portugal. Additionally, the demographics of those who responded to the survey does not correspond with the demographics of immigrants to Portugal since the majority of respondents were from the UK. The survey is used solely for illustration.

5. Results and discussion

5.1 Indicators of Labour Market Integration

As mentioned previously, the EU considers Activity, Employment and Unemployment rates as the main indicators of Labour Market Integration as per the Zaragoza 2010 declaration. This section explores the rates of each of these indicators for Portugal and compares them with the indicators of the EU-28, Spain, Italy, Greece and Ireland to help illustrate its positioning. Additionally, the scores of the last MIPEX survey Labour Market Mobility score is broken down into the different elements and examined as well as the MIPEX overall score.

Following the exposition of the current situation, this section further explores the relationship between the MIPEX 2015 scores on the Labour Market Survey and the labour market outcomes and between the Overall score and the labour market outcomes of Portugal and the comparison countries.

5.1.1 Activity rates

According to EU-LFS 2017 data, the activity rates of immigrants at the EU level has been higher than those of the native-born residents for most of the past decade, however, in 2017
this is no longer the case. At the EU level, locals have an overall activity rate of 73.4% while the general foreign-born have an activity rate of 73.0%. When split into the different migrant categories, Third Country Nationals have a rate of 70.1%, and immigrants from another EU country have the highest overall activity rate at 78.9%. This spread of immigrants having lower activity rates than those of native-born can only be observed since 2016, for this reason, it may be speculated that the massive influx of immigrants into Europe in 2015 may be influencing this shift.

In Portugal, the activity rate of both EU immigrants and Third Country National of 87.8% and 80.6% respectively, is the highest of the comparison countries followed by Spain (79.6%, 77.2%), Ireland (78.1%, 69%) and Greece (73%, 75.8%). Portugal also holds the most significant gap between the natives and the locals, where locals have an activity rate 8.7 percentage points higher than the native-born population, followed by Greece with 7.7 percentage point difference, Italy, 5.2 and Spain. Figure 2 below illustrates the gap in the activity rate of foreign-born (both EU and TCN) and native-born in the countries listed. Figure 3 compares the gap in the activity rates between those immigrants not born in the EU and the native population of each country.

Figure 2 Source: EU-LFS 2017 – Graph: Author’s own.
The graphs illustrate the most striking differences which become apparent when separating the population born in third countries from the EU immigrants. Most noticeable is the case of Ireland, where foreigners enjoy high activity rates if considered as a comprehensive group, but third country nationals are the least active population, having an employment rate several percentage points below that of native-born people. Portugal’s activity rate of third-country nationals follows mostly the same pattern as that of the whole foreign population, but with a more substantial dip after 2012 and a slower recovery. As a whole, in the EU those born in third countries have lower activity rates than EU-born residents since 2011.

5.1.2 Employment rate
The employment rate of foreign-born immigrants to Portugal is considerably higher than that of the local population. In 2017, 74% of immigrants in Portugal were employed, compared to 67.2% of natives. Dividing the foreign-born population into those of EU countries and Third Country Nationals yields that nationals of EU28 countries have even higher employment rates at 80.3% while TCNs have an employment rate of 72%. The employment rate of EU nationals has been steadily rising since 2007, and it is currently at its highest, with the lowest point has been in 2013 at 67.2%. 2013 was also the year with the lowest employment rate for TCNs with a rate of 61.1%. However, both numbers were higher than that of nationals in 2013, with only 60.4% employment rate. Portugal’s higher
employment rate for foreigners is in contrast with the EU average. In the EU natives have higher employment rates than foreigners by 3.5% (compared to the 7.1 point difference in Portugal. Additionally, Portugal has the highest employment rate gap between the countries chosen for comparison (Ireland, Spain, Greece and Italy). In fact, in the case of Spain and Greece, natives have higher employment rates than foreigners (1.8 and 0.8% respectively). This shows that in Portugal the amount of employed foreigners is higher than that of all the other countries used for comparison. Figure 3 illustrates a time series development of the employment rate gap between foreign-born and native-born individuals in each of the countries listed.

![Employment rate gap](image)

**Figure 3 Source:** EU LFS-2017 Survey. – **Graph:** Author’s own.

Examining the gap between native-born and immigrants not born in the EU demonstrates a different picture. The situation mirrors the case of all the foreign-born, although to a smaller degree, in Portugal, Italy and Greece, whereas in Ireland and Spain show some significant differences. In this case, the employment rate gap is only positive in Portugal and Italy, meaning that only these 2 countries have been able to integrate Third Country Nationals into the labour market with more positive results than the native-born population consistently over the past decade. However, in the case of Italy, there has been a steady decrease, representing that the employment rate of TCNs has been approaching that of the native population. Portugal, on the other hand, has shown improvement since 2013 but more drastically since 2015, with the employment rate of TCNs improving more rapidly than that of the native-born population. Further examination of the data demonstrates that
this is not due to a decrease of employment amongst the native-born but a real improvement in the case of Third-Country-Nationals. Figure 4 illustrates this case.

![Employment rate gap (TCNs)](source)

**Figure 4**
Source: EU LFS-2017 Survey. – Graph: Author’s own.

### 5.1.3 Unemployment rate

The unemployment rate in Portugal is the lowest it has been in the past decade. In 2017, Portugal’s unemployment rate of immigrants born in the EU Member States was 8.5%, compared to 10% in 2010 and 17.1% in 2013, while they were 10.7%, in 2017, 14% in 2010 and 23.3% in 2013 for Third Country Nationals. Of the countries used for comparison, Ireland has consistently had the lowest unemployment numbers of both national and foreigners for the last decade, also exhibiting a recovery since 2013. On the other hand, Greece has consistently had the highest unemployment rate. For comparison, Spain is the most interesting country as the situation of Portugal and Spain are closely linked, they share the most similar history and immigration patterns. Unlike Portugal, Spain has high unemployment rates in 2017: 19.5% of EU immigrants, 25% for TCNs. Still, like in the other countries, these numbers represent an improvement from the rates over the last decade.

While Ireland had the lowest unemployment rate of foreigners in 2017, with only 8.2%, Portugal had the smallest unemployment rate gap between foreigners and natives with only 0.9 percentage points difference while Ireland’s was 1.7, meaning that the unemployment
rate of foreigners was only slightly higher than that of natives. This low gap is very recent, as it held near 2 percent for the last three years, and was at a high of 5.3% in 2013. Spain has the second highest gap between foreigners and nationals, with 7.3 percentage point difference and until 2013 Spain had the highest gap, higher even than Greece’s. This shows that in Spain the issue is not only related to unfavourable economic conditions but that immigrants to Spain are unevenly disadvantaged in the labour market.

The results of the unemployment gap over time are not so different when examining those born in third countries separately from those born in the EU, as shown in Figure 6. The gap of unemployment rate remains positive in all cases (except Greece in 2008) meaning that third country nationals are unemployed in a more substantial proportion to those born in the reporting country. The most relevant difference is that the gap is more significant in all cases, showing that third-country nationals have higher unemployment rates than EU-immigrants. Portugal showed a minimal decrease in the gap between 2014 and 2016; since 2016, however, there has been a rapid decline, where the unemployment rate of TCNs approaches that of natives (only 1.6 percentage points). Ireland still has the lowest gap out of the comparison countries however whereas in the previous graph it was shown as decreasing since 2009, in this case, we can see that the unemployment rate of immigrants from non-EU has been steadily on the rise since 2011 with a decrease in 2016-2017.
5.2 MIPEX scores
As mentioned, Portugal has the second highest overall MIPEX score. Additionally, it has the second highest labour market mobility score. Portugal has held these rankings since the first MIPEX survey in 2007. The latest MIPEX survey was conducted in 2014; it granted Portugal an overall score of 75 points. The closest country in the rankings from the comparison countries is Spain. Ranked 11 with a total score of 60 points, followed by Italy ranked 13 with an overall score of 59 points, next is Ireland at 19 with a score of 59 points, and lastly, Greece, ranked 27 with a score of 44 points. Regarding Labour Market Mobility, Portugal also has the highest score of the comparison countries with 91 points. The rest of the countries follow in almost the same pattern as the overall score: Spain with a score of 72, Italy 66, but Greece and Ireland change place, Greece has a higher score with 55 points, and Ireland is last at 38 points. The rankings and scores have not changed significantly since the first 2007 survey and the 2010 survey indicating that there has been little change in the policies of the five countries. It is important to note that the MIPEX 2015 only measures the PII 2010-2013 and not the Strategic Plan for Migration 2015-2020, as it was not yet published when the survey took place.

The breakdown of the Labour Market Mobility score is as laid out in Figure 8. Portugal’s strengths are found in the Access and the Workers’ Rights categories where it obtains the
top score of 100. All of the comparison countries obtain high rankings in the Workers’ Rights category. The weakest category of all the comparison countries is Targeted Support, Greece has no targeted support institutions provided for immigrants. Portugal however, has a strong score in this category, with 80 points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LABOUR MARKET MOBILITY</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS TO GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARGETED SUPPORT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKERS’ RIGHTS</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. MIPEX Scores
Source: (Huddleston & al., 2015)

In order to illustrate the relationship of the Labour Mobility scores and the different indicators for each country, the points are plotted in a position map.

5.3 Indicators of Integration vs MIPEX Labour Market Mobility score

5.3.1 Employment rate vs Labour Market Mobility score
In Figure 7, there does not appear to be a relationship between the MIPEX Labour Market Mobility score and the gap between the employment rates of the foreign-born when compared to that of the native-born residents if the whole picture including the comparison countries is examined. However, Portugal receives a high MIPEX score and also has the most substantial employment gap, showing that more foreign-born residents than native-born residents, along with Italy and Greece it appears to follow a pattern. However, Ireland and Spain stand out. With a score of 72, Spain receives a relatively high MIPEX score, but foreigners have a lower employment rate than natives. Ireland has the lowest MIPEX score. However, foreigners in Ireland have a slightly better employment rate when compared to the native population.
Breaking the “foreign” classification down and separating immigrants born in non-EU countries from the yields very different results than when considering all foreigners as a whole as shown in Figure 8 below. In this case, the link between the low Labour Market Mobility score and the employment rate gap of third-country nationals becomes clear for Ireland, which now occupies the lowest position in both cases; meaning that its high standing in the previous graph is due to the high employment rate of immigrants born in EU-countries. On the opposite end, Portugal maintains the high rating and the considerable distance between those born in a third country and those born in Portugal. Spain, in this case, is presented as the outlier since it has the second lowest employment gap but retains the second highest MIPEX score.
Figure 9 illustrates the gap between the unemployment rate of all the foreign-born and the native born and positions each country on the map using the MIPEX Labour Mobility score. In all cases, despite the MIPEX Labour Mobility score, it remains that a higher proportion of foreigners are unemployed compared to native-born people. Portugal’s top MIPEX score and low unemployment gap suggest that migrants are well integrated and subject to almost the same conditions as the native-born. Ireland’s score, with a small gap between the foreigners and the locals but also the lowest MIPEX, shows that despite the lack of structured policy to integrate immigrants they are still subject to the same market conditions as the native population.

Figure 9 separates the cases of those born in a third country from immigrants born in the EU. Unlike in the case of employment, there are no drastic positional shifts, in fact, all of the countries’ positions remain the same, except for some small shifts upwards, signifying that the unemployment situation of non-EU immigrants is slightly more severe than that of EU immigrants compared to the native-born population. Ireland maintains its position of lowest MIPEX, but second, lowest unemployment and Portugal maintains its top position in both cases.
Figure 8. EU LFS-2017 Survey. – Graph: Author’s own calculations
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Figure 9 EU LFS-2017 Survey. – Graph: Author’s own calculations
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5.3.3 Activity rate vs. Labour Market Mobility score

The gap of the activity rate between immigrants and native-born shows no correlation with the MIPEX Labour Mobility score as illustrated in Figure 10 below. The gap between the activity rates is positive in all cases since more foreign-born are active in the labour market than native-born. Portugal has the most significant gap as well as the highest mobility score. Ireland matches as well since it has the smallest gap between the activity rate of immigrants and natives, but it also has the lowest MIPEX score. Spain and Italy both sit in the middle, with a gap that approaches 5 percentage points, and MIPEX Labour Mobility scores that lie in the midline of the countries used for comparison at near 70 points. Greece is the outlier this time, as it has the second highest gap, where more immigrants are active in the labour market than natives but it has a lower score than Italy and Spain.

Figure 10. Source: EU LFS-2017 Survey. – Graph: Author’s own calculations
As it was the case with the unemployment gap, separating the third country nationals from the EU immigrants makes little difference when it comes to the activity gap compared to the MIPEX score. In all cases, the countries have moved down a few percentage points, but except for Portugal, they retain their proportional standings compared to each other. For the first time out of all the analysis, Portugal has a gap that is less favourable to immigrants than to other comparison countries. Greece takes the spot where immigrants born in third countries are the most active in comparison to the native population, despite having the second lowest mobility score. The other country which shifted significantly, though not in ranking, is Ireland. Ireland is the only country of those for comparison which shows that immigrants born in third countries are less active in the labour market than the native population, once again showing that in Ireland, EU immigrants hold a much more favourable position.

Figure 11 Source: EU LFS-2017 Survey. – Graph: Author’s own calculations
5.4 Integration indicators vs Overall MIPEX scores.
As it has been established previously besides the Labour Mobility other areas of policy may also affect the labour market integration of immigrants. For this reason, the same process of analysis has been conducted with the overall MIPEX score and the three gaps between natives and foreign-born. Because the difference between the employment rate of immigrants born in a third country and the overall foreign-born population exhibits the most significant difference, the two graphs are included when analyzing this indicator. In the other cases, only the graph involving the third country nationals is analyzed as this is thought to give the most accurate representation of the outcome of the policies.

5.4.1 Employment gap vs MIPEX overall score

![Graph: Employment gap vs MIPEX overall score](image)

Figure 11 Source: EU LFS-2017 Survey. – Graph: Author’s own calculations

In the case of the overall score and the employment rate gap of all the foreign-born and the native-born, the positions remain very similar to those present when only the Labour Mobility scores are taken into account, as pictured in Figure 11 above. Portugal retains its place at the top, with the highest score as well as the most significant gap between the activity rate of immigrants compared to natives, favouring the immigrants. Besides Spain, all the countries follow a straight line pattern.
When broken down into the third country nationals Ireland no longer sits along the same line as the rest. It holds the lowest position (the most substantial gap between those born in a third country and native-born, favouring the native-born) despite the fact that it does not hold the lowest Overall MIPEX score. All other countries retain their positions although the gap favours the native-born more than in the previous case.

5.4.2 Unemployment gap vs MIPEX Overall score 2015
Unemployment does not seem to hold any correlation with the overall MIPEX score. Figure 13 resembles closely Figure 9 which only considered Labour Market Mobility score. The only country which has shifted is once again Ireland but only because the overall MIPEX score of Ireland is much higher than that of the other countries. Portugal like in all the previous cases holds true that the high MIPEX score also grants it the most favourable situation for immigrants. While Italy and Spain share a close MIPEX overall score, they also have widely different gaps, with Spain’s being the most disfavourable to immigrants.
As in the case of the unemployment gap, the activity rate gap of third country nationals compared against the MIPEX overall score yields almost the same results as in the case of the Labour Market Mobility, except that Ireland has better overall scores than Greece but still has the lowest gap, favouring the native-born over the foreign-born.
5.5 Satisfaction Survey

A brief survey was conducted for the purpose of this thesis to illustrate first-hand the uptake of the labour integration services provided by the Portuguese government as well as the level of satisfaction with the services offered. The survey was disseminated via social media and other websites which are accessible to immigrants to Portugal. It was distributed in English and in the Portuguese language, but the English language questionnaire received the majority of responses. Between March 30th and April 25th a total of 32 responses were collected from immigrants to Portugal from a total of 10 countries. Due to limitations in the way of dissemination and the low number of responses the results cannot be considered representative of the whole immigrant population to Portugal. However, the results are still helpful in illustrating the current satisfaction levels with the labour market integration of immigrants to Portugal from a first-hand and more personal perspective.

Concerning the demographics of the respondents, 41% of respondents were born in the UK, some of the other places of birth reported include, Lithuania, Belarus, Poland, India and Turkey; which is not representative of the real population proportions of immigrants in the Portuguese labour market. 53% of respondents reported being either employed full or part-time, and 25% reported as being entrepreneurs or freelance workers. Out of those who reported being employed, 32% consider themselves underemployed because of their education level salary.

![Employment status](image)

Figure 14. Source: (Garcia, 2018)
61% of respondents consider themselves to have a basic level of Portuguese but only 19% report having taken government-sponsored language courses. Those who reported having received the language courses indicate their satisfaction with the experience at an average score of 3 out of 5 points, where 5 means excellent. This is the case in both the Industry specific and the general language courses. A possible explanation for their lack of Portuguese language skills despite the fact that the majority are currently employed is that the majority of respondents are English speakers. In fact, 75% of respondents indicated that they either use English in their current job or are looking for jobs that require English knowledge. Some survey participants noted that they are learning Portuguese for basic integration rather than for job seeking. Uptake of the language courses was more common among those who are currently unemployed or underemployed than for those employed.
Among the respondents of this survey, language courses were the integration initiative most commonly taken, followed by recognition of their diplomas, employment counselling and services for entrepreneurs. The level of satisfaction with these services was overall very low amongst the respondents of the survey. In ratings from 1 to 5, where 5 means excellent language courses received an average rating of 3, employment training received 2.75, employment counselling received the lowest rating of 1.75, and finally, recognition of foreign qualities received a rating of 2. The average rating of these responses can be found illustrated in Figure 18 below. In the comments, respondents cited that bureaucracy was the main frustration in attempting to access the services. This was especially relevant to immigrants who have made use of the services to encourage entrepreneurship. Despite the friendly website setups with English language option and online chat-help, some respondents also complained of a lack of response from the online option. They reported the need to make contact with officials and caseworkers via the telephone, at which point the language barrier becomes an issue since they expressed that often the level of English of the person responding their calls is weak and the callers themselves lack significant knowledge of Portuguese. One respondent mentioned the need for advanced Portuguese in order to access the services which suggest a lack of awareness of the procedures of the services.
In order to reach conclusions which can be extended and applied to the whole of the population, a more extensive survey would need to be completed which includes a more diverse group of respondents with representations from more of the significant labour migrants to Portugal such as those from Cape Verde and Brazil.

5.6. Discussion

Immigrants in Portugal fare well in the Portuguese labour market. They have higher employment rates and activity rates and lower unemployment rates than the native-born Portuguese. An explanation for these favourable outcomes is that immigrants to Portugal, and indeed to the other recent immigration countries, are motivated to migrate by economic reasons. Immigrants arrive with the intention of finding work and in many cases must obtain jobs to keep their legal status in the country. As noted earlier, these migrant populations often fall into the most precarious, risky and low-skilled positions (Oliveira & Pires, 2010). As noted in the data, though immigrants to Portugal have favourable employment rates, they are more overqualified in their positions than the native population, so they may still experience barriers to access the jobs that they would have expected to have in their home countries.

The unemployment and the employment rates of immigrants in Portugal have also been improving since 2013. This could be due to the improvement of economic conditions in the country. However, the widening gap between the native-born and the foreign-born also
suggests additional reasons. As proposed by Kahanec & Guzi (2017) in their research, and backed by the negative net migration since 2011, immigrants who found themselves unemployed migrated again to a different country which could offer better opportunities. Immigrants from EU-countries, who fare consistently better in all the statistics have the highest international mobility to be able to do this, but so do third-country nationals to a lesser extent. Therefore this increased flexibility helps to adjust the rates and leaves only the most motivated to find employment.

MIPEX Labour Market Mobility measures the access which immigrants have to the labour market of their host country, as well as the rights protecting them and the support they receive. They do not directly allocate immigrants to jobs, but instead indirectly facilitate this (Bilgili, Huddleston, & Joki, 2015). Portugal, with the highest Labour Market Mobility score as well as the highest Overall MIPEX score, has consistently obtained the most favourable outcomes towards immigrants. This holds true whether the whole foreign-born population is observed or only those not born in the EU28. These results evidence the strength of the Portuguese integration institutions. The ACM, through the Strategy for Migration 2015-2020 has been successfully targeting immigrants. Even if the immigrants arrive highly motivated to work, the barriers in the host society and labour market may keep them from accessing the services. However, Portugal’s high MIPEX ranking indicates that it has reduced the barriers to the labour market, education, health, citizenship and political participation of immigrants at the policy and program level. The favourable labour market indicator results show the success translates to the practical level.

According to the analysis conducted, the employment rate is the only outcome that can be closely linked to the MIPEX Overall and Labour Mobility scores. The employment gap also is the most sensitive to the inclusion of immigrants born in the EU28 vs those born in third countries. According to Bisin et al. (2011), higher Labour Mobility score translates into less employment penalty for non-EU immigrants. This could be because, in Europe, EU immigrants already benefit from most of the elements measured by MIPEX’s Labour Mobility, and thus no additional policy is required at the individual country level. This is evidenced by Ireland’s immigrant’s employment rate gap. In Figure 7 Ireland holds almost the same employment rate gap as Italy, despite the more than 20 Labour Mobility point
difference. However, when the EU-born immigrants are taken out, Ireland moves to the lowest position, matching its MIPEX score, which is a 6.5 percentage point drop, passing from one which favoured immigrants to one which favours native-born. Portugal’s non-EU immigrants do have a smaller gap but the point difference is only 2.3, and it still holds the ranking. This shows that in Ireland, EU-born immigrants greatly benefit from the structural mobility elements brought about by the EU, but the non-EU-born migrants suffer from the lack of additional structure. Considering the Overall MIPEX score yields less concrete results to the isolated Labour Mobility; Ireland does not have the lowest Overall score but it still the lowest gap. This further emphasizes the conclusion reached by Bisin et al. since the Labour Mobility score seems to be the most influential.

When it comes to the unemployment rate, Ireland has the second lowest unemployment rate, after Portugal in both the Overall and the Labour Market Mobility analyses, remaining positionally unchanged whether it is the foreign-born or the non-EU born. This shows that the policies examined by MIPEX do not assert a definite influence on the unemployment rates. This is especially true for the Labour Mobility, which appears to show no relationship for any of the comparison countries except Portugal. However, in the rest of the comparison countries, a pattern appears when examining the unemployment gap vs the Overall MIPEX score, showing that some of the other factors (i.e. access to nationality) may exert a stronger influence on the immigrant’s unemployment rates.

The analysis of the Activity rate gap presents Greece as the outlier, with the highest rate despite the lowest score. However, this can be interpreted as a negative element to integration since it also holds the highest gap in the unemployment rate (most disfavourable to immigrants). This pattern can be linked to Greece’s economic conditions which are the worst of the countries compared as well as to the recent surge in immigration. Greece’s unemployment rate gap had been decreasing since 2012 but then has increased again since 2016, consistent with the massive influx of migrants in 2015. Therefore, holding this assumption to consider Greece as an outlier due to the described exogenous factors, the activity rate gap also demonstrates a relationship with the MIPEX score, when separating the non-EU born residents (to account for Ireland).
There are other factors not examined in the analysis between the MIPEX and the outcomes, such as the immigrants’ reasons for migrating, the country of birth, the educational level, gender distribution, and others; which, as demonstrated by Greece may also affect the rates. Closer analysis of each of the comparison countries would be needed to account for this.

The survey conducted for this thesis suggests that despite the having the most robust integration institutions and labour market outcomes for immigrants there is still work to be done. The survey respondents indicated they are not entirely satisfied with the institutions set up to help them to integrate into the labour market. Their obstacles lay in the amount of bureaucracy they felt was required to obtain access to the services. They also felt that they needed more services in English or better Portuguese language skills in order to be able to benefit from the services fully. However, as established, the demographics of the respondents does not correspond with the actual demographic of immigrants to Portugal, and therefore no conclusion can be reached from this.

6. Conclusion
This work started with the question:

*Does Portugal’s high MIPEX 2015 rating correlate with immigrants’ labour market outcomes?*

A moderate correlation was expected given the results of previous research which concludes that there are weak links between the Labour Market Mobility score and the Overall scores given in the MIPEX since the policies are often not well-targeted or sufficiently applied.

The results obtained from the plotting of the indicators of labour market integration by the Zaragoza 2010 convention: employment, unemployment and activity rate against the MIPEX 2015 Labour Market Mobility and Overall scores show that in the case of Portugal a strong relationship exists. Portugal consistently obtained the most favourable outcomes for immigrants, even when immigrants born in third-countries were considered separately.

The comparison of the same outcomes and scores for Italy, Greece, Spain and Ireland further reinforce this relationship. Ireland’s results were comparable to Portugal’s until immigrants not born in the EU were separated from EU immigrants, showing that the lack
of institutional arrangements for these immigrants heavily penalized them. Meanwhile, Portugal’s strong institutions of integration resulted in very similar results in both cases.

In recent years Portugal has had a return to the historical patterns of negative net migration. As a consequence, the ACM has added to its responsibilities aiding native-born and immigrant residents who wish to emigrate from Portugal. To date, this has not negatively affected the integration of immigrants into the labour market. In fact, immigrants labour market outcomes in Portugal have been increasing since 2013. The 2015-2020 Strategic Plan for Migration maintained many of the same labour market objectives as the previous Plan for Immigrant Integration 2010-2013 while adding support in areas the 2010 plan had not addressed. Still, some of the improvement of outcomes since 2013 could be attributed to increased economic growth and the post-crisis recovery. As observed by other researchers, by coupling emigration with immigrant integration Portugal could run the risk of weakening its commitment towards integration and the quality of the policies. Therefore, close, continued, the analysis must be conducted in this period to determine if the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan for Migration leaves some immigrants underserved.

Future research should carefully examine the effects of the policy changes. Additionally, as demonstrated by the MIPEX analysis conducted in this thesis, detailed research should be conducted to determine the reasons why Spain and Greece stand as outliers. If Spain’s situation and history are so close to Portugal’s and its policies are also highly ranked by MIPEX why does it underperform in the areas of employment and unemployment rates?

There are measures of labour integration which have not been explored in this thesis such as comparing the obstacles to labour market access of immigrants. This category formed part of the EU-LFS 2014 Ad-hoc module, but Portugal did not have any significant answers. Therefore, another recommendation is to continue to improve data collection on immigrant integration to be able to conduct analyses which lead to deeper understanding of the patterns.

Portugal is an example for other recent immigration countries to follow. The country used the waves of increased migration to create integration policy that has yielded excellent results. Its strong institutional basis of laws, policies and programs has had a very positive
effect on the labour market outcomes of immigrants, which help the country grow economically and also replace its declining population. Portugal’s institutional set-up is also flexible, adjusting to the needs of the labour market and migrants which the author believes grants it strength.

As the population of the majority of European countries continues to decline, and migrants continue to request entry into Europe. European governments should look at Portugal’s example to maximize the contributions of immigrants and strengthen their economies and societies.
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Annex

1. Survey

Integration into Portugal's labour market

It will only take you less than 5 minutes
The survey is meant for people who have a job or have had a job in Portugal before
Your responses will remain anonymous and used only for the context of my Master's Thesis.

1. Country of birth

2. Gender

Mark only one oval.

☐ Female
☐ Male
☐ Prefer not to say
☐ Other: ________________________________

3. How long have you lived in Portugal

Mark only one oval.

☐ less than 5 years
☐ 5-10 years
☐ 10-15 years
☐ 20 years or more

4. Do you have Portuguese citizenship?

Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ In process
☐ N/A
☐ Other: ________________________________
5. What level of Portuguese do you speak?
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - Fluent
   - Proficient
   - Conversational
   - Basic
   - None at all
   - Other: ________________________________

6. Do you speak any other languages which you use at work? If yes, which ones?
   ________________________________________________________________

7. Are you currently employed or have you been employed in Portugal before?
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - Yes, full-time
   - Yes, part-time
   - I am an entrepreneur/freelance
   - No, I am looking for a job
   - No and not looking

8. How would you rate the ease of finding a job in Portugal
   *Mark only one oval.*
   1  2  3  4  5
   Almost impossible  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Very Easy

9. Does your current job match your qualifications?
   *Mark only one oval.*
   - Yes
   - No, I am underemployed
   - Other: ________________________________
10. Have you used any of the following government services in order to help you find your job? (Check all that apply)

Tick all that apply.

☐ General language courses
☐ Industry-specific language courses
☐ Employment training or retraining
☐ Employment counseling
☐ Recognition of foreign qualifications
☐ Work provided through a government agency program
☐ Government-sponsored position in a private-sector job
☐ Financial support for entrepreneurs
☐ Training for entrepreneurs
☐ Other: ________________________________

How helpful was your experience with the services listed above?

Please answer only those that apply, leave empty those that do not apply.

11. General language courses
   Mark only one oval.

   1  2  3  4  5

   Unsatisfactory  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Excellent

12. Industry-specific language courses
   Mark only one oval.

   1  2  3  4  5

   Unsatisfactory  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Excellent

13. Employment training or retraining
   Mark only one oval.

   1  2  3  4  5

   Unsatisfactory  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Excellent

14. Employment counseling
   Mark only one oval.

   1  2  3  4  5

   Unsatisfactory  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ Excellent
15. Recognition of foreign qualifications
   *Mark only one oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Work provided through a government agency program
   *Mark only one oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Government-sponsored position in a private-sector job
   *Mark only one oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Financial support for entrepreneurs
   *Mark only one oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Training for entrepreneurs
   *Mark only one oval.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thank you very much for your contribution!**
2. Additional Figures not deemed essential

Unemployment Gap vs MIPEX

Activity rate gap vs MIPEX
Employment rate and Mobility

Activity rate vs Labour Mobility

Unemployment rate
### 3. Data tables

#### 3.1 Activity rates

**Activity rate Non-EU born**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activity rate all foreign-born**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activity rate Native-born**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activity rate gap Foreign-born – Native born**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Activity rate gap non-EU born – native-born

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment rate Non-EU born

#### Employment rate Foreign-born

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Employment rate Native-born

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Employment rate gap Foreign-born – Native-born

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment rate gap non-EU -born – Native-born

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Unemployment rate

#### Unemployment rate Non-EU born

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Unemployment rate Foreign-born

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Unemployment rate Native-born

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unemployment rate gap Foreign-born – Native-born

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment rate gap non-EU -born – Native-born

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>