OECD Regional Development Working Papers 2018/01

The integration of migrants
in OECD regions: A first
assessment

**Marcos Diaz Ramirez,
Thomas Liebig,
Cécile Thoreau,
Paolo Veneri**

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/fb089d9a-en>

THE INTEGRATION OF MIGRANTS IN OECD REGIONS: A FIRST ASSESSMENT

By Marcos Díaz Ramírez, Thomas Liebig, Cécile Thoreau and Paolo Veneri

This paper provides an assessment of the presence of migrants, their characteristics and integration outcomes across OECD regions, based on a new OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level. It reveals the wide diversity of the presence of migrants within countries, as well as the specific patterns observed in the way migrants locate and integrate in society across regions. For example, migrants tend to be more spatially concentrated in capital-city and metropolitan regions than the native-born population. What is more, highly-educated migrants are more likely to locate in the same regions where the highly-educated natives concentrate, a trend that is not observed for the low-educated foreign-born. Integration outcomes of migrants, relative to the native-born, are measured through a variety of labour market and housing indicators. The paper also provides preliminary findings on public attitudes towards migrants across regions, which suggest that attitudes tend to be more positive in regions with larger shares of foreign-born population.

JEL classification: F22, R10

Keywords: Migration, Integration, Regions

DIAZ RAMIREZ Marcos, CFE/ESG Marcos.DIAZRAMIREZ@oecd.org

LIEBIG Thomas, ELS/IMD Thomas.LIEBIG@oecd.org

THOREAU Cécile, ELS/IMD Cecile.THOREAU@oecd.org

VENERI Paolo, CFE/ESG Paolo.VENERI@oecd.org

OECD REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKING PAPERS

This series is designed to make available to a wider readership selected studies on regional development issues prepared for use within the OECD. Authorship is usually collective, but principal authors are named. The papers are generally available only in their original language English or French with a summary in the other if available.

OECD Working Papers should not be reported as representing the official views of the OECD or of its member countries. The opinions expressed and arguments employed are those of the author(s).

This document, as well as any [statistical] data and map included herein, are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

Working Papers describe preliminary results or research in progress by the author(s) and are published to stimulate discussion on a broad range of issues on which the OECD works. Comments on Working Papers are welcome, and may be sent to the Centre for Entrepreneurship, SMEs, Regions and Cities, OECD, 2 rue André-Pascal, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, France.

Authorised for publication by Lamia Kamal-Chaoui, Director, Centre for Entrepreneurship, SMEs, Regions and Cities, OECD.

OECD Regional Development Working Papers are published on

<http://www.oecd.org/cfe/regional-policy/>

© OECD 2018

You can copy, download or print OECD content for your own use, and you can include excerpts from OECD publications, databases and multimedia products in your own documents, presentations, blogs, websites and teaching materials, provided that suitable acknowledgement of OECD as source and copyright owner is given. All requests for public or commercial use and translation rights should be submitted to rights@oecd.org.

Table of contents

1. Introduction	6
2. Data description and sources.....	8
3. The spatial distribution of migrants by socio-economic characteristics in OECD regions.	11
4. The regional distribution of migrants' labour market outcomes.....	27
5. Migrants' housing conditions across OECD regions.....	36
6. Regional characteristics, attitudes and migrant integration	40
7. Conclusion and outlook.....	43
References	44
Annex.....	46

Tables

Table 2.1. Broad groups of indicators	9
Table 2.2. Produced indicators	10
Table 3.1. Regional characteristics and the evolution in the presence of migrants.....	14
Table A.1. Produced indicators and data source	46
Table A.2. Top 20 regions (TL2) in terms of number of Non-EU foreign-born with less than 10 years of residence, 2015	47

Figures

Figure 3.1. Presence of foreign-born across OECD regions, 2014-2015	11
Figure 3.2. Regional disparities in the presence of foreign-born, 2014-2015	12
Figure 3.3. Change in the presence of foreign-born from 2005 to 2015	13
Figure 3.4. Presence of foreign- and native-born in metropolitan regions, 2014-2015.....	16
Figure 3.5. Presence of Non-EU foreign-born relative to EU foreign-born, 2014-2015.....	17
Figure 3.6. Regional disparities in the presence of EU and Non-EU foreign-born, 2014-2015.....	18
Figure 3.7. Presence of settled foreign-born relative to recent foreign-born, 2014-2015	19
Figure 3.8. Regional disparities in the presence of recent foreign-born, 2014-2015	20
Figure 3.9. Presence of recent Non-EU foreign-born across OECD European regions, 2014-2015.....	21
Figure 3.10. Presence of foreign-born with tertiary education vs. presence of highly-educated natives, 2014-2015	22
Figure 3.11. Regional disparities in the presence of foreign- and native-born with tertiary education, 2014-2015	23
Figure 3.12. Presence of foreign-born with tertiary education across OECD regions, 2014-2015	24

Figure 3.13. Presence of foreign-born with tertiary education relative to native-born with tertiary education, 2014-2015	25
Figure 3.14. Regional disparities in the presence of foreign-born of primary working-age relative to the native-born of primary working-age, 2014-2015	26
Figure 4.1. Presence of foreign- and native-born in regions with high levels of unemployment, 2014-2015.....	28
Figure 4.2. Regional unemployment rates of native- and foreign-born, 2014-2015	29
Figure 4.3. Employment rate of foreign-born relative to native-born by gender and type of region, 2014-2015.....	30
Figure 4.4. Gender gap in employment rates by place of birth and type of region, 2014-2015	31
Figure 4.5. Employment rate of foreign-born relative to native-born by level of education and type of region.....	32
Figure 4.6. Regional disparities in employment rates of EU and Non-EU foreign-born, 2014-2015 ...	33
Figure 4.7. Regional disparities in over-qualification rates of native- and foreign-born, 2014-2015 ...	34
Figure 4.8. Share of over-qualified foreign-born vs. share of over-qualified natives in the OECD area, 2014-2015	35
Figure 5.1. Share of adults from foreign-born households living in an overcrowded dwelling by type of region, 2014.....	37
Figure 5.2. Adults living in overcrowded dwellings, foreign-born households relative to native-born households by type of region 2014	38
Figure 5.3. Adults living in deprived housing conditions, foreign-born households relative to native-born households by type of region, 2014	39
Figure 6.1. Regional disparities in the percentage of population believing their region is a good place to live for immigrants, 2008-2015	41
Figure 6.2. Belief that immigrants are good for the economy vs. presence of foreign-born and unemployment rate of the native-born, circa 2012-2014	42

Boxes

Box 3.1. What is a “region”? OECD definitions and urban/rural typology.	15
--	----

Key Findings

- Migrants are, on average, more spatially concentrated than natives, especially in mostly metropolitan and capital-city regions. In Europe, Non-EU and EU migrants tend to be clustered unevenly, with a higher level of concentration in capital-city regions for Non-EU migrants than for EU foreign-born.
- In most OECD regions, the presence of foreign-born has either increased or remained stable over the period 2005 to 2015. Regions with initial high levels of development and with larger communities of foreign-born seem to be more attractive for new migrants to settle.
- Across the OECD area, regions which have high shares of highly-educated natives also have high shares of highly-educated migrants. The regions with the highest shares of highly-educated migrants, both in absolute terms and relative to the native-born, are located in Northern Europe, Australia and Canada.
- Migrants tend to live in regions where the regional unemployment rate is lower than the national average. At the same time, unemployed migrants are more spatially concentrated than their native-born peers.
- Migrants, and especially in EU countries, are more likely to be employed in mostly metropolitan regions than in other types of regions, but their gap in employment rates relative to the native-born population is higher in such regions.
- Across all types of regions, migrants in Europe tend to be more likely to live in overcrowded dwellings and deprived housing conditions than natives.

1. Introduction¹

More than one in ten persons living in the OECD area were born abroad, and in recent years, more than 4 million additional people migrate permanently to OECD countries each year. These migrants are not dispersed equally across the country and getting adequate information on migrants' presence and outcomes in OECD countries, including at the regional level, is an essential tool for policy making and for informing public debate.

An important part of integration policy is designed or implemented at the sub-national level. Sub-national authorities manage 40% of public spending and 60% of public investment on average in key integration-enhancing areas such as education, housing and public services (OECD 2016b). Assessing migrants' characteristics, their distribution in size and outcomes at subnational level is therefore critical to ensure migrants' effective integration and efficient multilevel governance of migrant integration policies between supra-national, national and local authorities. For instance, information on the localisation of migrants with a certain profile in terms of education or labour market status can help governments to tailor their actions, such as language and job search training, entrepreneurship and labour matching programmes or adequate housing and public services, to the specific local situations. At the EU and national levels, there has been an increasing recognition of the “fundamental nature of the local and regional governance dimension of integration policies”, whereby the integration of migrants is more and more considered as a process that starts and that should be tackled on the ground (CSES, 2013: 24).

The OECD, jointly with the European Commission, has provided the first broad international comparison across EU and OECD countries at the national level (OECD and EU, 2015). Similar evidence on within-country differences is currently lacking. Against this background, this paper provides quantitative evidence on migrant characteristics and outcomes in OECD regions. The analysis is based on comparable regional integration indicators produced jointly by the Economic Analysis, Statistics and Multi-Level Governance Section in the OECD Centre for Entrepreneurship, SMEs, Regions and Cities (CFE) and the International Migration Division in the OECD Directorate for Employment, Labour and Social Affairs (ELS) and which will also constitute a new OECD database on migrants and their outcomes at the regional level.

A key result is that many relevant migrants' characteristics and integration outcomes vary largely within countries, stressing the importance of targeting policies related to migrant integration at the local and regional levels. More specifically, the paper shows that migrants tend to concentrate more in capital-city regions and mostly metropolitan regions than the native-born population – a trend that, in Europe, is even more pronounced for migrants born in Non-EU countries than for foreign-born from other EU countries. This paper also reveals large regional disparities in the distribution of settled and recent migrants, and their respective outcomes.

¹ Authors are grateful to Charlotte Demuijnck and Nathan Roberson who provided substantial drafting and statistical support. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official views of the OECD or of its member countries.

Building on and complementing previous OECD work on indicators of integration (OECD and EU 2015) by the OECD Directorate for Employment, Labour and Social Affairs, this paper is integrated in a broader project on “**The need for a territorial approach to migrant integration: the role of local authorities**” co-ordinated by the OECD Centre for Entrepreneurship, SMEs, Regions and Cities (CFE), which aims to support local authorities’ efforts in receiving and integrating migrants. The paper complements the project’s qualitative pillar which includes 10 case studies on migration integration governance processes in European cities. The project benefited from the support of the European Commission (DG-Regio) and Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC).

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the data sources and the indicators analysed in the following sections. Section 3 provides evidence on the geographical distribution of migrants across OECD regions, according to different socio-demographic characteristics. Sections 4 and 5 provide evidence, at the regional level, on integration outcomes for migrants, and how these outcomes compare with those of the native born – Section 4 on the labour market and Section 5 on housing. Section 6 explores the extent to which public attitudes towards migrants differ across regions. Section 7 concludes and sets possible steps for further research.

2. Data description and sources

The indicators produced in this paper are part of a new Database developed jointly by the Economic Analysis, Statistics and Multi-Level Governance Section (CFE) and the International Migration Division (ELS) of the OECD. Most of these indicators were produced at the Territorial Level 2 (TL2), which is the larger scale at which the OECD classifies regions (Box 1), mainly because data limitations did not allow further geographical disaggregation.

The main sources of data are the European Union Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS, data provided by Eurostat) for the European OECD countries as well as the American Community Survey for the United States, the Canadian Labour Force Survey for Canada, the National Survey of Occupation and Labour for Mexico and the Survey of Education and Work (SEW) for Australia. Outcomes on housing and income are currently only available for EU countries and stem from the EU Survey of Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC). Preliminary indicators on attitudes towards immigrants were explored using the European Social Survey and Gallup World Poll. To allow for statistical representativeness at the regional level, different waves are often pooled together to produce the indicators (see the Annex for details). At the time of writing, most indicators were available for around 318 regions of 29 OECD countries out of 393 regions in total in the OECD. Data from EU-SILC allow distinguishing different types of regions for 19 European OECD countries. Preliminary indicators from the European Social Survey were obtained for 237 regions of 24 European OECD countries and Israel, while data from Gallup World Poll allows covering 385 regions of the 35 OECD countries.

The indicators are segmented in three broad groups (Table 2.1). The first group includes relevant socio-demographic characteristics of the foreign-born population, such as age structure, duration of stay and place of birth (EU or Non-EU foreign-born for European regions). This first group also includes information on the educational level of the foreign-born population, which can be compared to that of native born. The second group of indicators encompasses the integration outcomes of migrants, with a focus on labour market integration and housing conditions. Finally, the third group includes indicators on attitudes towards migrants, such as the share of the population that think that migrants are beneficial to the economy.

In this paper, the migrant population is defined by place of birth. Unlike citizenship, this criterion does not change over time, it is not subject to country-differences in legislation and it is thus adequate for international comparisons. As such, the terms “foreign-born” and “migrants” will be used interchangeably in the following sections. While being the least biased, this criterion has limitations as well and may sometimes lead to an under or over-evaluation of migrants at the regional level. For example, it does not account for the border changes that have happened in countries such as Poland, the Baltic countries, the Czech and Slovak Republics, Slovenia and Croatia (OECD, 2015: 16). Besides, it may include foreign-born people that are nevertheless nationals, such as the ones born abroad by chance.

Table 2.1. Broad groups of indicators

Indicator Group	Description
Socio-economic characteristics	The first group of indicators provides information on the basic socio-economic characteristics of the foreign-born at the regional level, including place of birth, duration of stay, educational attainment and age.
Migration integration outcomes	The second group of indicators provides information on migration integration outcomes, with a specific focus on labour market integration and housing conditions. The participation of migrants in the labour market is indeed critical to the success of their integration, as it provides them with a source of income and an opportunity to become part of the country's social fabric. Access to affordable good-quality housing also plays an important part in migrants' successful integration, providing them with adequate shelter and being positively associated with other key integration outcomes including better health, educational outcomes and access to employment.
Attitudes towards migrants	The third group of indicators provides information on regional attitudes towards migrants. Public acceptance of migration across regions is indeed a key condition to the successful integration of migrants at the regional level, facilitating social cohesion and influencing the design of migration integration policies at the regional level.

Table 2.2 further details the regional indicators produced as part of this OECD project and that will constitute an enhancement of both the OECD Regional Database and the OECD Indicators of Immigrant Integration Database.

Table 2.2. Produced indicators²

	Type of indicator	Indicators
Socioeconomic characteristics	Basic demographics	
	Size and density	Share of foreign-born in the total population in 2015 Share of foreign-born in the total population in 2005 Share of EU and Non-EU foreign-born in the total population
	Gender	Share of women among the foreign- and native-born populations Share of women among the EU, Non-EU foreign- and native-born populations
	Structure by age group	Distribution of 10-year age groups Dependency ratio (0-14 & 65+ over 0+ pop) Share of "very active" working population (ages 25-54 over 0+)
	Duration of stay	Distribution of less than 10 years vs. more than 10 years present. Also mean number of years for migrants Distribution of less than 10 years vs. more than 10 years present of EU and Non-EU migrants Distribution of less than 10 years vs. more than 10 years present by educational attainment
	Region of birth of foreign born by income level of country	High-income versus low and medium-income countries of birth
	Migrants with host-country nationality	Share of nationals among the foreign-born
	Foreign born status of responsible adult in household	Number of foreign-born households (definitions A and B) Share of foreign-born households (definitions A and B)
	Household size	Average size of foreign-born households (definitions A and B) Composition of foreign-born households (definitions A and B)
	Household composition	Sole person More than 1 adult without children Single person with child(ren) More than 1 adult with children
	Education & skills	
	Educational attainment	Low education (ISCED 0/2) Medium education (ISCED 3/4) High education (ISCED 5/6)
	Educational attainment of EU and Non-EU migrants	Low education (ISCED 0/2) Medium education (ISCED 3/4) High education (ISCED 5/6)
	Labor market outcomes	
Migration integration outcomes	Employment status	Employment rate Unemployment rate Participation rate
	Employment status by gender	Employment rate Unemployment rate Participation rate
	Youth employment	Employment rate Unemployment rate Participation Rate
	Employment status of EU and Non-EU migrants	Employment rate Unemployment rate Participation rate
	Employment status by education for recent and settled migrants	Resident duration by labour participation and education Resident duration by education Resident duration by labour participation
	Employment status by degree of urbanisation	Employment rate Participation rate
	Employment status by educational attainment	Employment rate Unemployment rate Participation rate
	Labour sector	Agriculture, industry, and services sector rates
	Duration of unemployment	Rate of those unemployed for more than 1 year and those less than 1 year Percent with a permanent job/work contract of unlimited duration
	Job quality	
	Job skills	Low Medium High
	Overqualification rate	Foreign born with "high" level of education & in low or medium skilled jobs
	Housing standards	
	Homeownership	Share of population that owns a house
	Overcrowded dwelling	Percent of adults living in overcrowding conditions
	Deprived housing conditions	Percent of adults living in deprived housing conditions
Attitudes towards immigrants	Believes toward immigrants	
	Allow immigrants into the country	Percent of population that believes immigrants from poorer countries shouldn't be allowed into the country Percent of population that believes immigrants from different race/ethnic group shouldn't be allowed into the country Percent of population that believes immigrants from same race/ethnic group shouldn't be allowed into the country
	Believe that immigrants contribute positively to the country	Average of belief that immigrants enrich cultural life (from 0 to 10) Average of belief that immigrants make country better place to live (from 0 to 10) Average of belief that immigration is good for country's economy (from 0 to 10)
	Believe that place of residence is a good place to live for immigrants	Percent of people that believes their region is a good place to live for immigrants

Source: See Table A.1 in Annex.

2. Definition A: All heads are foreign-born; Definition B: at least 1 head is foreign-born; EU refers to EU-28.

"EU migrants": migrants born in countries of the European Union; "Non-EU migrants": migrants born outside of the European Union. For further information on data sources, see Table A.1 in Annex.

3. The spatial distribution of migrants by socio-economic characteristics in OECD regions.

Migrants are, on average, more spatially concentrated than natives, especially in capital-cities and metropolitan regions.

Large disparities are observed in the regional distribution of migrants across OECD countries (Figure 3.1). For example, with similar overall shares of foreign-born in total country population (around 15%), the United States, Belgium and the United Kingdom display a much larger variation in their regional distribution of migrants than Australia, Ireland, Norway or Switzerland. In Belgium, 42% of the population in Brussels-Capital is foreign-born while that share decreases to 6% in Western Flanders. In Australia, Switzerland and Ireland, the share of migrants in total population is above 15% in all regions (except Tasmania).

Figure 3.1. Presence of foreign-born across OECD regions, 2014-2015

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

Migrants tend to concentrate in capital-city regions, i.e. the regions where the capital city is located. In 14 countries out of the 24 countries for which data was available, the capital-city region gathers the highest share of foreign-born relative to the total regional population (Figure 3.2). In two Capital regions (Brussels-Capital and Greater London), foreign-born account for more than a third of total regional population and similar values are observed in California, Western Australia, Lake Geneva and Ontario.

Figure 3.2. Regional disparities in the presence of foreign-born, 2014-2015

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

In most of the covered OECD regions, the presence of foreign-born has increased since 2005

Figure 3.3. Change in the presence of foreign-born from 2005 to 2015

Difference between the share of foreign-born in 2015 and the share of foreign-born in 2005

Table 3.1. Regional characteristics and the evolution in the presence of migrants

Variables	Change in the presence of Foreign born (2005-2015)					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Presence of foreign-born in 2005 (in % of regional population)	0.130***					0.107**
	(0.0368)					(0.0431)
GDP per capita of 2005		4.45e-05**				2.80e-05*
		(1.95e-05)				(1.68e-05)
Annual growth of GDP per capita (from 2005 to 2014)			-0.0222			
			(0.147)			
Expenditure in R&D, average 2004-2009				0.268		
				(0.166)		
Change in the total expenditure in R&D from 2005 to 2015 (percentage points)					0.258	
					(0.182)	
Constant	1.931***	2.025**	3.785***	3.122***	3.628***	1.155
	(0.646)	(0.973)	(0.666)	(0.801)	(0.710)	(0.701)
Observations	236	236	236	204	204	236
R-squared	0.539	0.510	0.464	0.425	0.415	0.555
Country FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: OLS regressions with country-fixed effects. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. The shares of foreign-born refer to the population 15+. GDP per capita at constant prices of 2010 (PPP). Expenditure in R&D as a share of GDP.

Box 3.1. What is a “region”? OECD definitions and urban/rural typology.

OECD regions

The word region is used in this report to identify sub-national units that in most cases are granted administrative powers. The OECD classifies regions in two territorial levels. The higher level (Territorial Level 2 or TL2) often corresponds to the first administrative tier after national or federal government. Examples include the province of Ontario, Cataluña, including Barcelona, and the Île-de-France. The lower-level regions (Territorial Level 3 or TL3) always lie within the borders of TL2 regions, which in turn lie within countries' boundaries. The OECD includes 398 large regions (TL2) and 2,241 small regions (TL3). This classification in two levels allows international comparison among sub-national territorial units of comparable size. In most countries, these two levels are also used as a framework for implementing regional policies, since they are officially established and stable across the OECD. In the case of European countries, the OECD territorial classification is largely consistent with the Eurostat classification of NUTS2 and NUTS3 regions, with perfect consistency between NUTS3 and TL3 levels.

A simple urban-rural classification for TL2 regions

OECD TL2 regions can differ widely in morphological characteristics and patterns of agglomeration of population and economic activities. In other words, TL2 regions across OECD countries can exhibit different degrees of urbanity and rurality. A region that contains a large city potentially extending beyond its regional boundaries will be very different from another region with no large city and very low density settlement patterns.

In order to account for these differences and to facilitate the interpretation of the indicators presented in this report, TL2 regions are classified into two types: i) “mostly metropolitan” or “mostly urban”; and ii) “non-metropolitan” or “non-urban”. The methodology employed in building this classification is mainly based on the share of regional population living in functional urban areas (FUAs). FUAs provide a definition of cities based on an economic perspective rather than an administrative one. Such definition is consistently applied across countries and constitutes the unit of analysis of the OECD Metropolitan Database. A FUA usually encompasses a cluster of contiguous municipalities that have a high-density core and a functionally connected commuting zone (OECD, 2012b).

A TL2 region is classified as mostly metropolitan if the share of regional population living in FUAs is above 70% or if part of the regional population lives in a metropolitan area larger than 1.5 million inhabitants. In all other cases, regions are classified as non-metropolitan.

Source: OECD (2012b), Redefining "Urban": A New Way to Measure Metropolitan Areas, OECD Publishing, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264174108-en>.

Migrants are relatively more concentrated in metropolitan regions than native-born. According to the urban-rural classification of TL2 regions (see Box 1), close to two thirds of the foreign-born population live in mostly metropolitan regions across the OECD, 6 percentage points more than the average of the native-born population (58%). In all countries covered in Figure 3.4 except the Slovak Republic and Slovenia, the majority of migrants live in mostly metropolitan regions. In Belgium, the United Kingdom, France, Spain, Germany and Luxembourg more than two thirds of the total migrant population live in mostly metropolitan regions; the same pattern is observed for Canada, the United States, Mexico and Australia. In the United Kingdom, the share of the foreign-born living in mostly metropolitan regions reaches 82% of the total foreign-born population, the highest level among all the available countries and 18 percentage points more than the total share of the mostly metropolitan population in the country (64%).

Figure 3.4. Presence of foreign- and native-born in metropolitan regions, 2014-2015

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

In Europe, Non-EU and EU migrants tend to be clustered unevenly, with a higher level of concentration in capital-city regions for Non-EU migrants than for EU foreign-born.

Within the EU, distinguishing the EU and Non-EU foreign-born is particularly informing, as the two groups face different challenges and show different integration outcomes. For instance, Non-EU migrants living in Europe will usually face more difficulties in getting their qualifications legally recognized and valued in the labour market, while European education systems are more streamlined and recognition of credentials is more automatic (OECD, 2015: 316). Non-EU migrants also face more legal barriers with regards to employment in the public sector (OECD, 2015: 25). Understanding the regional distribution of migrants along this EU/Non-EU distinction appears as a key step towards the building of tailored regional migration policies.

In Europe, Non-EU migrants are relatively more spatially concentrated than the EU foreign-born.

Figure 3.6 shows that regional disparities in the distribution of Non-EU migrants are larger than those of the EU foreign-born in 16 out of the 19 countries covered. This result is partly accentuated by the higher shares of Non-EU foreign-born, relative to the EU foreign-born, across many OECD regions; nevertheless, this outcome holds even after rescaling by the total country population size of each type of foreign-born (this graph is not shown but it's available under request).

Non-EU and EU migrants alike tend to concentrate unevenly across regions, especially in regions surrounding the Mediterranean Sea, Ireland and Sweden. These regions display a positive difference of 5

to 15 percentage points in their concentration of Non-EU migrants relative to EU migrants as share of total regional foreign-born (Figure 3.5). The opposite trend is observed in the regions of Ireland.

Figure 3.5. Presence of Non-EU foreign-born relative to EU foreign-born, 2014-2015

Difference between the share of Non-EU and EU foreign-born

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

In particular, Non-EU migrants tend to be more concentrated in capital-city regions than EU migrants. Among the 19 countries covered, the regions with the highest share of Non-EU foreign-born in the total population are all capital-city regions except for Italy, Spain, Poland and Switzerland (Figure 3.6). With regards to EU migrants, regions with the highest share of EU foreign-born are not necessarily the capital-city regions, with only 11 capital-city regions out of the 19 covered concentrating the highest shares of EU migrants in total regional population.

Figure 3.6. Regional disparities in the presence of EU and Non-EU foreign-born, 2014-2015

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

In most OECD regions the share of settled migrants is larger than that of recent migrants; however, this result doesn't hold in many regions of Northern Europe.

Defined as the time-period between the year of arrival and the year of survey, duration of stay is a defining characteristic of migrants given its positive impact on integration outcomes. Longer presence in the country is indeed associated with improved integration outcomes (OECD, 2015: 21). In this paper, recent migrants are migrants who have lived in the host country for less than 10 years, while settled migrants refers to migrants who have lived in the host country for 10 years or more. As previously mentioned, in the European Union, duration of stay is particularly important for Non-EU migrants as it determines their ability to apply for national permanent residency or the EU's long-term resident status. These statuses usually require a minimum of five years of uninterrupted residence in the host country.

Recent migrants thus face specific integration challenges which require tailored regional integration policies and initiatives including pre-arrival support, integration settlement services, language and vocational training (European Commission, 2016). In both the OECD (23)³ and the EU (19)⁴, about a third of migrants have arrived in the last ten years – respectively 22 and 13 million recent migrants.

³ AUS, AUT, BEL, CAN, CHE, CZE, DEU, DNK, ESP, FIN, FRA, GBR, GRC, HUN, IRL, ITA, LUX, NLD, NOR, NZL, PRT, SWE and USA.

Nine in ten OECD regions gather more settled than recent migrants in the total foreign-born population. Figure 3.7 shows that around 90% of the regions display positive differences in the shares of settled and recent migrants in total foreign-born population.

Figure 3.7. Presence of settled foreign-born relative to recent foreign-born, 2014-2015

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

Across the OECD, countries differ substantially in their interregional distribution of settled and recent migrants. Figure 3.8 shows that around a third of the countries covered display more than 20 percentage point difference between the region with the lowest share and the region with the highest share of recent migrants in total foreign foreign-born population, with highest differences in Czech Republic, Canada and Greece. In 8 countries out of the 22 countries available, this difference is between 10 and 20 percentage points.

Northern European countries tend to have relatively more regions that concentrate higher shares of recent than settled migrants. Figure 3.7 shows that recent migrants account for larger shares in total foreign-born population than settled ones across many regions in Northern European countries, particularly in Norway, Sweden, Ireland and the United Kingdom. Figure 3.8 shows that in these countries, even in the regions with the lowest shares of recent migrants, the recent-foreign born still represents at least one third of the total foreign-born population, a trend that is not observed in the other OECD countries.

⁴ AUT, BEL, CHE, CZE, DNK, ESP, EST, FIN, FRA, GBR, GRC, IRL, ISL, ITA, LUX, NOR, PRT, SVN and SWE.

Figure 3.8. Regional disparities in the presence of recent foreign-born, 2014-2015

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

Non-EU recent migrants tend to be much more evenly distributed in regions of the Nordic European countries than in Southern and Western Europe. Sweden and Norway stand out as the only countries where recent Non-EU migrants represent at least 2% of total regional population (Figure 3.9). Regional disparities in the proportions of Non-EU recent migrants with respect to total population are much stronger in other European countries such as the United Kingdom, Spain, Italy and France. In these countries, Non-EU recent migrants tend to locate more in the capital-city regions, regions surrounding the Mediterranean Sea, Northern Italy and Northern Spain. In absolute terms, Greater London stands out as the region that hosts the largest number of Non-EU recent foreign-born, twice the amount of the second next region, Île-de-France (Annex, Table A.2).

Figure 3.9. Presence of recent Non-EU foreign-born across OECD European regions, 2014-2015

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

Across the OECD area, regions tend to have similar shares of highly-educated migrants and natives; Northern European countries, Australia and Canada display relatively high shares of highly-educated migrants across most regions, including relative to the native-born population.

Since most foreign-born entered as adults and acquired their education abroad (OECD and EU, 2015), educational attainment measures migrants' ability to integrate across regions rather than being itself an indicator of integration outcomes. In 2013, migrants were, on average, more educated than the native-born population in the OECD. A third of migrants of working age held a tertiary education degree in the OECD area, against 29% for the native-born population (OECD and EU, 2015: 132). Across the European Union, only one in five Non-EU foreign-born holds a tertiary education degree, against about 30% of the EU migrants and 25% of the native-born population (OECD and EU, 2015). Higher levels of educational attainment improve migrants' prospects of employment and integration. However, the average employment shortfall relative to their native-born peers tends to be higher for highly-educated

migrants than low-educated ones. This could be explained by the difficulties highly-educated migrants face in getting official recognition for the academic qualifications (OECD, 2015: 82-83).

Several studies have examined the effect of migration on employment and shown mixed results in terms of impact on wages and employment of native-born with similar characteristics (Vanselow, Liebig and Kaplanis, 2016). Assessing the regional distribution of migrants' human capital can help analyse possible effects migration can have on local labour markets and better match migrants' skills with specific regional needs, fostering skill complementarities.

Regions tend to have similar shares of highly-educated migrants and natives across the OECD area. Figure 3.10 shows that the share of highly-educated migrants is positively correlated with that of the native-born with tertiary education at the regional level. In more than half of the countries covered in Figure 3.11, regions with the highest shares of highly educated foreign-born also concentrate the highest shares of native-born with tertiary education, suggesting that highly educated migrants tend to locate where their native peers are. This pattern is not observed for the regions with the lowest shares of highly educated people, where only four regions hold the lowest shares of tertiary education for both the native- and the foreign-born.

Figure 3.10. Presence of foreign-born with tertiary education vs. presence of highly-educated natives, 2014-2015

Percent in respective working-age population

Note: Correlation=0.7.

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

Most countries display smaller variations in the regional distribution of highly-educated foreign-born people than for the native-born population. Regional variations in the distribution of highly educated migrants are smaller than those of their native peers in 14 out of the 23 countries covered in

In Europe, capital-city regions tend to gather the largest shares of both highly-educated migrants and natives. Among the 24 countries covered in Figure 3.11, 13 out of the 24 capital-city regions gather the highest share of both highly-educated foreign-born and native-born in their respective country.

Figure 3.12. Presence of foreign-born with tertiary education across OECD regions, 2014-2015

Percent of foreign-born working-age population

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

Regional heterogeneity in the educational attainment of migrants relative to that of natives tends to be lower in Canada, Australia, Northern and Southern Europe than in Western and Central Europe and the United States. In the United Kingdom, Ireland, Norway and Sweden, most regions display positive differences in the share of highly-educated foreign-born and highly-educated native-born (Figure 3.13). In all regions of Australia and most regions of Canada, the share of foreign-born with tertiary education is higher than that of natives by at least 10.9 percentage points. In Spain, Greece and Italy, the opposite trend is observed where most regions display higher shares of highly-educated natives than shares of highly-educated migrants. In Central and Western European countries and in the United States, more regional heterogeneity in the relative educational attainment of migrants and natives is observed. In the United States for example, migrants tend to have higher educational attainment level than the native-born in most Eastern regions of the country while the opposite is true for the Central and Western regions.

Figure 3.13. Presence of foreign-born with tertiary education relative to native-born with tertiary education, 2014-2015

Difference between the shares of foreign- and native-born with tertiary education

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

In most regions, migrants are over-represented among primary working-age population (25-54 years old)

Across OECD regions, the foreign-born population of primary working age tends to be **proportionally larger than its native-born counterpart**. Figure 3.14 shows that migrants are overrepresented compared with the native-born in this age-group in all regions except for four states of Germany and one region in Czech Republic, France and Canada. In eight out of the 20 countries covered, this positive difference is of at least 15 percentage points. In Germany, Czech Republic, France, Spain, Belgium and the United States, the regional gaps in the differences between the shares of foreign- versus native-born in this age-group are of at least 20 percentage points. In other countries, such as Australia, Ireland, Nordic countries and the United Kingdom, these differences are much lower, less than 10 percentage points.

While the links between population ageing and the offsetting effect of migrants are far from obvious at the national level – in particular because of the high dynamism of labour markets (OECD, 2012a), the settlement of such migrants in regions facing population ageing and labour shortages could help reduce regional demographic imbalances and improve migrants' contribution to regional development (Brezzi et al., 2010: 16).

Figure 3.14. Regional disparities in the presence of foreign-born of primary working-age relative to the native-born of primary working-age, 2014-2015

Difference between the shares of foreign- and native-born of primary working-age (25-54 years old)

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

While this above section provided new statistical evidence on the sub-national reality of migration, the design of sustainable integration policies also requires identifying how migrants integrate in each of these regions, in comparison with the native-born population. The next two sections thus explore the regional distribution of integration outcomes across OECD regions. Section 4 deals with labour market integration and section 5 with housing conditions.

4. The regional distribution of migrants' labour market outcomes.

Migrants' integration in the labour market is assessed by comparing native-born and foreign-born employment and unemployment rates at the regional level. This section also presents descriptive statistics on migrants' job quality and labour market mismatches at the regional level by measuring the regional distribution of migrants' over-qualification rates.

Employment is a core aspect of the integration process. It is not only vital for economic integration, but has also implications for broader social integration such as finding adequate housing, learning the host-country language and making contacts with the native-born population. In 2014-2015, 11% of the migrant population was unemployed in the OECD area, 2 percentage points more than unemployed native-born. In the European Union, migrants' unemployment rate reached 14.5%, against 10% among native-born (OECD, 2017). Understanding disparities in labour market outcomes across regions is crucial to developing effective integration policies that work at that level. In this context, the rural versus urban dimension is particularly important.

For the majority of countries, migrants tend to live in regions where the unemployment rate is lower than the national average.

In the majority of countries covered in Figure 4.1, migrants live in regions where the unemployment rate is lower than the national average. This is the case in most Central and Eastern European countries as well as in Italy, Canada and Finland. Conversely, in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, the United States and the United Kingdom, immigrants tend to be more concentrated in regions with high unemployment than the native-born population (Figure 4.1). This is also the case in Switzerland and in the Netherlands, although the share of foreign- and native-born populations concerned is relatively low. In Greece and Portugal, four in five immigrants are located in regions with relatively high unemployment, and this proportion is similar among the native-born population. Overall, recent immigrants are relatively more concentrated in regions where unemployment rates are relatively low with respect to settled migrants.

Figure 4.1. Presence of foreign- and native-born in regions with high levels of unemployment, 2014-2015

Percent with respect to the total population of regions where unemployment rate is higher than the national average

Note: Countries are ranked according to the gap between foreign- and native-born populations in the share of populations located in regions with relatively high unemployment. Recent immigrants are those who entered their current country of residence over the last ten years.

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

Unemployed migrants tend to concentrate more than their native-born counterparts (Figure 4.2).

18 out of the 20 countries considered in Figure 4.2 display higher regional variations in the unemployment rates of migrants than those of the native-born. This trend is particularly strong in seven countries (The Netherlands, Germany, Sweden, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Finland and Norway) where the regional disparities in the unemployment rates of the foreign-born population are at least twice as large as those of the native-born population. Italy and Spain stand out as the only countries where the unemployment rates of the native-born are more regionally dispersed than those of the migrants. In Italy, this trend is partly explained by higher unemployment rates in southern regions than in the northern and central regions, where immigrants are highly concentrated, (Bertola and Garibaldi, 2006).

Figure 4.3. Employment rate of foreign-born relative to native-born by gender and type of region, 2014-2015

Difference between foreign- and native-born employment rates

Note: In countries shaded in blue, outcomes for the foreign-born are more favourable in metropolitan regions than in non-metropolitan ones.

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

These patterns are more mixed when looking only at migrant women. Immigrant women face more difficulties in the labour market. This holds for both metropolitan and non-metropolitan regions. The negative gap in employment rates with the native-born women is relatively high in Nordic countries as well as in France, Germany and the Netherlands. Among these countries, in the Netherlands, Finland and Norway, the situation is worse for immigrant women in mostly metropolitan regions than in non-metropolitan ones.

The gender gap in employment rate is generally wider among the foreign-born, and this is particularly pronounced in mostly metropolitan regions.

Among immigrants the gender gap in employment rates varies more widely across type of region than among the native-born (Figure 4.4). It also tends to be larger in mostly metropolitan regions, whereas no such pattern is observed for the native-born. This is notably the case in the Scandinavian countries, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Hungary as well as in Canada and Australia where the immigrant gender gap in employment is almost twice as large in mostly metropolitan regions, suggesting that, in the covered countries, immigrant women face – compared with their male counterparts – fewer obstacles in non-metropolitan regions.

Figure 4.4. Gender gap in employment rates by place of birth and type of region, 2014-2015

Note: In countries shaded in blue, gender gaps are smaller in metropolitan regions than in non-metropolitan ones.

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

Tertiary-educated immigrants are less likely to be employed than their native peers, but they tend to struggle less in metropolitan regions than elsewhere in Europe.

Figure 4.5 shows a diverse picture in terms of differences between immigrant and native-born in employment rates for the low educated. About half of the countries show better outcomes for low-educated immigrants, in terms of gaps with the native-born, in non-metropolitan regions. In some countries with significant labour migration, such as Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom, such immigrants fare much better in non-metropolitan regions. In Australia and the United Kingdom, there is even a higher employment of low-educated immigrants compared with their native-born peers in non-metropolitan regions. For the high-educated, the key finding is that in both types of regions, immigrants have much more difficulties in the labour market than their native-born peers.

Figure 4.5. Employment rate of foreign-born relative to native-born by level of education and type of region

Note: In countries shaded in blue, outcomes for the foreign-born are more favourable in metropolitan regions than in non-metropolitan ones.

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

Looking at Europe, employment rates tend to be higher for EU migrants than for Non-EU migrants in most regions (Figure 4.6). At the same time, regional disparities in the employment rate tend to be larger for Non-EU migrants. In nine out of the 16 countries covered in Figure 4.6, regional disparities in employment rates are higher for the Non-EU foreign-born than for their EU peers. In Austria, Ireland, Switzerland and the Nordic countries, the best performing regions in terms of employment of the Non-EU foreign-born do not even reach the lowest regional levels of employment rate for the EU foreign-born.

Figure 4.6. Regional disparities in employment rates of EU and Non-EU foreign-born, 2014-2015

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

Regional disparities in over-qualification rates tend to be larger for migrants than for the native born.

Over-qualification is a recurring issue for migrants and often associated with a waste of skills. The over-qualification rate estimated in this paper is the share of people with tertiary education working in a low- or medium-skilled job (OECD and EU, 2015). In 2015, more than a third of employed foreign-born with a tertiary education degree were over-qualified across the OECD and the EU, against a 25% over-qualification rate of the native-born working population (OECD and EU, 2015: 116). This difference can be partly attributed to the difficulties migrants face in having their qualifications valued in the labour market of the host country, speaking the host country's language and fully understanding the way labour markets work, although there also seem to be some issues related to poorer performance of education systems in some origin countries (OECD, 2014a; Liebig and Huddleston, 2014). Besides its negative impact on migrants' job satisfaction and well-being, research has shown that higher skills and qualification mismatch tends to be associated with lower labour productivity (Adalet McGowan M., Andrews, D., 2015).

Variations in the regional distribution of over-qualified foreign-born tend to be larger than for natives, although not everywhere. The average gap for the foreign-born is of eight percentage points, the average difference for natives is of around five percentage points (Figure 4.7). The differences in the regional gaps for the foreign- and native-born are especially strong in the United States, Ireland, Sweden,

Germany and the United Kingdom. Spain and Switzerland stand out as the only countries where regional disparities are larger for the native-born population, although these differences are very small.

Figure 4.7. Regional disparities in over-qualification rates of native- and foreign-born, 2014-2015

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

In countries such as Ireland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Australia, migrants' over-qualification tends to be much higher than that of native population. Among the 17 countries for which data is available, only Slovenia, the United States and Spain have regions where the lowest levels of over-qualified migrants are equal or lower than those of their peers in the native-born population. In the United States, the lowest regional over-qualification rate for native-born is in the region of Louisiana, at 20%, while the respective rate for migrants goes down to slightly less than 10% in the region of New Mexico. In Ireland and the Nordic countries (Sweden, Norway and Denmark), the regional levels of over-qualification of the foreign-born are always higher and never overlap with the regional over-qualification rates of native-born. Previous research suggests that large share of refugees among the highly-educated immigrants, a group with more difficulties in getting their foreign qualifications valued in the labour market, can partially explain this phenomenon (Dumont et al., 2016).

The shares of over-qualified migrants and over-qualified natives tend to be similar across regions in the European-OECD area and in Australia while the United States and Canada tend to display more differentiated patterns. Figure 4.8 shows that the correlation between the share of over-qualified migrants and the share of over-qualified natives is statistically significant when looking at Australia and the European-OECD area, while this trend is not observed in the United States and Canada.

Figure 4.8. Share of over-qualified foreign-born vs. share of over-qualified natives in the OECD area, 2014-2015

Percent of employed working-age population

Note: Correlation first panel=0.52; correlation second panel=not significantly different from zero.

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.

5. Migrants' housing conditions across OECD regions.

Access to good-quality housing is a core dimension of migrants' well-being and successful integration. Limited access to acceptable housing conditions and housing instability are indeed linked to lower educational outcomes, high risks of social exclusion and health-related issues (Salvi del Pero *et al.* 2016: 10). Moreover, housing is a regional or local competence in most countries. Across the OECD area, migrants are less likely to own their homes and more likely to live in substandard housing than the native-born population (OECD and EU, 2015). They are also more exposed to housing cost overburden than native born households, an issue which can lead to households' cut back on other needs, including health care (Salvi del Pero *et al.*, 2016).

Previous analyses have emphasized the importance of the sub-national and local levels in the relationship between migration and housing (OECD, 2016a: 117). Migrants' spatial concentration in specific regions suggests that migration's impact on local infrastructure and housing could be larger at the sub-national level than what is observed at the national level. Although not causing them, large inflows of migrants can intensify local issues with regards to local housing infrastructure (OECD, 2016a: 110). Migrants' spatial concentration and the resulting pressure it can put on local housing markets, especially social housing markets, can also exacerbate anti-migration views and contribute to the design of restrictive housing policies for migrants (OECD, 2016a: 124). At the local level, sub-national governments across the OECD can play a significant role in housing-related policies and investments, housing and community amenities being the third largest field of sub-national direct public investments after economic affairs and education in the OECD (OECD, 2014b: 5).

As such, understanding the sub-national distribution of migrants' access to good-quality housing in the OECD area, in comparison with that of the native-born, is critical to design inclusive and tailored migration policies that ensure migrants can benefit from acceptable housing standards across all regions. This section provides evidence on two key housing indicators, namely living in an overcrowded dwelling and living in deprived housing conditions. The indicators included in this first initial overview distinguish between mostly metropolitan and non-metropolitan regions, as housing conditions tend to differ between these types of regions, and – as seen above – immigrants tend to be highly overrepresented in mostly metropolitan regions.

In most European-OECD countries, migrants are more likely to live in overcrowded dwellings than natives across all regions but tend to be worse off in mostly metropolitan regions.

Living in an overcrowded dwelling tends to be more frequent among immigrants in mostly metropolitan regions than in other regions (Figure 5.1). However, both in all types of regions, immigrants are much more likely to live in an overcrowded dwelling than the native-born population (Figure 5.2).

Figure 5.1. Share of adults from foreign-born households living in an overcrowded dwelling by type of region, 2014

Note: Data for Sweden is from 2013. See OECD and EU (2015) for detailed definition of overcrowding.

Source: Authors' elaboration based on EU Statistics on Income and Living Conditions.

In half of the European-OECD countries covered, the difference in the overcrowding rate in metropolitan regions is not significantly different from that in non-metropolitan regions (Figure 5.2). The gap between immigrants and native-born is particularly large in mostly metropolitan regions in Italy and Austria and in non-metropolitan regions in Greece and the Czech Republic. In the former two countries, immigrant households face strong housing challenges in mostly metropolitan regions compared with their native counterparts, with more than 30 additional percentage points of overcrowding rate, while the gap is smaller but still high in non-metropolitan regions (around twenty percentage points). Conversely, in Greece, the Czech Republic and Poland, differences in overcrowding rate between immigrants and native-born are smaller in mostly metropolitan regions than elsewhere. In Greek and Czech non-metropolitan regions, the overcrowding rate of foreign-born is around three times as high as that of the native-born, while around two times as high in mostly metropolitan ones.

Figure 5.2. Adults living in overcrowded dwellings, foreign-born households relative to native-born households by type of region 2014

Difference in percentage points between the percent of adults in foreign-born households and the percent of adults in native-born households living in overcrowding conditions

Note: Data for Sweden is from 2013. See OECD and EU (2015) for detailed definition of overcrowding.

Source: Authors' elaboration based on EU Statistics on Income and Living Conditions.

In European-OECD countries, migrants are more likely to live in deprived housing conditions than natives across all regions.

Regardless of the urbanisation of the region, migrants tend to be much more likely than native-born to experience deprived housing conditions. The only exceptions are non-metropolitan regions in Poland and metropolitan regions in the Czech Republic – regions in countries which host a relatively lower number of migrants. Figure 5.3 shows that there is much more dispersion along the rural/urban lines among migrants than among the native-born. Immigrants face particularly deprived conditions in Austrian and Spanish mostly metropolitan regions compared with their native counterparts, while the gap is smaller in non-metropolitan regions. The reverse is true in Italian regions. In most other countries, differences in terms of deprived housing are not as pronounced, except in Czech, and to a lesser extent in French, non-metropolitan regions where immigrants are much more often in deprived housing than their native counterparts.

Figure 5.3. Adults living in deprived housing conditions, foreign-born households relative to native-born households by type of region, 2014

Difference in percentage points between the percent adults in foreign-born households and the percent of adults in native-born households living in deprived housing conditions

Note: Data for Sweden is from 2013. See OECD and EU (2015) for detailed definition of deprived dwelling.

Source: Authors' elaboration based on EU Statistics on Income and Living Conditions.

6. Regional characteristics, attitudes and migrant integration

In 2012, one in four OECD native-born believed the effect of migration on the economy was negative (OECD and EU, 2015) – an anti-immigration trend that keeps rising in the OECD area (OECD, 2016a:7). While most empirical studies find that migration has a broadly neutral effect on national economic performance, such discrepancy between the perceived and the actual impact of migration could be explained by the fact that migration has a strong local feature (OECD, 2016a). As previously shown, migrants tend to concentrate in specific regions and these concentration patterns vary according to migrants' specific socio-economic characteristics. As such, it might well be that migration's effects are stronger and felt more strongly at the local level than at the national one, depending on the way migration links with regions' specific economic needs and socio-economic characteristics of its native-born population (Vanselow, Liebig and Kaplanis, 2016). For example, in a region where the unemployment rate is relatively high and migrants share similar skills with the native-born, greater competition and natives' fear of unemployment in the regional labour market could lead to a higher level of anti-migration attitudes making it more difficult for migrants to integrate.

Regional disparities in attitudes towards migrants are not very large across the OECD. Figure 6.1 shows that the variation in the regional distribution of attitudes towards migrants, as measured by the percentage of the population who believe that the region is a good place to live for migrants, is below 15 percentage points in 20 countries out of 32 countries covered. The largest regional disparities in the share of people that believe their region is a good place to live for migrants are observed in Mexico, Turkey, and Greece where differences between the regions with the highest and lowest shares are above 20 percentage points. In Europe, regional disparities are the largest in Greece, Germany and Czech Republic; whereas in Ireland, Slovenia and Belgium, regional differences are the lowest.

Figure 6.1. Regional disparities in the percentage of population believing their region is a good place to live for immigrants, 2008-2015

Note: These outcomes should be taken with cautious due to the relative ambiguity of the question. The respondent may consider his/her region is a good place to live for immigrants regardless of his/her attitudes towards immigrants.

Source: Authors' elaboration based on Gallup World Poll.

In most OECD countries, all regions have at least 50% of their population considering their region to be a good place for migrants. In 20 countries out of the 32 countries covered in Figure 6.1, all regions have at least 50% of their population believing that their region is a good place to live for migrants. European regions with the lowest shares in this respect are located in Greece (West Macedonia), Poland (Swietokrzyskie) and Czech Republic (Northeast) while Capital Territory in Australia is the region with the highest share - 90% of its population declaring that their region is a good place to live for migrants.

Regional views on the positive impact of migration on the economy seem to be positively correlated with the share of migrants in the population and negatively associated with natives' unemployment rates. Figure 6.2 shows that attitudes towards migrants tend on average to be more positive in regions with a higher share of migrants and lower unemployment rates of the native-born. In contrast, there is no strong correlation between the share of migrants in the region and the view that migrants tend to take jobs that host-country citizens would want (Figure 28).

Figure 6.2. Belief that immigrants are good for the economy vs. presence of foreign-born and unemployment rate of the native-born, circa 2012-2014

Note: The percent of foreign-born in the population was estimated using the LFS of 2014 and 2015. Indicators on attitudes from the ESS are built by pooling together waves 4 to 6, which corresponds to the period 2008-2013. In the second panel the correlations are statistically significantly different from 0 at the 0.05 level even when excluding regions with unemployment rates above the 20% (correlation of 0.32) or when excluding all the regions of Greece and Spain (correlation of 0.45) – the countries with some outliers in regional unemployment..

Source: Authors' elaboration based on Labour Force Surveys and the European Social Survey.

7. Conclusion and outlook

As immigrants tend to concentrate in certain regions, and their characteristics differ across regions, looking at the national averages conceals a wide variety of situations and migrant outcomes. Against this backdrop, this paper provided an assessment of the presence of migrants, their characteristics and integration outcomes across OECD regions, based on a new OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level. A key finding is the wide diversity of the presence and integration of migrants within countries. For some indicators, there is more diversity within countries than across countries. A second key finding is that there are some specific patterns in the way migrants are settled across regions and integrate in society that can be generalised. For example, migrants tend to be more spatially concentrated than natives, especially in capital cities or metropolitan regions. What is more, highly-educated migrants tend to concentrate in the same regions where the highly-educated natives concentrate, a fact that is not observed for low-educated migrants. A third key finding relates to attitudes of regional communities towards migrants. Here, evidence suggests there is no strong correlation between attitudes towards migrants and their presence. If anything, attitudes tend to be more positive in regions with larger shares of migrants, but further work is needed to ascertain this correlation and to investigate further links with regional characteristics such as regional unemployment.

Further work should look into whether there are specific regional or local characteristics – such as those related to economic growth, innovation and industrial structure – related to the characteristics of migrants and their outcomes. Such analysis should contribute to better target policy to the specific needs of each region.

References

- Adalet McGowan, M. and D. Andrews (2015), “Labour market mismatch and labour productivity: evidence from PIAAC data”, *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, No. 1209, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Bertola, G., Garibaldi, P. (2006), “The structure of history of Italian unemployment.”, in Werding, M., *Structural Unemployment in Western Europe. Reasons and Remedies*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Brezzi, M. and M. Diaz Ramirez (2016), “Building subjective well-being indicators at the subnational level: A preliminary assessment in OECD regions”, *OECD Regional Development Working Papers*, 2016/03, OECD Publishing, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5jm2hhcjftvh-en>.
- Brezzi M., Dumont JC., Piacentini M., Thoreau C. (2010), “Determinants of localisation of recent immigrants across OECD regions”. *OECD workshop Migration and Regional Development*, 7 June 2010, OECD, Paris.
- Center for Strategy and Evaluation Services (2013), *Study on Practices of Integration of Third-Country Nationals at Local and Regional Level in the European Union*, European Union, Brussels.
- Dumont, J.-C.; Liebig, T.; Peschner, J.; Tanay, F. and Xenogiani, T. (2016), “How Are Refugees Faring on the Labour Market in Europe? A First Evaluation Based on the 2014 EU Labour Force Survey Ad Hoc Module”, *European Commission DG Employment Working Paper*, No. 1/2016.
- European Commission (2016), *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, The Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the Action Plan on the integration of third-country nationals*, COM(2016) 377 final, 7 June 2016, European Commission, Brussels.
- Liebig, T. and T. Huddleston (2014), “Labour Market Integration of Immigrants and their Children: Developing, Activating and Using Skills”, Chapter 2 in OECD (2014a), *International Migration Outlook*, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/migr_outlook-2014-en.
- OECD (2012a), *International Migration Outlook 2012*, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/migr_outlook-2012-fr.
- OECD (2012b), *Redefining “urban”. A new way to measure metropolitan areas*, OECD Publishing, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264174108-en>.
- OECD (2013), *OECD Framework for Statistics on the Distribution of Household Income, Consumption and Wealth*, OECD Publishing, Paris, [10.1787/9789264194830-en](http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264194830-en).
- OECD (2014a), *International Migration Outlook 2014*, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/migr_outlook-2014-5-en.
- OECD (2014b), *Recommendation of the Council on Effective Public Investment Across Levels of Government*, Adopted on 12 March 2014, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- OECD/European Union (2015), *Indicators of Immigrant Integration 2015: Settling In*, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/migr_outlook-2015-fr.
- OECD (2016a), *International Migration Outlook 2016*, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/migr_outlook-2016-en.
- OECD (2016b), *OECD Regions at a Glance 2016*, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/reg_glance-2016-en.
- OECD (2017), “International migration database”, *OECD International Migration Statistics* (database), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/data-00342-en>.

-
- OECD (2018), *OECD Regional Statistics (database)*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.
- Salvi del Pero, A. et al. (2016), "Policies to promote access to good-quality affordable housing in OECD countries", *OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers*, No. 176, OECD Publishing, Paris, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5jm3p5gl4djd-en>.
- Vanselow, A.-M.; Liebig, T. and Kaplanis, I. (2016), "The economic impact of migration: Why the local level matters". Chapter 3 in *OECD (2016), International Migration Outlook*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

Annex

Table A.1. Produced indicators and data source

	Dimensions	Indicators	Additional Information	EU Data Source and Year (if diff. from 2014-15)	US Data Source	MX Data Source	CAN Data Source	AU Data Source
Socioeconomic characteristics	Basic demographics							
	Size and density	Share of foreign-born in the total population in 2015	0+ and 15+ (AUS:14-74 ; MEX:15-64)	EULFS	ACS	MLFS	CLFS	SEW
		Share of foreign-born in the total population in 2005	15+	EULFS	ACS	MLFS	Census	Census
		Share of EU foreign-born in the total population	0+	EULFS	ACS	MLFS	CLFS	SEW
	Gender	Share of women among the foreign- and native-born populations	0+ (AUS:14-74 ; MEX:15-64)	EULFS	ACS	MLFS	CLFS	SEW
		Share of women among the EU foreign- and native-born populations	0+	EULFS	X	X	X	X
	Structure by age group	Distribution of 10-year age groups	0+ (AUS:14-74 ; MEX:15-64)	EULFS	ACS	MLFS	CLFS	SEW
		Dependency ratio (0-14 & 65+ over 0+ pop)	0+/Includes native-born children into the count for foreign-born	EULFS	ACS	X	X	X
		Share of "hyperactive" working population (ages 25-54 over 0+)	0+	EULFS	ACS	X	X	X
	Duration of stay	Distribution of less than 10 years vs. more than 10 years present	Ages 15-64	EULFS	ACS	X	X	SEW (2015)
		Distribution of less than 10 years vs. more than 10 years present. Also mean number of years for all migrants	Ages 15-64	EULFS	X	X	CLFS	X
		Region of birth of foreign born (upon ad-hoc request to Eurostat)	High-income versus low and medium-income countries of birth	EULFS	X	X	X	X
	Migrants with host-country nationality	Share of nationals among the foreign-born	15-64 foreign-born population, living in the country for at least 10 years	EULFS	ACS	X	X	SEW (2015)
	Foreign born status of responsible adult in household	Number of foreign-born households (All heads are foreign-born vs at least 1 head is foreign-born - Definitions A and B) Share of foreign-born households (definitions A and B)	Number of households	EULFS, 2013-14	ACS*	MLFS	X	X
	Household size	Average size of foreign-born households (definitions A and B)	Number of households	EULFS, 2013-14	ACS*	MLFS	X	X
	Household composition	Composition of foreign-born households (definitions A and B)						
		Sole person						
		More than 1 adult without children	Number of households	EULFS, 2013-14	ACS*	X	CLFS	X
		Single person with child(ren)						
		More than 1 adult with children						
Migration integration outcomes	Education & skills							
	Educational attainment	Low education (ISCED 0/2)	Ages 15-64 and excluding those currently in education or training	EULFS	ACS	MLFS	CLFS	SEW
		Medium education (ISCED 3/4)						
		High education (ISCED 5/6)						
	Educational attainment of EU and Non-EU migrants	Low education (ISCED 0/2)	Ages 15-64 and excluding those currently in education or training	EULFS, 2013-14	X	X	X	X
		Medium education (ISCED 3/4)						
		High education (ISCED 5/6)						
	Labor market outcomes							
	Employment status	Employment rate	Ages 15-64	EULFS	ACS	MLFS	CLFS	SEW
		Unemployment rate	Ages 15-64	EULFS	ACS	MLFS	CLFS	SEW
		Participation rate						
	Employment status by gender	Employment rate	Ages 15-64	EULFS	ACS	MLFS	CLFS	SEW
		Unemployment rate						
		Participation rate						
	Youth employment	Employment rate	Ages 15-34 and excluding those in education or training	EULFS	ACS	MLFS	CLFS	SEW
		Unemployment rate						
		Participation Rate						
	Employment status by place of birth (EU-28/Non-EU Breakdown)	Employment rate	Ages 15-64. No EU/non-EU distinction for Germany	EULFS, 2013-14				
		Unemployment rate						
		Participation rate						
	Employment status by education for recent and settled migrants	Resident duration by labour participation and education	Ages 15-64 and excluding those currently in education or training	EULFS, 2013-14	ACS	X	CLFS	SEW (2015)
		Resident duration by education	Ages 15-64 and excluding those currently in education or training	EULFS	X	X	X	X
		Resident duration by labour participation	Ages 15-64 and excluding those currently in education or training	EULFS	X	X	X	X
	Employment status by degree of urbanisation	Employment rate Participation rate	Ages 15-64	EULFS	CPS	MLFS	X	SEW
	Employment status by educational attainment	Employment rate Unemployment rate Participation rate	Ages 15-64 and excluding those in education or training	EULFS	ACS	MLFS	CLFS	SEW
	Labour sector	Agriculture, industry, and services sector rates	Ages 15-64	EULFS	ACS	MLFS	CLFS	SEW
	Duration of unemployment	Rate of those unemployed for more than 1 year and those less than 1 year	Ages 15-64	EULFS, 2013-14	CPS	X	X	SEW (2014)
		Percent with a permanent job/work contract of unlimited duration	Ages 15+	EUSILC, 2012-2014 for regional estimates, and 2014 for rural/urban estimates	X	X	X	X
Attitudes towards immigrants	Job quality							
	Job skills	Low	Ages 15-64 for employed people only (ilostat=1)	EULFS	ACS	X	CLFS	SEW
		Medium						
		High						
	Overqualification rate	Foreign born with "high" level of education & in low or medium skilled jobs	Ages 15-64 for employed people only (ilostat=1)	EULFS	ACS	X	CLFS	SEW
	Housing standards							
	Homeownership	Share of population that owns a house	All ages	EUSILC, 2014	X	X	X	X
	Overcrowded dwelling	Percent of adults living in overcrowding conditions	Ages 16+	EUSILC, 2014	X	X	X	X
	Deprived housing conditions	Percent of adults living in deprived housing conditions	Ages 16+	EUSILC, 2014	X	X	X	X
	Believes toward immigrants							
	Allow immigrants into the country	Percent of population that believes immigrants from poorer countries shouldn't be allowed into the country	Ages 15+	ESS, 2008-2013	X	X	X	X
		Percent of population that believes immigrants from different race/ethnic group shouldn't be allowed into the country						
		Percent of population that believes immigrants from same race/ethnic group shouldn't be allowed into the country						
	Believe that immigrants contribute positively to the country	Average of belief that immigrants enrich cultural life (from 0 to 10)	Ages 15+	ESS, 2008-2013	X	X	X	X
		Average of belief that immigrants make country better place to live (from 0 to 10)						
		Average of belief that immigration is good for country's economy (from 0 to 10)						
	Believe that place of residence is a good place to live for immigrants	Percent of people that believes their region is a good place to live for immigrants	Ages 15+	Gallup World Poll, 2008-2015	X	X	X	X

Table A.2. Top 20 regions (TL2) in terms of number of Non-EU foreign-born with less than 10 years of residence, 2015

Country	Region	Total	As percent of foreign-born	As percent of population
GBR	Greater London	752183	23.74	8.87
FRA	Ile de France	363344	14.44	3.02
ESP	Catalonia	288272	27.52	3.89
ITA	Lombardy	278198	24.00	2.79
GBR	South East England	265135	23.67	3.00
ESP	Madrid	240058	26.14	3.76
SWE	Stockholm	158016	28.10	7.31
ITA	Emilia-Romagna	156619	28.28	3.52
GBR	East of England	144261	20.20	2.41
GBR	North West England	137398	20.55	1.93
GBR	West Midlands	136730	19.90	2.40
ESP	Valencia	136688	18.73	2.76
FRA	Rhône-Alpes	135192	17.60	2.09
FRA	Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur	132625	14.81	2.67
IRL	Southern and Eastern	127078	22.07	3.77
ITA	Veneto	126027	21.93	2.56
BEL	Brussels-Capital Region	123230	23.94	10.30
ESP	Andalusia	121726	16.38	1.45
ITA	Lazio	117875	17.55	2.01
GBR	Yorkshire and The Humber	106368	21.22	1.99

Source: OECD database on immigrant integration at the regional level, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/region-data-en>.