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Another year now lies between us and the migration crisis of 2015/2016. Since then, the number of asylum applications has fallen continuously, by 44% compared to the previous year. However, the decline in asylum applications is no reason to stop focussing on migration to Europe. In addition to measures at the national level, we still need a close cooperation at the European level. At the same time, it is important to offer those people who receive international protection in Austria suitable framework conditions for successful integration. The goal is to support the migrants’ ability to support themselves as soon as possible and to enable them to participate actively and comprehensively in social life in Austria.

At the time when the number of asylum applications peaked in 2015/2016, Austria was one of the first European countries to react, and right from the start developed an integration strategy for those entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection. These measures have been continuously expanded over the years, for example, with the values and orientation courses as well as various in-depth courses of the Austrian Integration Fund. The legal foundation of government integration work is the Integration Act introduced in 2017 which, for the first time, created a comprehensive legal framework and precisely regulates the rights – and the duties – of immigrants in the field of integration. The integration structures established in Austria are viable, recognised and exemplary by European standards.

The great commitment of all players in integration is bearing fruit – as can be seen from the figures in this year’s Integration Report. For example, pupils with Syrian, Afghan or Iraqi citizenship, who are often listed as extraordinary pupils mainly due to a lack of language skills, were able to switch more often to regular classes. The intensive language courses and labour market qualification measures as well as the longer length of stay of those entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection in Austria are allowing them to slowly gain a foothold in the labour market.

At the same time, the challenges in the area of integration continue to exist and will still require considerable efforts in the future as well. For example, the unemployment rate for people from countries of origin of refugees is partially above 50%, with women being disproportionately affected by unemployment. In addition to government offers, however, it is also necessary for all immigrants to demonstrate individual responsibility and engagement in pursuing their opportunities in Austria and integrating themselves into the receiving society. Furthermore, the internalisation of Austrian values and norms as well as identification with the receiving country are of central importance. As places of education and orientation for children and young people, schools, in particular, are of great importance here; but at the same time, they are also places where social and cultural conflicts primarily come to light. Against this background, a common understanding of the constitutionally anchored values and fundamental attitudes in Austria is particularly important.
As part of the 2019 Integration Report, the Expert Council for Integration has been working for the second time on contextualising data from the legally-required integration monitoring. Together with the Statistical Yearbook “migration & integration 2019”, this year’s Integration Report of the Expert Council is mandatory reading for all integration policy stakeholders in Austria. The report thus forms the foundation for an evidence-based integration policy by illustrating and thematising relevant figures and data from the integration monitoring.

In addition, in this Integration Report, the Expert Council examines central integration policy issues that will require more attention, both now and in the future. They analyse relevant developments in complex and interdisciplinary areas of integration and provide important stimuli for future considerations and measures in integration work.

In conclusion, I would like to express my sincere thanks to the Expert Council for Integration and its Chairwoman, Univ.-Prof. Dr. Katharina Pabel, for the informative Integration Report 2019 and for the ongoing expertise they have provided. I look forward to the continued good cooperation between the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs and the Expert Council for Integration, and hope all our readers find this report insightful.

Mag. Alexander Schallenberg, LL.M.
Federal Minister for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs

Vienna, 2019
FOREWORD

by the Chairwoman of the Expert Council for Integration

With this present report, the Expert Council for Integration devotes itself to current developments in integration in Austria. The Expert Council is thus fulfilling the task assigned to it by the Integration Act.

The past year 2018 was again marked by a decline in immigration to Austria, and in particular by a decline in asylum seekers. However, this does not make integration policy less important. It just means the focus is shifting away from direct migration management towards longer-term integration work and regular integration of migrants living in Austria. At all administrative levels and in civil society, legally anchored, differentiated and sustainable structures have been established and measures taken in recent years to support the integration of migrants living in Austria for longer periods, along with persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection who have only recently come to Austria. This ensures the continuity of integration, also in view of predictability and reliability. At the same time, proven measures have been strengthened and further developed.

Even though the developments of the last two years have led to a decline in immigration figures to a level corresponding to the long-term average, it is necessary to further intensify efforts to integrate migrants. A decrease in the number of asylum applications does not mean a decrease in the number of migrants to be integrated. The economic and cultural integration of people who have recently migrated is a process that is currently taking place intensively, but it is far from completed. Integration requires not only the will and commitment of the immigrants as well as the support of the receiving society, but above all one thing: time. In addition, integration policy must not overlook people with a migrant background who have been living in Austria for some time already. Improving their opportunities to participate in education and the labour market still remains the objective of integration policies. Moreover, the sometimes precarious economic, demographic and security situation in the countries of the Near and Middle East as well as Africa makes it possible that migration flows to Europe will increase in the future, and possibly at a very quick pace.

For the first time, last year’s integration report was based on the integration monitoring which is anchored in the Integration Act. This year again, based on the integration monitoring, data will be summarised from the areas of asylum and residence, education, the labour market, welfare benefits as well as values and orientation courses from the 2018 calendar year, and then discussed and put into a holistic context by the Expert Council. For the first time, it is possible to make a comparison with the results of the previous year’s monitoring, and this enables detecting initial developments and certain trends. The integration monitoring data were submitted by the members of the Advisory Committee on Integration at the federal and province level, and made available to the Expert Council for Integration for further analysis. This legally established cooperation regarding relevant fig-
ures and data makes a significant contribution to the success of the annual Integration Report. Together with the national integration indicators of the Statistical Yearbook “migration & integration”, a clear and informative overall picture of integration trends can be drawn. Thus, important data material is available for all stakeholders in integration policy.

The integration monitoring data shows that immigrants are gradually integrating themselves into the regular structures. As far as the labour market is concerned, there are positive trends towards an increase in the number of employed and self-employed foreign nationals in Austria, including third-country nationals from Syria, Afghanistan and Iraq, the main countries of origin of recent refugees. On the one hand, this development is due to the increasing length of stay of the refugees who arrived mainly in 2015 and 2016. At the same time, however, the data also speak in favour of maintaining and further developing the promising approaches to integration work. Providing structural integration aimed at economic self-sufficiency at the earliest possible time benefits the migrants themselves most of all, but it also benefits the Austrian society as a whole. The second part of this report deals with the areas of life that are relevant for economic and cultural integration, and the challenges facing specific groups and the receiving society.

The Expert Council placed the thematic focus of this year’s Integration Report on dealing with different gender roles in family and society, the integration of young people and the possible effects of family reunification and marriage migration on the integration process. It becomes apparent that these topics are closely interlinked, as the question arises whether and how various cultural backgrounds influence a successful integration process.

A first chapter deals with the handling of different gender roles and their effects on women and girls, the family environment and society. Notably patriarchal ways of thinking and behaviour patterns on the part of immigrants, some of which are partly contrary to the principle of equal rights and thus bring with them the potential for social tensions, can represent a challenge in the integration process. In order to promote social development with a view to gender roles, work with and for immigrant men is particularly of great importance in addition to engagement with women, in order to progress sustainably and effectively towards equal rights for women and men in all areas of life.

The integration of young people, especially in the education system, is another thematic area to which this report pays particular attention. In this context, too, the Expert Council dealt with possible conflicts that may arise as a result of a tension between the culture of origin and the culture of the receiving country and, based on current studies, addressed the value patterns of these young people. The special motivation of young people with a migrant background in school, their absorption capacity when learning in general and their ability to master the German language quickly and well should be used for successful integration into Austrian society through effective support measures.

Another chapter discusses questions of family reunification and the phenomenon of marriage migration as well as their respective influence on the integration of migrants. Both forms of immigration initially have the potential to promote the integration of immigrants into the Austrian society but can also inhibit it. Integration policy must also look at the people who come to Austria in the course of family reunification and provide them with suitable integration opportunities, especially in the education system and in adult education and training. For a successful integration, however, it is equally necessary that these offers be accepted by the immigrants.
Religion is also addressed as an aspect of integration, because it is of central importance for social coexistence in Austria. In this respect, the Expert Council analyses the increasing diversity of religious beliefs and the concept of the separation of religion and state in Austria. The social understanding about possibilities and spaces for religious development as well as its limits appears central here. Two things become clear: Integration always includes a cultural dimension and thus more than just participation in the education system or the labour market, or mastery of the receiving country’s language. And conversely, integration into the education system or the labour market cannot succeed if the cultural dimension is not taken into account.

Since the publication of the last Integration Report, the Expert Council has received valuable support through the admission of three new members. We are pleased that Rasha Corti, Prof. Emina Saric, MA and Mag. Renate Winter will reinforce the Expert Council and contribute additional competencies and new perspectives to the work of the Expert Council, a fact which is already reflected in this year’s Integration Report. As Chairwoman of the Expert Council, my thanks go again this year to all the members of the Expert Council for Integration, the members of the Advisory Committee on Integration for the transmission of data in the course of the integration monitoring, and the Integration Coordination Department at the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs (BMEIA) for their outstanding and appreciative support over the past year.

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Katharina Pabel
Chairwoman of the Expert Council for Integration
Vienna, 2019
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In this chapter, the Expert Council fulfils its legal mandate to interpret and contextualise the data of the integration monitoring (Sections 18, 21 of the Integration Act). Following the first-time integration monitoring done for the Integration Report 2018, this year's Integration Report offers the opportunity for the first time to compare the figures with those of the previous year and to see the developments and trends. The integration monitoring creates a solid and broad data basis concerning essential aspects of integration in Austria and will enable the presentation and analysis of relevant developments in the future, especially with a multi-year comparison.
1 Integration monitoring
1.1 Immigration, asylum and residency
1.1 IMMIGRATION, ASYLUM AND RESIDENCY

In the EU, Austria is one of the countries with the highest proportion of migrants. On 1 January 2018 (last available data for the EU Member States), in the EU28 about 60 million people lived in a country other than their country of birth (first generation). This was 12% of the total population of the EU28. Of these, 22 million (4% of all 512 million inhabitants of the EU28) came from another EU Member State. A further 38 million (8%) came as migrants from a third country.¹

Luxembourg had the highest proportion of immigrants (first generation) in 2018 (46.5%), followed by Cyprus (21.0%), Austria (19.2%) and Sweden (18.5%). Whereas the Central and Eastern European countries, but also Finland, had very low proportions of first generation migrants, with Poland statistically the lowest at 1.8%.² In Luxembourg, Cyprus, Ireland, Malta, Austria and Slovakia more than half of the immigrants came from another EU Member State. In contrast, in the southern European countries as well as France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Scandinavia and the Baltic States, for example, there were more migrants from third countries than from EU Member States.

Proportion of population born abroad
In total and from EU28, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Born abroad</th>
<th>Born in another EU Member State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechia</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1.1.1 Source: Eurostat (2019), Population as at 7 June 2019; own presentation

¹ Eurostat (2019), Migration and migrant population statistics.
² This low value is due to a significant under-reporting of Ukrainian citizens in Poland. Poland issued around 2 million residence permits in 2015–2017 to non-EU persons, mostly from Ukraine.
The proportion of immigrants (first generation) in the population of an EU Member State is higher than the proportion of foreign nationals in the population, as many immigrants become citizens of the receiving country over time. As both the legal situation and the practice of naturalisation differ between the EU Member States, the proportions of foreign population cannot be readily used to draw conclusions about the actual level of immigration in recent years and decades. This explains why the proportion of foreign nationals in Austria’s population in 2018 was 15.8%, compared with only 8.8% in Sweden - a country that enables migrants to naturalise relatively quickly in an EU comparison. At the same time, low naturalisation rates mean that some of the children born in Austria come to the world with (exclusively) foreign citizenship and are therefore foreigners, but not first generation migrants.

For these reasons, the analysis of the population born abroad (first generation of immigrants; Fig. 1.1.1) – irrespective of citizenship – provides much better information about the main target group of integration policy. The education sector, where the everyday language of the pupils (irrespective of place of birth and citizenship) is in the foreground (see Chapter 1.2 – School, vocational training and adult education), needs to be looked at differently once again.

**Population growth in Austria essentially a consequence of immigration**

In the 1950s and 1960s, population growth in Austria was a consequence of a high birth surplus (baby boom). Immediately after World War II, during the phase of guest workers recruitment, and from the end of the 1980s until today, population growth was primarily due to immigration.

On an annual average in 2018, there were almost 1.5 million immigrants living in Austria (first generation, 17.2% of the total population) who were born abroad. These included 406,000 immigrants with Austrian citizenship and 1.09 million immigrants with foreign citizenship. Immigrants’ children born in Austria (i.e. the second immigrant generation) accounted for 530,000 persons or 6.1% of the total population. Of these, 337,000 possessed Austrian citizenship and 193,000 foreign citizenship. The group of immigrants of the first and second generation in 2018 together comprised 2.02 million people, including more women (1.05 million) than men (977,000). Of the immigrants living in Austria in 2018, 616,000 had immigrated before 2000, another 350,000 between 2000 and 2009, and a total of 527,000 since 2010. 649,000 came from another EU country, especially Germany. Most foreign EU citizens entered the country after 2000. 844,000 immigrants came from third countries, in particular Turkey, Serbia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina. The majority of them came to Austria before the year 2000.4

---

3 Predominantly naturalised immigrants, but also persons who were born abroad as Austrians.  
4 Statistik Austria (2019), Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund im Überblick (Jahresdurchschnitt 2018).
Compared to major countries of origin such as Germany or Turkey, immigrants from the Middle East and Asia still do not form a particularly large group of Austria’s resident population, despite the influx of refugees between 2014 and 2017. As of 1 January 2019, Syrians (49,800 persons) and Afghans (44,400 persons) form the ninth and tenth largest groups respectively of the foreign population in Austria. In quantitative terms, the role of immigration from Africa is almost non-existent in Austria. Nevertheless, the group of persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection continues to be the most important target group for integration policy measures. The indicators of their structural integration presented in the following chapters (e.g. in the field of education or on the labour market) underline this necessity.

Proportion of the population with a migrant background and Austrian citizenship
Annual average 2018; by country of birth of mother

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Austrian citizens</th>
<th>Foreign nationals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>743,000 (37%)</td>
<td>1,279,200 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>406,500 (27%)</td>
<td>1,086,100 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td>336,500 (64%)</td>
<td>193,200 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Yugoslavia (non-EU, total)</td>
<td>220,800 (41%)</td>
<td>311,600 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>119,000 (32%)</td>
<td>252,000 (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td>101,800 (63%)</td>
<td>59,600 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey (total)</td>
<td>156,800 (58%)</td>
<td>113,000 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>68,300 (44%)</td>
<td>87,200 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td>88,500 (77%)</td>
<td>25,900 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other third countries (total)</td>
<td>147,300 (35%)</td>
<td>278,000 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>94,100 (28%)</td>
<td>236,600 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td>53,100 (56%)</td>
<td>41,400 (44%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1.1.2 Source: Statistik Austria (2019): Migrationsgenerationen (gerundete Werte); own presentation

In the last 10 years, the number of persons not born in Austria (first generation) increased from 1.06 million in 2008 (12.9% of the total population) to 1.49 million in 2018 (17.2%). In the same period, the number of people born in the country with a migrant background (second generation) grew from 363,000 (4.4%) to 530,000 (6.1% of the total population). It is worth noting that the ratio between the first and second generations remained stable over the entire period. For every three immigrants (first generation) there is one person born in Austria with a migrant background (second generation).
Population with a migrant background in Austria
2008 – 2018, People in ‘000s

Fig. 1.1.3 Source: Statistik Austria (2019), Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund seit 2008; own presentation

Population with a migrant background in Austria
Annual average 2018

By nationality

By year of immigration

Fig. 1.1.4 Source: Statistik Austria (2019), Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund; own presentation
Development of foreign resident population in Austria
1961 – 1 Jan. 2019 (with change compared to 2018)

- Total foreign resident population
- Third-country nationals: non-European countries
- Third-country nationals: other countries in Europe (non-EU/EFTA)*
- EU/EFTA countries

Top 10 foreign nationalities in Austria as at 1 January 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>192,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>121,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>117,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>112,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>95,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>82,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>79,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>63,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>49,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>44,420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Immigration to Austria by citizenship of immigrants
2013 – 2018

- Austria
- EU members before 2004/EFTA
- EU accession states 2004
- EU accession states since 2007
- Former Yugoslavia (non-EU)
- Turkey
- Afghanistan/Iraq/Syria
- Other

Source: Statistik Austria (2019), Wanderungen mit dem Ausland (2013 – 2018); own presentation
Since a high percentage of immigrants also migrate abroad every year, net immigration is significantly lower. In 2018, a total of 146,856 people immigrated, compared with 111,555 emigrants in the same year. This brought net migration to 35,301 persons, the lowest figure since 2012. An immigration of 15,132 Austrians and an emigration of 19,848 Austrians in 2018, for instance, resulted in a net emigration of 4,716 Austrians. Similarly, the immigration of 3,860 persons from Afghanistan/Iraq/Syria was offset by a larger number of departures, not least as a result of the repatriation of refugees, which means that there was a net emigration of 779 persons from Afghanistan/Iraq/Syria. On the other hand, immigration from the EU and European third countries remained clearly positive, with the exception of Turkey, where for the first time in many years a net emigration of Turkish migrants has been recorded.

Austria’s migration balance with foreign countries
2013 – 2018

Fig. 1.1.8

Source: Statistik Austria (2019), Wanderungen mit dem Ausland (2013 – 2018); own presentation
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Asylum application numbers in Austria

An analysis of the countries of origin of foreign nationals newly immigrated to Austria shows that, in 2018, most of them – as in the years before – came from other EU states. In terms of numbers, the group of asylum seekers continued to lose importance compared to all other categories of immigration. In 2018, a total of 13,746 applications for international protection were lodged in Austria. These included 11,609 first-time applications. This corresponds to a decrease of -44% compared to 2017 (24,735 applications, 22,471 first-time applications). Already in 2017 there had been a decrease in asylum applications compared to the previous year (-41.5% compared to 2016).

Of all applications lodged in 2018, 2,137 or 15.5% came from persons who had already previously applied for asylum. Even the number of these repeat applications declined. However, their relative share has been increasing for several years; in 2015 only 2.9% were repeat applications.

Almost half of all asylum applications in Austria in 2018 were lodged by persons from three countries of origin. As before, the largest number of asylum seekers came from Syria (24.2%) and Afghanistan (15.4%). Asylum seekers from Iran were in third place with 8.1% (2017: seventh place). They were followed by asylum seekers from Russia (7.0%) and Iraq (5.5%). The number of Pakistani asylum seekers, who were third in 2017, fell to a total of 264 in 2018 (eleventh place) (Fig. 1.1.10).
The number of unaccompanied minor refugees decreased significantly from 1,352 in 2017 to 390 in 2018. Their share in the total number of asylum seekers also declined: from 5.5% (2017) to 2.8% (2018) of all asylum applications. As in 2017, in 2018 the largest number of unaccompanied minors were Afghans (2018: 41.8% or 163 persons).

As far as the age structure is concerned, in 2018 49% of all asylum applicants were younger than 18 (6,750), another 34% were between 18 and 34 years old (4,699) and only 16% between 35 and 64 years old (2,236). A very small number – 61 asylum seekers – were over 65 years old (1%).

The decline in the number of applications in Austria was seen for both sexes at about the same level. In 2018, as before, more asylum applications were lodged by men (8,297) than by women (5,449) (Fig. 1.1.12). The proportion of women among all asylum applications rose slightly from 39% (2017) to 40% (2018). In the three largest groups of origin, the share of women among asylum seekers differed already in 2017, and changed only slightly thereafter. While the proportion of female asylum seekers from Syria fell from 57% (2017) to 54%, it rose from 33% (2017) to 38% for women from Afghanistan. The proportion of women among Iranian asylum seekers also declined, namely from 46% (2017) to 41% (2018).
In 2018, asylum procedures were sped up at the Austrian Federal Office for Immigration and Asylum (BFA). Cases with asylum applications after 1 January 2018 were decided in 2018 within an average of 2.6 months. Including all older cases, the average duration of the procedures was 19.9 months. The fast-track procedures\(^6\) lasted 27 days on average in 2018. As a result, the Austrian Federal Office for Immigration and Asylum (BFA) also reduced the number of open procedures from over 32,000 at the end of 2017 to about 7,200 at the end of 2018.\(^7\)

---

**Asylum applications in Austria by sex**

2018; compared to previous year

![Graph showing asylum applications by sex in 2017 and 2018](image)

**Fig. 1.1.12** Source: Integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation

---

**Decisions on international protection in Austria**

In total, more than 57,200 legally binding decisions were taken in 2018 (2017: approx. 66,300). Of the 20,809 positive decisions, 14,696 decisions were for asylum, 4,191 for subsidiary protection and a further 1,922 for other humanitarian residence titles. In total, 39% of all decisions on international protection were legally positive in 2018 (2017: 51%). The total number of decisions to grant international protection declined in 2018, not least due to a decline in the number of applications compared to 2017 (see Fig. 1.1.13).

---

**Decisions on international protection in Austria**

2006 – 2018

![Graph showing decisions on international protection 2006-2018](image)

**Fig. 1.1.13** Source: BMI (2019), Asylstatistik 2006 – 2018; Integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation

---

\(^6\) “A fast-track procedure is an accelerated procedure. It is used when a person from a safe country of origin lodges an asylum application. Safe countries of origin are countries in which no political persecution or inhuman or degrading punishments take place. These include Kosovo, Montenegro, Serbia, but also Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and all EU Member States. The safe countries of origin are determined by the Federal Government by ordinance.” BFA (2017), Asylverfahren in Österreich, p. 18.

\(^7\) BMI, internal query.
In a European comparison, Austria once again came first in 2018 with 168 asylum recognitions per 100,000 inhabitants in proportion to its population (2017: 237). Luxembourg (157) and Greece (119) ranked second and third respectively. In 2018, compared to previous years, the composition of the group of states, from which most asylum seekers and persons who were granted legally valid asylum or subsidiary protection in Austria came from, changed slightly, and the ranking shifted somewhat. In 2018 the ranking was Afghanistan, Syria and Iran, while in 2017 it was Syria, Afghanistan and Iraq. Nationals from Afghanistan, with 4,979 asylum grants, accounted for 34% of all legally valid asylum grants in 2018 (2017: 20%), a further 34% of legally valid asylum grants (4,951) related to Syrian nationals (2017: 54%) and 9% (1,370) to Iranian nationals (2017: 6%). A total of 2,062 Afghan citizens received subsidiary protection in 2018, which accounted for 49% of all cases of subsidiary protection in Austria (2017: 46%). Somali (665 or 16%; 2017: 14%) and Iraqi nationals (536 or 13%; 2017: 15%) ranked second and third, respectively.

European comparison of flight and asylum

In the EU28 the number of first-time asylum applications in 2018 was 586,100, which was 68,600 or -10.5% lower than in 2017 (654,600 first-time applications). Germany recorded the highest number of first-time asylum applications in absolute figures in 2018 (161,885), followed by France (111,415) and Greece (64,975). Austria, which still ranked seventh in 2017, now ranks tenth with 11,390 first-time applications for international protection, behind Sweden and Belgium.

Austria ranks ninth in terms of asylum applications in proportion to its population (1.5 applications per 1,000 inhabitants), while Cyprus (9.0 per 1,000 inhabitants) and Greece (6.2 per 1,000 inhabitants) are in first and second place, followed by Malta (4.5 per 1,000 inhabitants), Luxembourg (3.9 per 1,000 inhabitants) and Germany (2.2 per 1,000 inhabitants).

In the EU28 the top 3 countries of origin of asylum seekers remained the same in 2018 compared to 2017. However, the positions shifted. Syria remained in first place with 83,720 (13.0%) (2017: 15.7%), followed by Afghanistan with 45,920 and 7.1% (2017: 6.7%; third place) almost on a par with Iraq with 44,735 and 6.9% respectively (2017: 7.3%; second place). In Austria, on the other hand, the constellation of the top 3 countries of origin in 2018 was somewhat different from the EU average (see Fig. 1.1.14).

Main countries of origin of asylum seekers
Comparison EU28 – Austria, 2018

In Austria, the top 3 countries of origin of asylum seekers remained the same as in 2018, with Afghanistan leading at 15.3%, followed by Syria at 24.7% and Iran at 8.2%.

---

8 Eur ostat (2019), Final decisions; First instance decisions; Population on 1 January.
9 A total of 13,746 asylum applications were lodged in Austria in 2018, 84.5% of which were first-time applications.
10 Eurostat (2019), asylum applicants and first-time asylum applicants by citizenship, age and sex. Annual aggregated data (rounded).
Settlement and residence in Austria

In the settlement and residence area¹¹ a total of almost 166,800 residence titles (including renewals and changes of purpose) were issued in 2018. This corresponds to an increase of +8% compared to the almost 154,100 residence titles issued in 2017. These figures include all residence titles issued in Austria in one calendar year, i.e. initial permits as well as extensions and changes in the purpose of the residence titles.

Of particular importance for integration policy is the number of residence titles granted for the first time, which provides information on the immigration of third-country nationals. In 2018, approx. 23,600 immigrants from third countries received a residence title for the first time in Austria (2017: approx. 23,900).¹²

The significant increase in the (highly) qualified segment is particularly noteworthy. The application figures for the Red-White-Red – Card (+76%) and the Blue Card EU (+71%) show considerable growth, although the absolute number of applications is still low compared to other residence titles. In 2018, almost 1,500 more Red-White-Red – Cards were issued than in 2017 (2017: 2,020; 2018: 3,561) (Fig. 1.1.15).

¹¹ This only includes the right of settlement and residence, but not the status of "entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection".
Another interesting aspect in the area of settlement and residence is the distribution of citizenships among the applicants. Compared to 2017, the top ten citizenships of the applicants did not change in their composition in the last year, but only slightly as regards to their order. Thus, citizens of Turkey (34,178 applications, +7%), Bosnia and Herzegovina (29,200 applications, +12%) and Serbia (28,744 applications, +18%) continued to be the three groups with the highest number of applications in 2018. The largest increase could be observed last year among nationals of North Macedonia (7,021 applications, +21%).

**Top 10 nationalities for all residence titles issued**
2018 (with change compared to previous year)

![Top 10 nationalities for all residence titles issued](image)

Source: Integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation
1.2 School, vocational training and adult education
Proportion of foreign pupils as well as pupils with non-German everyday language in Austria and Vienna by type of school in the school year 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Foreign pupils in Austria</th>
<th>Non-German everyday language in Austria</th>
<th>Foreign pupils in Vienna</th>
<th>Non-German everyday language in Vienna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in Austria</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General secondary schools</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New secondary schools</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs schools</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic schools</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate vocational schools</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic secondary schools</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational schools</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher vocational schools</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1.2.10 / * Participants are all persons who participated in a course for at least one day during the observation period (1 September 2017 – 31 August 2018). A person can also participate in several courses and will then be counted once for each participation. Source: Integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation

Participation in the Austrian Initiative for Adult Education* by nationality, 1 September 2017 – 31 August 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU before 2004</td>
<td>115 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU since 2004</td>
<td>516 (4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stateless and unknown</td>
<td>1,428 (11.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1,545 (12.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third countries</td>
<td>8,663 (70.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1.2.13 Source: Integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation

Sex ratio of participants in values and orientation courses 2018 (with percentage point change compared to previous year)

- Women: 45.3% (+12.8)
- Men: 54.7% (-12.8)

Total number of participants: 19,354

Pupils at all schools under the responsibility of the Austrian Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research (BMBWF)* by nationality and status in the school year 2017/18

- Austrian citizens
- Foreign nationals

Fig. 1.2.4 / * The data disclosed by the Austrian Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research (BMBWF) in the course of integration monitoring pursuant to Art. 21 (2) (5-8) IntG refer to schools under the responsibility of the BMBWF (private schools, agricultural and forestry schools as well as schools in health care do not fall under the responsibility of the BMBWF). Source: Integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation
Development of the number of pupils

In the school year 2017/2018 there were a total of 1,132,367 pupils in Austria. The majority attended public schools (1,015,100 or 89.6%). Only 117,270 or 10.4% of all pupils attended private schools. The proportion of private pupils was highest in Vienna with 18.2%, followed by Salzburg (11.5%) and Burgenland (10.0%). In all other federal provinces, the share was below the national average.13

Development of the number of pupils with non-German everyday language

From the point of view of integration policy, everyday language14 is an essential indicator for the school sector. It is noticeable that in Austria the proportion of pupils who speak a language other than the language of instruction at home is disproportionately high compared to the EU or OECD average. Moreover, a comparison between the member states of the EU and the OECD as a whole and Austria shows a clear difference in the change of the everyday language of pupils from the first to the second generation. While the share of pupils with a different everyday language decreases in the EU or OECD average from about 60% to about 40% within one generation (i.e. by one third), their share in Austria decreases only slightly from the first to the second generation from 77% to 73%. This means that in Austria, among both - newly immigrated pupils and those children who already live in the country in the second generation -, a language other than German is spoken in almost equal proportions at home (77% in the first generation, 73% in the second generation).

The proportion of pupils with non-German everyday language increased by 0.7 percentage points between the school year 2016/2017 and the school year 2017/2018, and totalled 26% in the school year 2017/2018 (Fig. 1.2.1). The increases as well as the overall share were distributed differently throughout Austria. The highest increases were recorded in Upper Austria with +1.3 percentage points and in Vienna and Carinthia with +0.7 percentage points each. With 51.9%, the majority of pupils with non-German everyday language went to school in Vienna, followed by Vorarlberg (26.4%), Upper Austria and Salzburg (21.9% each).

The proportion of pupils with an everyday language other than German differs greatly according to school type. It was highest in 2017/2018 in special needs schools with a 38.0% average throughout Austria and with 61.8% in Vienna (as the federal province with the highest proportion of pupils with non-German everyday language), followed by polytechnic schools with 34.4% in Austria and 72.5% in Vienna. This is followed by new secondary schools with 31.8% (Vienna: 74.5%) and primary schools (Austria: 30.8%; Vienna: 58.8%). The lowest proportion of young people with an everyday language other than German was in sports academies (Austria: 3.5%; Vienna: 3.1%) and in vocational schools (Austria: 18.7%; Vienna 47.4%).

14 It should be noted at the outset that publicly accessible data primarily via the categories of “citizenship” and “non-German everyday language” provide integration policy-relevant indicators of a possible migrant background. Of course, this does not mean that all children and young people who speak a language other than German in their daily environment are not also proficient in the German language. However, it can be seen from these data that the educational behaviour of children socialised in everyday German differs from that of children socialised in other languages.
The fact that polytechnic schools (as well as general secondary schools and new secondary schools), in contrast to schools leading to a school leaving examination, have a comparatively high proportion of pupils with non-Austrian citizenship or non-German everyday language may be an indication that the transition from compulsory schooling to schools leading to a school leaving examination or apprenticeship is more difficult for young people with a migrant background than for those without. Their disproportionately high share of pupils in special needs schools also points to the difficulties that children and young people with a migrant background have in finding their way into the regular school system and succeeding there. Against this background, measures that strengthen the German language skills of children and young people (above all early language support in kindergarten, German support in schools) are all the more important.
### Percentage of pupils with non-German everyday language in all school types* in the school year 2017/18 (with change compared to previous year)

- **Pupils with German everyday language**
- **Pupils with non-German everyday language**

**Austria**
- (-0.7%)
  - 74.0% 824,021
  - 26.0% 289,652 (+3.1%)

**Vienna**
- (+0.6%)
  - 48.1% 113,897
  - 51.9% 122,672 (+3.4%)

**Vorarlberg**
- (-0.2%)
  - 73.6% 40,111
  - 26.4% 14,385 (+/- 0.0%)

**Upper Austria**
- (-1.6%)
  - 78.1% 153,158
  - 21.9% 42,822 (+6.3%)

**Salzburg**
- (-0.9%)
  - 78.1% 59,364
  - 21.9% 16,642 (+1.8%)

**Tyrol**
- (-0.1%)
  - 82.4% 79,768
  - 17.6% 17,036 (+1.2%)

**Styria**
- (-0.6%)
  - 82.9% 121,662
  - 17.1% 25,049 (+1.8%)

**Burgenland**
- (-0.5%)
  - 82.9% 28,665
  - 17.1% 5,900 (+2.6%)

**Lower Austria**
- (-0.9%)
  - 83.0% 167,701
  - 17.0% 34,280 (+2.3%)

**Carinthia**
- (-1.6%)
  - 84.6% 59,695
  - 15.4% 10,866 (+4.0%)

* These data are based on the pupils’ first indication of his/her characteristic “language(s) used in everyday life” within the framework of data collection for school statistics according to the Education Documentation Act (BilDokG), irrespective of whether German was also indicated as other language(s) used in everyday life. – Without schools and academies in health care. - Without pilot project “New Secondary School” at academic secondary schools (AHS). - Including pupils who are taught in other schools according to the curriculum of a special needs school.

**Development of the number of pupils by nationality**

Around 175,000 or 15.5% of all pupils had foreign citizenship in the school year 2017/2018.15 111,700 or 2/3 of the foreign pupils had the citizenship of a European country (without Turkey).16 The largest single group of non-Austrian pupils were Germans (16,300), followed by Turkish pupils (15,300), pupils with citizenship of Serbia or Montenegro (14,200) and Bosnia and Herzegovina (10,200).

15 The numbers of pupils broken down by citizenship do not include some smaller types of schools, such as other academic (statutory) schools, federal sports academies and schools and academies in the health sector. The number of pupils reduced by these school types amounted to 1,099,214 pupils in the school year 2017/2018.

16 This includes: EU28 (excluding Austria), EFTA states, associated small states, Albania, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Moldova, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Russian Federation, Serbia and Ukraine.
Depending on the type of school, the proportion of foreign pupils varies considerably. It is highest in special needs schools (23.1%), followed by polytechnic schools (22.3%). It is lowest in academic secondary schools (11.4%) and in higher vocational schools (10.4%).

Compared to 2016/2017, the number of foreign pupils increased in all school types in the school year 2017/2018, while the number of domestic pupils decreased. As a result, the proportion of foreign pupils rose by one percentage point to 15.8% compared to the school year 2016/2017. The lowest increase was recorded by higher vocational schools with 0.5 percentage points, the highest by special needs schools with 2.0 percentage points.

A look at the ten most common nationalities of foreign pupils in Austria shows a small decrease in the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina (-2.9%) and Turkey (-0.3%) and an increase in foreign pupils with other nationalities. The total number of pupils with Syrian, Afghan and Iraqi citizenship increased in part significantly in 2017/2018 compared to the previous school year. The number of pupils with Syrian citizenship grew most strongly in 2017/2018 at +37.4%. With a total of 10,342 Syrians enrolled in school, the group was already ahead of pupils with Bosnian citizenship.

### Top 10 foreign nationalities of pupils in the school year 2017/18 (with change compared to previous year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>16,333</td>
<td>+4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>15,343</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>12,141</td>
<td>+10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>12,123</td>
<td>+13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>10,342</td>
<td>+37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>10,241</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>9,453</td>
<td>+12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>9,222</td>
<td>+1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>8,163</td>
<td>+4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>7,864</td>
<td>+11.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation

### Extraordinary pupils in the school year 2017/2018

For pupils who are unable to follow lessons due to a lack of knowledge of the language of instruction or other factors, the status “extraordinary pupil” can be assigned following a standardised test procedure. Classification as extraordinary (“ao.”) pupil is allowed for a maximum of two years. Extraordinary pupils with insufficient knowledge of the language of instruction receive intensive language training during this period based on an individual curriculum, but at the same time attend regular classes in selected subjects (e.g. sports, art, music, etc.) depending on specific and organisational requirements. After the first half of the year in such a German support class, the language level is re-evaluated. Depending on the language level achieved, the student can then enter the regular class with a supplementary German training course for a maximum of two years or switch to regular classes with the status of “regular pupil”. In the school year 2017/2018, the proportion of extraordinary pupils remained constant compared with the previous year at 4.1% or 45,310 persons. As in the school year 2016/2017, foreign pupils accounted for the majority of extraordinary pupils (72.4%).

---

The three most frequent foreign nationalities in absolute numbers of extraordinary pupils in 2017/2018 remained Syria (6,062), Afghanistan (3,750) and Romania (2,680), as in the previous year. Although the number of extraordinary pupils with Syrian citizenship continued to rise, their relative share decreased as many were able to switch to the group of regular pupils. While in the school year 2016/2017 74.2% of all pupils with Syrian citizenship still had an extraordinary status, this proportion fell to 58.6% (-15.6 percentage points) within one school year. Similarly, sharp declines in the proportions of extraordinary pupils within one nationality could be observed in 2017/2018 among Afghan (39.7%; -13.5 percentage points) and Iraqi (48.8%; -17.4 percentage points) students.

In 2017/2018 (compared to 2016/2017), the number of ordinary pupils increased by +120.2% for Syrians, +45.3% for Afghans and +67.4% for Iraqis. In contrast, the number of extraordinary pupils increased only slightly among Syrians (+8.6%), while it fell by -15.7% for Afghans and by -18.5% for Iraqis.
Pupils by nationality
in the school year 2017/18 (with change compared to previous year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Ordinary pupils</th>
<th>Extraordinary pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>1,944 (+120.2%)</td>
<td>4,280 (+8.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>3,924 (+45.3%)</td>
<td>6,062 (+67.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>821 (+74.5%)</td>
<td>1,312 (-18.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1.2.6
Source: Integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation

Pupils in language training by school type
and federal province in the school year 2017/2018

Against this background and in view of the pupils’ further education and career paths, language training is of great importance for the integration of children and young people with an everyday language other than German. In the school year 2017/2018, there were 40,550 pupils in language training throughout Austria, almost the same number as in the previous year. By far the largest proportion of pupils in language training (31,331) was in primary schools. In the school year 2017/2018, the majority of the pupils receiving language support was in beginners’ language training groups (74.5%). The remaining 25.5% attended language courses.

Pupils in language training in Austria by school type
in the school year 2017/18

31,331
6,550
479
1,755
435

Fig. 1.2.7
Source: Integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation
German support classes and German training courses since the beginning of the school year 2018/19

Since autumn 2018, pupils in compulsory general schools as well as in intermediate and higher schools who are classified as extraordinary pupils due to a lack of knowledge of the language of instruction have been taught in German support classes and German training courses. German support classes have their own curricula; they take place at primary level in the amount of 15 hours per week and at lower secondary level in the amount of 20 hours. At each school location at least eight pupils can be taught for a maximum of four semesters. In less language-intensive subjects such as sports, music and art education, the pupils of the German support class are taught together with pupils of the regular class. If pupils can follow the lessons to some extent, but still need additional support, they are admitted to the regular class as extraordinary pupils and receive German training courses. In these courses, a minimum of eight pupils are taught six hours a week over a maximum period of two years. Of the 9,761 children throughout Austria who started in a German support class in autumn 2018, 1,524 (16%) were able to switch to regular classes after one semester. It remains to be seen how the transfer rate will develop after the phase of the original roll-out. Already now the necessity of this particular measure is apparent, since the catching-up needed in German language is so great for some pupils that it cannot be compensated within one semester. It is not only in Austria that such language support classes have been introduced. A report published by the European Commission shows that particularly those countries which, like Austria, have taken in many refugees in recent years (e.g. Sweden, Denmark, Germany) have introduced "preparatory classes"/language support classes.

20 European Commission (2017), Key Data on Teaching Languages at School in Europe. Eurydice Report.
Vocational training (apprenticeships)

In 2018, a total of around 108,000 people were in apprenticeships in Austria, a slight increase on the previous year. The vast majority of them (87.2%) were Austrian citizens. However, the number of apprentices with foreign citizenship increased to 13,849 compared to the previous year, while the number of Austrian apprentices declined slightly.

The ten most frequently represented foreign citizenships among apprentices remained the same in 2018 as in 2017. However, the number of apprentices increased to varying degrees for different nationalities, which changed the ranking. Of the total of 13,849 apprentices with foreign citizenship, 5,228 were EU nationals and 8,621 third-country nationals. In 2018, among EU nationals, 3,105 apprentices from EU Member States since 2004 predominated, compared with 2,123 apprentices from EU Member States before 2004. With 3,053 apprentices, persons with citizenship of a country of the former Yugoslavia (non-EU) formed the largest group of third-country nationals.

Adult education

The Austrian Initiative for Adult Education set up by the federal government together with the provinces serves the purpose of catching up on basic educational levels free of charge even after completion of school-based training and is divided into the areas of basic education/basic competences and compulsory school leaving certification. The target group is both young people and adults.

In 2017/2018, participation in the offers of this initiative rose by +16.1% to 12,267 persons compared to 2016/2017, with the distribution between Austrian, other EU and third-country nationals remaining approximately the same. Between 1 September 2017 and 31 August 2018, Afghan nationals continued to be the most frequent participants in the Austrian Initiative for Adult Education. Compared to the previous period, the number of Afghan course

Development of the number of apprentices by nationality 2018; compared to previous year

Participation in the Austrian Initiative for Adult Education* by nationality, 1 September 2017 – 31 August 2018

* Participants are all persons who participated in a course for at least one day during the observation period (1 September 2017 – 31 August 2018). A person can also participate in several courses and will then be counted once for each participation.

More information at https://www.initiative-erwachsenbildung.at/initiative-erwachsenbildung/was-ist-das/
participants rose by +17.8% from 3,449 to 4,064. In second and third place among participants from third countries were Syrians with 1,267 and Turks with 546 persons. For nationals from Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria (i.e. the main countries of origin of refugees who have come to Austria since 2015), the number of participants in the basic education courses fell slightly, while there was a sharp increase in the number of participants in the courses to complete compulsory school-leaving certification.

Values and orientation courses

With the entry into force of the Integration Act in June 2017, a number of integration obligations were introduced for persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection. In addition to signing an integration declaration, attendance and participation in German language courses as well as in values and orientation courses (WOK) became mandatory.

The concept of values and orientation courses was developed at the suggestion of the Expert Council for Integration within the framework of the 50 Action Points for integration (2015). Central themes of the courses concern the fundamental values of the Austrian constitution such as equal rights for men and women, human dignity, the separation of religion and state, democracy, freedom of expression and the rule of law. The courses also convey basic knowledge about the functioning mechanisms of the Austrian state and its institutions, but also about education, work and economy, health, housing and neighbourhood as well as information about the principles of living together in Austria and the role of voluntary work for a prosperous coexistence.
The values and orientation courses are designed for persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection as well as asylum seekers admitted to the procedure with a high probability of remaining from the age of 15 onwards. In the courses held in German, interpreters for the most common languages of origin, such as Arabic or Farsi/Dari, are available for participants with little or no knowledge of German. The values and orientation courses have been offered throughout Austria by the Austrian Integration Fund (ÖIF) since 2015. The quality of the values and orientation courses is evaluated, among other things, by interviewing the participants and external assessment. The knowledge gained is continuously incorporated into the further development and optimisation of the existing range of courses.

In 2018, the Austrian Integration Fund (ÖIF) conducted a total of 1,315 values and orientation courses for around 19,354 participants throughout Austria. If one looks at the five most strongly represented nationalities among the participants, no changes can be observed compared to the previous year. Syrians (7,776), Afghans (5,372) and Iraqis (1,556) are still the three largest participant groups. It is noteworthy, however, that the number of Somali participants has increased (+211); they are now the fourth largest group, ahead of Iranians.

A gender-specific analysis of the participants shows that there has been an increase in the proportion of women. The proportion of female course participants increased by +12.8 percentage points from 32.5% in 2017 to 45.3% (8,761 women) in 2018. The Austrian Integration Fund (ÖIF) is thus increasingly reaching women who, on the one hand, are informed about further integration offers for themselves and their families in the courses and, on the other hand, gain a better understanding of the organisational structures of Austrian society. As multipliers in their families and communities, women thus improve not only their own integration opportunities but also those of their families.

The range of values and orientation courses was further expanded in 2018. In addition to the compulsory course formats, the Austrian Integration Fund (ÖIF) also offers in-depth courses on specific topics (e.g. work and employment, women, youth, etc.) and tailor-made counselling formats for women and men.

### Top 5 nationalities of participants in values and orientation courses 2018 (with change compared to previous year)

- **Somalia**: 1,336 (+18.8%)
- **Iraq**: 1,206 (-23.8%)
- **Afghanistan**: 5,372 (-23.0%)
- **Syria**: 7,776 (-19.3%)
- **Iran**: 1,336 (+18.8%)
- **Other**: 2,108 (-4.1%)

### Sex ratio of participants in values and orientation courses 2018 (with percentage point change compared to previous year)

- **Men**: 54.7% (-12.8)
- **Women**: 45.3% (+12.8)

Total number of participants: 19,354

---

Fig. 1.2.12 Source: Integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation

Fig. 1.2.13 Source: Integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation
1.3 Labour market
Registered unemployed and jobseekers in training 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>In training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austrains</td>
<td></td>
<td>255,026</td>
<td>216,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38,778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU citizens</td>
<td>45,152</td>
<td>37,559</td>
<td>7,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which from EU states before 2004</td>
<td>11,115</td>
<td>9,516</td>
<td>1,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which from EU accession states since 2004</td>
<td>34,038</td>
<td>28,043</td>
<td>5,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFTA citizens</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-country nationals</td>
<td>80,396</td>
<td>58,068</td>
<td>22,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which persons entitled to asylum</td>
<td>26,336</td>
<td>14,815</td>
<td>11,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which persons entitled to subsidiary protection</td>
<td>5,427</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>2,826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered unemployed by nationality 2018

- Foreign nationals: 95,859 (31%)
- Austrian citizens: 216,248 (69%)

Unemployment rate by nationality
Annual average 2018 (with change in percentage points compared to previous year)

- Austria: 6.7% (-0.8)
- Foreign countries: 11.3% (-1.2)
- Third countries: 16.4% (-1.4)
- EU countries before 2004: 6.3% (-0.7)
- EU accession states 2004: 6.4% (-0.8)
- Germany: 5.8% (-0.7)
- Turkey: 16.8% (-1.8)
- Serbia: 29.5% (-4.8)
- Bosnia and Herzegovina: 11.4% (-1.9)
- Romania: 11.2% (-1.3)
- Bulgaria: 14.4% (-1.3)
- Poland: 10.0% (-1.2)
- Croatia: 12.5% (-2.1)
- Russian Federation: 30.0% (-3.4)
- Afghanistan: 29.6% (-7.2)
- Iraq: 39.2% (-10.9)
- Syria: 50.9% (-10.9)
The labour market developed positively in 2018 due to the good economic situation. The annual average number of employees increased by 58,600 or +1.4% to 4,319,100 as compared with 2017. These included 465,100 self-employed workers (+0.02%) and 3,800,600 people in employment (+67,400 or +1.8%). Unemployment decreased by 27,900 (-8.2%) to 312,000 while the rate of unemployment fell from 8.5% to 7.7%.

Both Austrian and foreign workers benefit from the improved situation on the labour market. The number of foreign nationals working as employees for instance rose by 54,400 (+7.8%) while the number for Austrians rose by 31,800 (+1.1%). The largest increase was in the number of employees from EU/EFTA countries (+36,200 or +8.6%), followed by third-country nationals (+18,200 or +6.6%). Recent asylum seekers who have been granted asylum or subsidiary protection have also gained a stronger foothold in the labour market. The number of Syrian employees increased by +73% to 6,700 employees, the number of Somalis by +65% to 1,200 employees, the number of Iraqis by +47% to 1,900 employees, the number of Afghans by +39% to 8,400 employees and the number of Iranians by +22% to 3,900 employees. This is due both to the increasing length of stay among refugees who primarily arrived in the country between 2014-2016 and to the positive conclusion of asylum procedures in recent times.

### Employed and self-employed persons

#### Annual average 2017 and 2018, by nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Employed persons</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Self-employed persons</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Change to previous year</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Change to previous year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2,956,785</td>
<td>2,988,592</td>
<td>31,807</td>
<td>+1.1%</td>
<td>371,551</td>
<td>371,131</td>
<td>-420</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU countries before 2004</td>
<td>134,757</td>
<td>142,211</td>
<td>7,454</td>
<td>+5.5%</td>
<td>14,173</td>
<td>14,786</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>+4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU accession states 2004</td>
<td>194,753</td>
<td>211,400</td>
<td>16,647</td>
<td>+8.5%</td>
<td>40,148</td>
<td>38,320</td>
<td>-1,828</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria and Romania</td>
<td>60,061</td>
<td>68,614</td>
<td>8,553</td>
<td>+14.2%</td>
<td>33,542</td>
<td>35,011</td>
<td>1,469</td>
<td>+4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>28,054</td>
<td>31,404</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>+11.9%</td>
<td>5,163</td>
<td>5,908</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>+14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFTA</td>
<td>3,189</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>+5.0%</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third countries of which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>3,854</td>
<td>6,677</td>
<td>2,823</td>
<td>+73.2%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>+66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>+46.9%</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>3,881</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>+21.7%</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>+23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>6,053</td>
<td>8,394</td>
<td>2,341</td>
<td>+38.7%</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>+45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>+64.5%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+54.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Labour market database of the Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs, Health and Consumer Protection (BMASGK) (2019), Budget, Labour Market and Beneficiary Information System (Ball), own presentation

---

22 Statistik Austria (2019), Erwerbstätige.
23 National calculation method.
Registered unemployed and jobseekers in training 2018

In 2018 an annual average of 312,107 persons were registered with the Austrian Public Employment Service (AMS) as unemployed persons with immediate availability, which is 27,868 (-8.2%) less than the annual average for 2017. There were also 68,739 people in training who were not immediately available for the labour market. The number of registered jobseekers who were in training also decreased by 3,359 as compared with 2017 (-4.7%).

The proportion of foreign nationals among the registered unemployed was 30.7% (2018) which was therefore slightly higher than in 2017 (29.2%), partly because there were more recognised refugees on the labour market. With respect to training participants, at 43.6% the proportion of foreigners was higher than in 2017 (41.2%), and was also higher than among unemployed persons with immediate availability.

The number of registered unemployed Austrians fell by 24,376 (-10.1%) to 216,248 in 2018 compared with the previous year, while the fall in the number of registered unemployed foreign nationals was significantly less at just 3,492 (-3.5%) to 95,859. However, this is still consistent with the slight increase in the proportion of registered foreign unemployed persons as a share of the total registered unemployed, as unemployment among Austrians fell significantly more sharply over the same period while the supply of foreign labour increased.

The situation among training participants is a little more complex. The number of Austrian training participants decreased by 3,601 (-8.5%) to 38,778 in 2018, while the number of foreign participants increased by 242 (+0.8%) to 29,960.
Registered unemployed 2018 (with change compared to previous year)

- Austrian citizens: 240,624 (−10.1%) in 2017, 216,248 (−3.5%) in 2018
- Foreign nationals: 99,351 in 2017, 95,859 in 2018
- Total: 339,976 (−8.2%) in 2017, 312,107 (−3.5%) in 2018

Registered jobseekers in training 2018 (with change compared to previous year)

- Austrian citizens: 42,379 in 2017, 29,719 (−10.1%) in 2018
- Foreign nationals: 29,719 (−3.5%) in 2017, 29,960 (−0.8%) in 2018
- Total: 72,098 (−4.7%) in 2017, 68,739 (−3.5%) in 2018

Registered unemployed and jobseekers in training 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>In training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austrians</td>
<td>255,026</td>
<td>216,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU citizens</td>
<td>45,152</td>
<td>37,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which from EU states before 2004</td>
<td>11,115</td>
<td>9,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which from EU accession states since 2004</td>
<td>34,038</td>
<td>28,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFTA citizens</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-country nationals</td>
<td>80,396</td>
<td>58,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which persons entitled to asylum</td>
<td>26,336</td>
<td>14,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which persons entitled to subsidiary protection</td>
<td>5,427</td>
<td>2,601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation
Of the 95,859 registered foreign unemployed persons, 37,791 or just under 39.4% came from an EU/EFTA country and 60.6% from a third country. Among the foreign training participants, the proportion of individuals from third countries was significantly higher at 74.5%. Of the 80,396 third-country nationals registered as jobseekers in 2018, an annual average of 28% (22,328) were undergoing training that year. Two thirds of all training participants from third countries were entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection, while the share of these as a proportion of the unemployed from third countries immediately available for the labour market was just under one third (17,417). Among those persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection, both the number of unemployed who were capable of being placed into work immediately rose on average in 2018 (by +1,387 or +8.7% compared with 2017) as did the number of training participants (+1,194 or +9.1% compared with 2017). The trend from recent years continues to apply as a whole to this target group. The unemployment figures for recognised refugees do not yet take into account the falling number of asylum applications over the last two years. Between 500 and 1,100 new persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection registered as unemployed actually entered the labour market on average each month last year. This trend is expected to continue.

**Registered unemployed by nationality**

2018 (with change compared to previous year)

**Registered jobseekers in training by nationality**

2018 (with change compared to previous year)
Unemployment rate by nationality
annual average 2018

In 2018 the unemployment rate for Austrians was 6.7% (2017: 7.5%) and 11.3% for foreign nationals (2017: 12.5%). Third-country nationals were relatively more likely to be unemployed (16.4%) than foreign EU citizens (EU prior to 2004: 6.3%; EU accession 2004: 6.4%). The unemployment rate for immigrants from Romania and Bulgaria (2018: 11.8%; 2017: 13.1%) and for workers from Croatia (2018: 12.5%; 2017: 14.6%) was above the average for all foreign EU citizens.

The rate of unemployment among nationals of significant refugee countries of origin over recent years was above average in 2018: nationals from Syria (50.9%), followed by Iraq (39.2%), Afghanistan (29.6%) and the Russian Federation (30.0%). However, the rate of unemployment for all of the nationalities considered decreased compared with 2017. The biggest changes were for individuals from Syria (-10.9 percentage points) and Iraq (-7.2 percentage points) and for immigrants from Serbia (-4.8 percentage points). However, the rates of unemployment remain well above average compared with other groups of origin.

Many individuals in the group of persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection are not covered by labour market statistics, though, because they are not (yet) available for the labour market. These individuals are particularly removed from the labour market, e.g. because they do not have a sufficient knowledge of German to pursue gainful employment or because they are not available for the labour market as they have care obligations. They do not therefore appear in the number of registered jobseekers.

The rate of unemployment for males entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection is generally significantly lower than that for women from the same country of origin.

Unemployment rate by nationality
Annual average 2018 (with change in percentage points compared to previous year)

Focus on labour market integration of refugees – Current empirical findings from Austria

A recently published research report examines the gainful employment of foreign immigrants who came to Austria in 2007, 2011 and 2016. Unlike sample surveys, which provide an insight into a cross-section at a given point in time, this report for the first time provides a complete account of progress with integration and labour market integration of specific target groups over time, since the database used to provide the data belongs to the Main Association of Austrian Social Security Institutions. All individuals living in Austria who have a social security number were therefore classified according to pre-defined criteria (e.g. nationality, time of immigration, “receipt of basic welfare support to refugees” in the case of refugees, etc.) and their gainful employment at different times (1, 6 and 10 years after immigration) was presented over the period.

Of those individuals of working age who have been living in Austria as persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection since 2007, 58% were in employment after 10 years in 2017 (at least 90 days per calendar year). Of those who have lived in the country since 2011, 53% (aged between 15-64) were in employment in 2017. Of those who had applied for asylum in 2016 and were still in Austria in 2017, only 3% had starting working by this point.

The rate of employment varies widely according to nationality. Refugees of Syrian origin were most likely to find employment in Austria: 69% of the 2007 cohort and 63% of the 2011 cohort were employed as of 2017. Refugees from Afghanistan are in second place, with 65% of the 2007 cohort and 58% of the 2011 cohort employed as of 2017. The group with the lowest rates of employment were Chechen refugees: only 33% of the 2007 cohort and 20% of the 2011 cohort were in employment in 2017.

Fig. 1.3.10

Source: Labour market database of the Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs, Health and Consumer Protection (BMASGK) (2019), Budget, Labour Market and Beneficiary Information System (Bali); own presentation

Forstner, Klaus et al. (2019), Erwerbsverläufe von Migrant/innen aus der EU, aus Drittstaaten und von Flüchtlingen aus Syrien, Afghanistan und der Russischen Föderation im Vergleich.
There were also clear gender differences which also vary according to nationality. Overall, male refugees were more likely to be in employment than women (aged between 15–64); as for the 2007 cohort, 69% of men and 42% of women were in employment in 2017, while 62% of male refugees and 28% of female refugees from the 2011 cohort were in employment. The gender gap was most pronounced among refugees from Afghanistan. With respect to the 2007 cohort, 82% of men and only 37% of women were employed after 10 years; for the 2011 cohort, 69% of men but only 17% of women were in employment after 6 years. Chechen refugees had the lowest gender-specific differences. This has to do with the low employment generally among Chechen men and women, with only a minority taking up employment in Austria.

Unemployed persons or jobseekers in training by nationality, residence status and educational level

In 2018, those entitled to subsidiary protection had the lowest level of education on average among all foreign job seekers. A total of 82% of these had no higher than a compulsory school leaving certificate. This proportion was 71% in the case of all third-country nationals registered as unemployed or undergoing training, 65% for those entitled to asylum and 55% for nationals of EU accession states since 2004.

Registered unemployed or jobseekers in training, by nationality, residence status and level of education

2018; by category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Third-country nationals</th>
<th>EU accession states since 2004</th>
<th>EU before 2004</th>
<th>Austrians</th>
<th>EFTA citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship training</td>
<td>57,078</td>
<td>18,640</td>
<td>3,117</td>
<td>98,062</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory education</td>
<td>8,280</td>
<td>4,480</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>27,953</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>6,499</td>
<td>5,535</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>15,992</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18,024</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic education</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>333</td>
<td></td>
<td>332</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclarified</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>912</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation

Fig. 1.3.11

25 Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Czechia, Hungary, Cyprus (accession 2004); Bulgaria, Romania (accession 2007); Croatia (accession 2013).
21% of citizens of EU Member States before 2004 who were unemployed or registered for training had received an academic education. EU citizens had the highest proportion of individuals with this level of education as compared with other individuals. The proportion of unemployed persons or jobseekers registered for training with an academic education was below 10% for each of the following groups: those entitled to subsidiary protection (5%), third-country nationals and citizens of the EU accession states since 2004 (8% each) and Austrians (7%). The rate was 11% among those entitled to asylum. Only 8% of unemployed persons or persons in training entitled to subsidiary protection had received a “higher education” in 2018. However, this figure was 17% among those entitled to asylum.

The proportion of those individuals who had completed apprenticeship training among the unemployed or persons undergoing training was relatively low in the case of third-country nationals (8%) and in particular those entitled to asylum (4%) and to subsidiary protection (2%). This is mainly due to the fact that there is no dual education system involving apprenticeships and vocational training in the relevant countries of origin and they have not yet completed any training in this field in Austria.

Rate of transferral from unemployment to employment in 2018

An increase in gainful employment following a period of unemployment can be observed in particular among nationals of the main countries of origin of refugees. The rate of people from Syria switching from unemployment to gainful employment was up +8 percentage points in 2018, while the rate for those from Afghanistan and Iraq was up +5 percentage points each. Despite this increase, the rate of transferral to the labour market for nationals of the three main refugee countries of origin remains below that of all third-country nationals (39%). Analysis by sex shows that Russian men had the highest rate for taking up employment in 2018 at 40% and Syrian women the lowest at 7%.

Exit rate from unemployment to employment * by nationality

2018; compared to previous year

* Proportion of exits into employment out of total exits from unemployment

Source: Integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; Labour market database of the Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs, Health and Consumer Protection (BMASGK) (2019), Budget, Labour Market and Beneficiary Information System (Bali); own presentation
Turkish nationals had a slightly higher rate of entry into the labour market at 40% than the average for third-country nationals. However, these were well below the rate of nationals from non-EU countries of the former Yugoslavia (51%). The highest transition rate from unemployment to employment was achieved in 2018 (63%) for nationals from the EU countries before 2004. Citizens of the EU accession states since 2004 featured the same transition rate as Austrians at 58%.

## Exit rate from unemployment to employment *

### 2018; by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU28</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU countries before 2004</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU accession states since 2004</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFTA countries</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third countries</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Yugoslavia</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Proportion of exits into employment out of total exits from unemployment*

Source: Integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; Labour market database of the Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs, Health and Consumer Protection (BMASGK) (2019), Budget, Labour Market and Beneficiary Information System (Bali); own presentation.
1.4 Social affairs
The data on the Austrian means-tested minimum income (BMS) was transmitted by the individual federal provinces and refer to the 2018 calendar year (and thus also to the legal situation at that time). The figures for Vienna are based on annual averages, except for the annual total of 183,000, while those for the other federal provinces are based on annual totals. Due to dates of the specific queries, there may be deviations for both, the 2017 and 2018 calendar years. The figures are therefore rounded to 100, rounding differences have not been adjusted.

1) Lower Austria/Salzburg: Persons entitled to subsidiary protection are not eligible for BMS and are supported by provisions of basic welfare support to refugees.
2) Burgenland: Persons entitled to subsidiary protection are only eligible for BMS if they do not receive benefits from the provision of basic welfare support or under the Burgenland Social Welfare Act.
3) Styria: Information on the status “entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection” was not yet available in the calendar year 2017.
4) Carinthia: For the calendar year 2017, data from Klagenfurt cannot be taken into account for technical reasons (database logic), with the exception of the categories “Austrian citizens” and “Other foreign nationals”, although the latter does not include children.
5) The category “Other foreign nationals” includes the entries “Stateless”, “Unknown” and “Unclarified”.

Distribution of all means-tested minimum income (BMS) recipients by federal province
2018; annual totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Province</th>
<th>Total BMS Recipients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Austria</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Austria</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrol</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorarlberg</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinthia</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgenland</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total amount of BMS recipients in Austria: 308,200

Recipients of the means-tested minimum income (BMS) by federal province and nationality
2018; annual totals (with change compared to previous year) without Vienna

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Province</th>
<th>Austrian Citizens</th>
<th>Foreign Nationals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Austria</td>
<td>13,800 (-1,400)</td>
<td>11,700 (-1,100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styria</td>
<td>13,900 (-2,500)</td>
<td>11,600 (+200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Austria</td>
<td>10,700 (-1,300)</td>
<td>10,400 (+300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrol</td>
<td>6,600 (-700)</td>
<td>10,200 (+300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>6,900 (-900)</td>
<td>6,500 (-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorarlberg</td>
<td>5,600 (-300)</td>
<td>7,600 (-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinthia</td>
<td>2,900 (-200)</td>
<td>3,500 (+700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgenland</td>
<td>2,200 (+100)</td>
<td>1,100 (+300)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of recipients of the means-tested minimum income (BMS) by federal province
2018 (with percentage point change compared to previous year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Province</th>
<th>Austrian Citizens</th>
<th>Persons entitled to asylum</th>
<th>Other foreign nationals</th>
<th>Persons entitled to subsidiary protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>54% (0)</td>
<td>29% (-2)</td>
<td>19% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Austria</td>
<td>55% (-1)</td>
<td>31% (-1)</td>
<td>15% (+1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styria</td>
<td>51% (-3)</td>
<td>16% (0)</td>
<td>1% (0)</td>
<td>1% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Austria</td>
<td>39% (-4)</td>
<td>12% (+1)</td>
<td>3% (-1)</td>
<td>7% (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrol</td>
<td>52% (-2)</td>
<td>19% (-2)</td>
<td>16% (-1)</td>
<td>7% (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>42% (+1)</td>
<td>30% (-1)</td>
<td>23% (+1)</td>
<td>5% (-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorarlberg</td>
<td>45% (-7)</td>
<td>39% (+10)</td>
<td>8% (-4)</td>
<td>8% (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinthia</td>
<td>67% (-7)</td>
<td>15% (+6)</td>
<td>18% (+1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgenland</td>
<td>47% (-2)</td>
<td>29% (-2)</td>
<td>19% (0)</td>
<td>5% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on the Austrian means-tested minimum income (BMS) was transmitted by the individual federal provinces and refer to the 2018 calendar year (and thus also to the legal situation at that time). The figures for Vienna are based on annual averages, except for the annual total of 183,000, while those for the other federal provinces are based on annual totals. Due to dates of the specific queries, there may be deviations for both, the 2017 and 2018 calendar years. The figures are therefore rounded to 100, rounding differences have not been adjusted.

Fig. 1.4.1 / Source: Data of the federal provinces recorded in the course of the integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation.

Fig. 1.4.5 / Source: Data of the federal provinces recorded in the course of the integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation.

Fig. 1.4.8 / 1) When comparing the BMS figures from Carinthia with those of the previous year, it must be taken into account that the data from Klagenfurt for 2017 were missing with the exception of the categories “Austrian citizens” and “Foreign nationals”, but here again without children. (The proportion of Vienna is based on annual averages, those of the other federal provinces on annual totals. There are no data on changes for Styria, as it is not possible to break it down by persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection for 2017.)

Source: Data of the federal provinces recorded in the course of the integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation.

* The data on the Austrian means-tested minimum income (BMS) was transmitted by the individual federal provinces and refer to the 2018 calendar year (and thus also to the legal situation at that time). The figures for Vienna are based on annual averages, except for the annual total of 183,000, while those for the other federal provinces are based on annual totals. Due to dates of the specific queries, there may be deviations for both, the 2017 and 2018 calendar years. The figures are therefore rounded to 100, rounding differences have not been adjusted.
1) Lower Austria/Salzburg: Persons entitled to subsidiary protection are not eligible for BMS and are supported by provisions of basic welfare support to refugees.
2) Burgenland: Persons entitled to subsidiary protection are only eligible for BMS if they do not receive benefits from the provision of basic welfare support or under the Burgenland Social Welfare Act.
3) Styria: Information on the status “entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection” was not yet available in the calendar year 2017.
4) Carinthia: For the calendar year 2017, data from Klagenfurt cannot be taken into account for technical reasons (database logic), with the exception of the categories “Austrian citizens” and “Foreign nationals”, although the latter does not include children.
5) The category “Other foreign nationals” includes the entries “Stateless”, “Unknown” and “Unclarified”.

Integration Report 2019
Means-tested minimum income (BMS) was introduced throughout Austria in September 2010 by way of an Agreement between the Federation and the provinces[^26]. This Agreement expired in 2016 with laws specific to the provinces enacted after this. The BMS aims to support living and housing needs outside of inpatient facilities and also covers medical assistance. The statutory regulations have meanwhile been amended at federal level, and social assistance will replace the means-tested minimum benefit system from 1 January 2020.[^27] However, this chapter focuses on the means-tested minimum income since the integration monitoring data refers to the previous calendar year and therefore to 2018. A brief overview of the BMS data is provided first of all below so that this can then be put into context.

Notes on evaluation of the data for the 2018 calendar year

The Integration Act stipulates that the federal provinces must provide data from the preceding calendar year on both the number of recipients of means-tested minimum income and on those individuals subject to sanctions under the means-tested minimum income provisions due to a lack of participation in integration measures. All federal provinces with the exception of Vienna have submitted their data as annual totals in accordance with these legal requirements. The annual total shows how many people have received means-tested minimum income at least once over the course of the year.

Vienna on the other hand submitted its data in the form of annual averages. With annual averages the number of means-tested minimum income recipients is added together for all months and then divided by 12. If all means-tested minimum income recipients were to receive the minimum benefit for the entire year (i.e. 12 months), the values for the annual totals would be identical to those for the annual averages. However, since the average means-tested minimum income period is 8.5 months[^28] (see also the section “Duration of benefit period and costs” at the end of this chapter), the annual average values are significantly lower than the annual totals. As such the annual average value for BMS recipients in Vienna was actually 142,600 while 183,000[^29] people received means-tested minimum income over the year as a whole. As annual totals cannot be deduced from annual average values, it is therefore not possible to compare the data from Vienna with the other eight federal provinces or with the previous year.

[^26]: Parlamentarische Materien (2010), Vereinbarung zwischen dem Bund und den Ländern gemäß Art. 15a B-VG über eine bundesweite Bedarfsorientierte Mindestsicherung.
[^27]: The Basic Law on Social Assistance came into force on 1 June 2019. The relevant provincial laws must come into force by 1 January 2020, although these may provide for transitional arrangements lasting up to one and a half years.
[^29]: Vienna only reported the number of all means-tested minimum income recipients in addition to the annual average data as an annual total, which is why this is the only statement that can be made in this chapter for the whole of Austria. All other data (e.g. breakdown by residence status, nationality, etc.) must therefore be evaluated separately for Vienna.
The means-tested minimum income data for Vienna had to be evaluated separately due to this differing data logic. This is presented in a separate section at the end of the chapter and is compared with the minimum income statistics for 2017 from Statistik Austria\textsuperscript{30} where possible in order to enable a comparison with the previous year.

**BMS recipients in Austria**

There were 308,200 recipients of BMS in Austria in the 2018 calendar year as a whole.\textsuperscript{31} This is 20,600 or -6\% less than in the previous year. The distribution of recipients of BMS across the federal provinces was also very uneven in 2018. As in 2017, almost 60\% of means-tested minimum income recipients lived in Vienna.\textsuperscript{32}

**Distribution of all BMS recipients by federal province**

2018; annual totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Province</th>
<th>BMS Recipients</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>1,750,000</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Austria</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Austria</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorarlberg</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinthia</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styria</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrol</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgenland</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of means-tested minimum income recipients equates to 3.5\% of the population in 2018. The proportion varies according to the federal province. It is highest in Vienna at 9.7\% and lowest in Burgenland and Carinthia at 1.1\% each. After Vienna, Vorarlberg also has a comparatively high number of persons who have received a needs-oriented minimum benefit at least one day in the year, i.e. 3.4\% of the total population (13,200 people).

**BMS recipients in relation to population by federal province**

2018

\textsuperscript{30} As in the previous year, the monitoring data provided by the federal provinces may deviate from the Statistik Austria data (Mindestsicherungsstatistik) due to queries related to the respective key dates.

\textsuperscript{31} Vienna has submitted all data in the form of annual averages (see footnotes above). Only the number of all BMS recipients was additionally reported as an annual total, which is why only this statement can be made in this chapter for the whole of Austria.

\textsuperscript{32} Further evaluations of the annual totals can only be carried out for Austria not including Vienna; structural characteristics are calculated from the annual average values in the case of Vienna. Comparisons with the previous year are therefore only possible to a limited extent.
BMS recipients in Austria not including Vienna: Developments and trends

In Austria (not including the City of Vienna) 125,200 persons received means-tested minimum income benefits in 2018. This was 6,700 (-5%) fewer people than in the previous year. Half of the means-tested minimum income recipients outside of Vienna were Austrians and half were foreign nationals. Persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection accounted for close to one third (34%) of all recipients. A further 7% were EU/EFTA citizens, with 9% other foreign citizens.33

Persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection account for more than two thirds (42,500 or 68%) of foreign recipients of BMS in Austria not including Vienna.

The number of foreign recipients of means-tested minimum income in Vorarlberg, Salzburg and Lower Austria fell in 2018 as compared with the previous year. Lower Austria recorded the largest fall at -9%. The number of foreign recipients of BMS has increased in all other federal provinces. The highest increases were in Burgenland (+38%) and Carinthia34 (+25%). The number of Austrian recipients of the means-tested minimum income has fallen in all federal provinces except Burgenland; the largest fall recorded is in Styria at -15%, followed by Salzburg at -12%.

The proportion of foreign recipients of BMS was above 50% in Tyrol, Carinthia and Vorarlberg. The biggest changes in the proportion of foreign recipients of the means-tested minimum income in 2018 as compared with the previous year were recorded in Carinthia and Burgenland (+7 percentage points each).

33 Includes those listed in the statistics as “stateless”, “unclarified” and “unknown”.
34 When comparing the means-tested minimum income figures from Carinthia with those of the previous year, it should be remembered that the data was missing from Klagenfurt for 2017, with the exception of the categories “Austrian citizens” and “Foreign nationals”, although these did not include children.
The number of people entitled to asylum and receiving means-tested minimum income increased in all federal provinces except for Lower Austria and Vorarlberg. Burgenland recorded the largest increase at +67% (from a comparatively low starting point), while the figure fell to 7,900 in Lower Austria (-10%). It remained virtually unchanged in Vorarlberg. The number of other recipients of means-tested minimum income from third countries decreased in 4 of the 7 federal provinces considered, with Carinthia recording the largest fall (-29%). The number for these increased only in Burgenland and Upper Austria, and remained roughly the same in Vorarlberg.

### BMS recipients by federal province and nationality

#### 2018; annual totals (with change compared to previous year) without Vienna

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Province</th>
<th>Austrian Citizens</th>
<th>Foreign Nationals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Austria</td>
<td>11,700 (+1,400)</td>
<td>10,400 (-700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styria</td>
<td>11,600 (+200)</td>
<td>10,200 (+300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Austria</td>
<td>10,700 (-1,300)</td>
<td>6,500 (-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrol</td>
<td>6,600 (-700)</td>
<td>5,600 (-200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>6,900 (-900)</td>
<td>7,600 (-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorarlberg</td>
<td>5,600 (-300)</td>
<td>2,900 (-200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinthia</td>
<td>6,600 (-1,100)</td>
<td>3,500 (+700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgenland</td>
<td>11,600 (-1,100)</td>
<td>10,200 (+300)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Change in the number of BMS recipients by federal province

#### 2018; annual totals compared to previous year in %; excluding Vienna

- **Austrian citizens**
- **Foreign nationals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Province</th>
<th>Austrian Citizens</th>
<th>Foreign Nationals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burgenland</td>
<td>+38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorarlberg</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinthia 1)</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrol</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styria 2)</td>
<td>+25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Austria</td>
<td>+3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Austria</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) When comparing the BMS figures from Carinthia with those of the previous year, it must be taken into account that the data from Klagenfurt for 2017 were missing with the exception of the categories "Austrian citizens" and "Foreign nationals", but here again without children. 2) For Styria there are no separate figures available for 2017 on persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection / other third country nationals.

---

35 There are no separate figures available for 2017 for Styria regarding persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection / other third-country nationals.
BMS recipients by federal province, nationality and status
2018; annual totals (with change compared to previous year)

Vienna 1)  Lower Austria  Styria  Upper Austria  Tyrol  Salzburg  Vorarlberg  Carinthia 2)  Burgenland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Province</th>
<th>Austrian citizens</th>
<th>Persons entitled to asylum</th>
<th>Other foreign nationals</th>
<th>Persons entitled to subsidiary protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>183,000 (-7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Austria</td>
<td>25,500 (-9%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styria</td>
<td>25,500 (-5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Austria</td>
<td>16,800 (-7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrol</td>
<td>13,400 (-3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>13,200 (-3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorarlberg</td>
<td>6,400 (+8%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinthia</td>
<td>3,300 (+14%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgenland</td>
<td>3,000 (0%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Vienna submitted the data as annual averages and not as annual totals like the other federal provinces. Only the total number of BMS recipients (without differentiation by status or nationality) is available as an annual total. 2) When comparing the BMS figures from Carinthia with those of the previous year, it must be taken into account that the data from Klagenfurt for 2017 were missing with the exception of the categories “Austrian citizens” and “Foreign nationals”, but here again without children. (There are no changes for Styria, as it is not possible to break data down by persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection for 2017)

Fig. 1.4.7 Source: Data of the federal provinces recorded in the course of the integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation

Distribution of BMS recipients by federal province
2018 (with percentage point change compared to previous year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Province</th>
<th>Austrian citizens</th>
<th>Persons entitled to asylum</th>
<th>Other foreign nationals</th>
<th>Persons entitled to subsidiary protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>47% (-2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Austria</td>
<td>54% (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styria</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Austria</td>
<td>51% (-3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrol</td>
<td>39% (-4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>52% (-2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorarlberg</td>
<td>42% (-1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinthia 2)</td>
<td>45% (-7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgenland</td>
<td>67% (-7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) When comparing the BMS figures from Carinthia with those of the previous year, it must be taken into account that the data from Klagenfurt for 2017 were missing with the exception of the categories “Austrian citizens” and “Foreign nationals”, but here again without children. (The proportion of Vienna is based on annual averages, those of the other federal provinces on annual totals. There are no data on changes for Styria, as it is not possible to break it down by persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection for 2017)

Fig. 1.4.8 Source: Data of the federal provinces recorded in the course of the integration monitoring according to the Integration Act; own presentation
A closer look at foreign nationals reveals the significance of the main countries of origin for persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection. Syrians were for instance by far the largest group of foreign recipients of the means-tested minimum income in Austria not including Vienna. With 21,000 recipients this involved as many as the recipients from the following 5 countries of origin put together. Afghan citizens followed in second place with those from the Russian Federation in third. Iraqis were in fifth place.

Turkish nationals represented the highest number of recipients from third countries who are not among the main countries of origin of refugees. Romanians were the most common recipients of the means-tested minimum income among EU citizens.

Top 10 foreign nationalities among BMS recipients in Austria
2018; annual totals; excluding Vienna

The totals for receipt of the means-tested minimum income for 2018 for the federal provinces of Burgenland, Salzburg, Tyrol, Styria, Upper Austria and Lower Austria included sanctions (reductions) imposed on 800 people (annual total) as a result of a lack of participation in integration measures.

BMS recipients in Vienna in 2018: Developments and trends

There were 183,000 means-tested minimum income recipients in Vienna in 2018 (annual total). However, since Vienna provided its monitoring data as annual averages (see also section “Notes on evaluation of data for the 2018 calendar year” at the beginning of the chapter), only the average value of 142,600 can be used as a basis for further evaluations. This means that the number of recipients of the minimum benefit was 7,600 or -5% lower than in the previous year. Although the number of means-tested minimum income recipients with Austrian citizenship decreased by
-10%, it remained almost unchanged among foreign nationals. This is primarily due to the fact that +11% more people entitled to asylum received means-tested minimum income compared with 2017 as the number of other foreign BMS recipients decreased by -14% in the same period.

A total of 47% of BMS recipients in Vienna were Austrian citizens in 2018, with persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection accounting for more than one third of all recipients. A further 7% were EU/EFTA citizens, with 12% other foreign citizens.

Persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection make up 64% (49,200) of the foreign BMS recipients in Vienna.

As in the other eight federal provinces, persons with Syrian (17,900), Afghan (8,500) and Russian (5,500) citizenship were the most common recipients of the means-tested minimum income in Vienna. However, unlike in the other federal provinces, there was a significant proportion (10,400) of means-tested minimum income recipients whose citizenship was unclarified.

As in the rest of Austria, Turkish nationals represented the highest number of recipients from third countries who are not among the main countries of origin for refugees, followed by Serbian nationals. Among EU citizens in Vienna, citizens of Romania and Poland were the most common recipients of BMS.
A total of 2,700 sanctions were imposed in Vienna in 2018 as a result of a lack of participation in integration measures (annual total of all sanctions, whereby one and the same person may have been sanctioned multiple times).

Duration of benefit period and costs (nationwide)

In 2017 (the year in which the latest nationwide data on duration of receipt and costs is available), 69% of BMS recipients received the benefit for a period of between 7 and 12 months, i.e. the minimum income represented important interim assistance for them. As in the previous year, the average receipt period in 2017 was 8.5 months, ranging from 6.4 months in Vorarlberg to 9.2 months in Vienna. An average of 52% of means-tested minimum income recipients had an income, e.g. from employment, a benefit from the Austrian Public Employment Service (AMS) or a maintenance payment, which was included in the calculation of the minimum income. This means that around half of the recipients of BMS received “top-up benefits”, and their income was supplemented by BMS benefits until the defined minimum standard was reached. Among those individuals with an income, people receiving unemployment benefits (regular unemployment benefits, unemployment assistance, etc.) were the largest group (43%), with 16% receiving income from gainful employment. Expenditure on the means-tested minimum income for 2017 (latest available data) amounted to 977 million euros in total (living expenses, housing, health care), 53 million euros (+5.8%) more than in the previous year (excluding any amounts recovered from reimbursement of costs).
1.5 Summary and assessment
On the relevance of integration monitoring

The integration monitoring has now been carried out for the second time and provides a wealth of figures and information that make an important contribution to recording the structural integration of migrants in Austria. The integration monitoring embedded in the Integration Act ensures that data material is built up in stages and that developments can be observed and evaluated over longer periods of time. This year it will be possible to compare the data for 2018 with that for 2017 for the first time (see Integration Report 2018), thereby revealing initial trends that can be used as an evidentiary basis for integration policy measures. The integration monitoring captures a solid data basis from the areas of asylum and residence, education as well as the labour market and social affairs, thereby enabling wide-ranging thematic discussions on integration. A comprehensive survey and analysis of the statistical material is required in order to draw conclusions for future integration policy given that different stakeholders are active at different levels in the field of integration.

Key results

The integration monitoring data shows that immigration to Austria continues to take place. Immigration from EU Member States to Austria accounts for the largest share of immigration by far. Immigrants from third countries include asylum seekers, persons coming for family reunification purposes and a relatively small but growing group of highly qualified people arriving with the Red-White-Red – Card. Austria is therefore still an important destination country for immigrants from the EU and third countries with different reasons for migrating.

In terms of the proportion of immigrants (first generation) in a given country, Austria ranks third in the EU behind Luxembourg and Cyprus in relation to the total population, although the respective structural characteristics of immigration must be taken into account specifically in these two countries. Unlike Austria, for instance, Luxembourg in particular is primarily characterised by highly qualified immigration.

The number of asylum applications in Austria fell considerably in 2018 (-44% compared with 2017). This number has also fallen significantly across the EU, although not to the same extent as in Austria. Since the peaks in 2015 and 2016, the number of asylum applications in Austria has continued to fall significantly. The number of new applications for asylum in 2018 is comparatively low based even on a long-term comparison. However, experience from 2015 and 2016 shows that migration can be triggered by crises developing in (potential) countries of origin, which in turn can lead to an increase in the number of asylum seekers in Europe.

The fall in asylum applications in Austria does not mean that the target group of migrants to be integrated will become smaller. On the contrary, it will continue to grow in future due to various factors. Austria once again ranks first in the EU for positive asylum decisions in proportion to its population. The positive outcome of ongoing asylum procedures will increase the number of persons entitled to asylum who represent a significant target group for integration. There is therefore definitely still a need for an effective integration policy. Additional migrants have already arrived in Austria within the scope of family reunification with those entitled to asylum; this migration will continue to be relevant in future. These new arrivals in Austria are also a target group for integration policy. The falling numbers of asylum applications are therefore an argument for, and not against, intensification of integration policy. The focus is shifting away from direct migration management to an approach based around a longer-term integration policy for those who will remain in Austria in the medium to long term.
In terms of structural integration in the education sector it can be stated that the people from the most recent refugee cohort are slowly integrating into the structures in Austria. Mastery of the German language is an indispensable prerequisite for any successful integration process in Austria for young people, particularly when it comes to training. Initial results from German support classes, according to which 16% of pupils manage to switch to regular classes after the first half of the year, clearly show the extent of the shortcomings with German and how necessary targeted language support measures are in schools. More detailed evaluation of these German support classes is therefore necessary in order to ensure that effective support is provided in schools for learning German.

Values and orientation courses have been increasingly taken by women since the introduction of the legal obligation in the Integration Act. In last year’s Integration Report the Expert Council noted that the proportion of women taking values and orientation courses had risen significantly since the Integration Act had come into force. The proportion of women taking these courses continued to grow in 2018. This is highly significant as the multiplier role played by women can also be expected to have positive effects on the family and the community. It is also apparent that compulsory counselling and training formats continue to be important measures in promoting the individual integration process, especially for those entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection, and can also make a contribution towards successful integration across society as a whole.

The situation on the Austrian labour market is improving the number of unemployed fell as a whole in 2018, benefiting both people with and without a migrant background. The increases in migrant employment are partly due to the good economic situation and the fact that more asylum procedures were completed positively, thereby allowing migrants to participate in the labour market with no legal restrictions. The length of stay has also actually increased, especially in the case of those who arrived in Austria in 2015 and 2016. This is also as a result of the successful training measures available to refugees following a positive asylum decision. The completion of language courses as well as values and orientation courses has also improved their chances of integration into the labour market.

Although the number of unemployed migrants has fallen, their share as a proportion of the total unemployed is increasing. This shows above all that unemployed Austrians were able to benefit more from the good economic situation than unemployed third-country nationals. However, there has also been an above-average increase in the supply of labour of third-country nationals. This is partly due to the fact that the supply of foreign labour continued to increase in 2018 as a result of asylum granted recently. On the other hand, the lower average level of education for third-country nationals makes it more difficult for them to enjoy employment opportunities. It is therefore the combination of a quantitative and a qualitative aspect of the labour supply of third-country nationals that makes their integration into the labour market more difficult.

Those individuals who are not available to the labour market because they are particularly removed from the labour market are not included in the available data. This is the case for instance if they are undergoing training or qualification measures, have poor German skills or have childcare obligations. This unrecorded group must be taken into account when interpreting employment rates for migrants, and must not be overlooked when it comes to integration measures. People who are not part of the labour market must themselves make special efforts in order to have the opportunity of entering the labour market in future. This requires specific low-threshold offers that meet the special needs of this group which is in itself highly heterogeneous. Support measures should remain focused on younger women with childcare obligations.
The thematic focus of this year’s Integration Report is on dealing with different gender roles in family and society, the integration of young people and the possible effects of family reunification and marriage migration on the integration process. It becomes apparent that these topics are closely interlinked, as the question arises in each case whether and how various cultural backgrounds can influence a successful integration process. The culture of the receiving society in Austria, as well as the culture that migrants bring with them, are influenced not least also by religion. For a successful social coexistence it is therefore necessary to agree on how to deal with religion and the religious and non-religious convictions of individuals as well as on the relationship between religion and state. A separate chapter is dedicated to this.
2 Perspectives of integration in Austria
Equal rights for men and women as the basis of society

Genuine equality between men and women is a key objective in liberal democratic societies. The high importance accorded to gender equality in Austria is reflected not least through its enshrinement in Article 7 (2) of the Federal Constitution. It is also embedded in other standards. In terms of its structural, social and cultural dimension, this intended gender equality has an impact on participation in the education system, career choices and opportunities to pursue a profession, remuneration and the right to choose a partner freely.

Gender equality was demanded in Austria by social movements and partly achieved in the course of a long and arduous process. This can be seen from historical achievements such as the women’s right to vote, which was introduced in Austria in 1918, and the establishment of equal opportunity officers in public institutions.

While gender equality is spelled out in laws and norms and has essentially been implemented within liberal democratic societies, many of the regions from which migrants originate have social systems that are more patriarchal and feature no comparable legal basis. Societal models are never static but rather are subject to a process of constant change.

While the 2018 Integration Report focused on the structural integration of women with a migrant background, this chapter examines cultural aspects of gender roles and their implications for integration. Patriarchal values and norms are manifest strongly within the countries of origin of refugees who have recently immigrated (e.g. Syria, Afghanistan and Iraq). However, care must be taken to avoid generalisations and cultural interpretation of the phenomenon when discussing gender roles. Patriarchal cultural practices are neither lived by all immigrants, nor are they equally prevalent within the countries of origin. At the same time, it is clear that patriarchal models were also highly developed in Austria in the past and to some extent still have repercussions today.

[43] See among others El Feki et al. (2017), Understanding Masculinities.
Gender roles of immigrants in the context of the reception of refugees

The people who migrate have different values, attitudes and identity traits which can be traced back to their socialisation in their country of origin. These socialisation characteristics are not discarded following migration and only change gradually, as they fulfil their task as the support mechanisms for a person’s identity and therefore contribute towards a holistic personality structure. The values, attitudes and behavioural patterns shaped through culture and brought along following immigration remain significant when it comes to the individuals’ thoughts and actions when in Austria. Societies characterised by patriarchy and tradition feature hierarchical structures and orders which primarily reflect male dominance. In any such social organisation, men and women occupy different positions and are valued differently in economic, social and political areas. This inequality is essentially to the detriment of women who are limited in terms of their rights and personal choices.

Studies in some cases show clear differences in attitudes towards gender roles among immigrants depending on origin, education and religious denomination. Patriarchal role models involving individuals from predominantly Muslim countries therefore receive stronger backing and the role of the man as head of the family is strengthened more than is the case in Christian communities.44 This can partly be explained by the more religious nature of Muslims on average compared with other population groups in the receiving country. This is because people who base their lives around religious rules are more likely to advocate traditional gender roles, irrespective of their religious affiliation.

Patriarchal gender role models in Austria can create tensions within the family and within society, as the dominance attributed to men contrasts with the Western ideal of women’s equal rights and self-determination. This can for instance lead to conflicts in schools. The phenomena evident here include non-participation of girls in swimming lessons due to rigid sexual morals as well as social control over schoolgirls by their male classmates.

Every individual in our society is protected by law from violence. However, the specific measures that provide protection from violence for groups such as women and children and that have been developed and implemented in recent decades indicate that these groups run a higher risk of being exposed to violence in real life, despite formal equal rights under the law. The state responds to this through specific measures aimed at protecting these groups against violence.

Empirical evidence suggests that violent attacks against women in relationships are more prevalent in countries with patriarchal values and norms. Norms related to male authority over women’s behaviour and norms justifying beating of the wife are particularly significant in terms of the prevalence of physical and sexual violence, as is the extent to which law and practice discriminate against women in relation to men when it comes to access to property and other resources.45 It is not only the physical aspects of violence that need to be considered. Social control over women exerted by husbands or male relatives, such as in the form of forced dress codes, arranged marriages and forced marriages (which can also impact on husbands’ freedom of choice), as well as related social pressures exerted by communities represent dimensions of violence. Gender-specific concepts of honour play a central role here, which is why the term “violence in the name of honour” is also used in this context.

44 See e.g. Becher, Inna und El-Menouar, Yasemin (2013), Geschlechterrollen bei Deutschen und Zuwanderern Christlicher und Muslimischer Religionshöigkeit; Kohlbacher, Josef et al. (2017), Wertehaltungen und Erwartungen von Flüchtlingen in Österreich; Peter, Zoltan et al. (2019), Integrationsthema Toleranz; Weiss, Hilde et al. (Eds.) (2016), Muslimische Milieus im Wandel?
45 Heise, Lori und Kotsadam, Andreas (2015), Cross-national and multilevel correlates of partner violence.
While a woman’s honour is primarily defined by her “purity” and chastity, a man’s honour refers to his “manliness”. This means that he must be able to prove the male qualities generally attributed, such as bravery or strength, for which he in turn gains respect from others. Any deviation from these norms can be accompanied by a loss of honour and disgrace to the family or community as a whole. Violence can be part of a defence strategy aimed at restoring lost honour. A look at Austrian crime statistics shows that victims of violence are often women, also in an Austrian context. Among the 73 murder victims in 2018, 41 were women, with the suspects and victims predominantly in a family relationship. In the field of research on perpetrators, experts point to the factor of patriarchal thinking, which can manifest itself both in perpetrators with and without a migrant background. However, changes in attitude can be noted among young men without a migrant background with a move away from patriarchal attitudes and demonstrations of power, while these attitudes are still firmly embedded within recent immigrants from patriarchal countries of origin.

Collectivist values play an important role in the foundation of the patriarchal system. The interests of the community have priority over those of the individual in this form of social organisation. Individuals experience their value primarily as part of a group in this system. The collective “we” takes precedence over the individual “I”, and individual freedoms are subordinate to group interests. Social control over members is important as individual decisions are seen and assessed in light of the potential consequences for the group. Women are expected to show obedience to the husband, male relatives or the community. Women experience esteem primarily in their role as mothers. Any escape from this system is sometimes associated with the degradation or devaluation of the individual and exclusion from the family and wider social environment.

However, it would be a mistake to see women merely as victims in their role as mothers in this system. Women play a key role in passing on patriarchal and collectivist values to the next generation. This is because the consolidation of gender inequality begins during a child’s upbringing, for example when boys are given more extensive freedoms and girls are denied a certain education or career because of family obligations.

The emancipation of women in this system means a loss of control and influence for men. This loss of status is perceived by some men as an attack on their masculinity and sometimes triggers a feeling of being overloaded, which in the most extreme cases can result in violence.

47 For further information see: Haller, Birgitt (2018), Evaluierung Sexualstraftaten und Haller, Birgitt (2013), Sexuelle Aggression bei jungen Männern.
Implications for integration work

What are the conclusions and implications for integration work? It is important to bear in mind that the change processes required will take years and cannot happen overnight. Gender equality – as is the norm in Austria and in large parts of Europe – is not practised in the countries of origin of many immigrants, especially those of the refugees arriving over recent years. A lasting learning effect requires the values to be conveyed explicitly through information, setting a consistent example and actual implementation wherever possible in a liberal society, as well as an appropriate period for immigrants to internalise the new situation individually. With respect to integration policy therefore the question arises as to how this process of female emancipation can be initiated or accelerated within a liberal democratic society. First of all, it is important for attitudes to be clearly communicated and set as examples in encounters and interactions. Any accusations of acting in a culturalist or Eurocentric manner must be countered with the civilising achievements of human and women’s rights in Austria, which must be observed and respected.

It must also be made clear that violent traditional practices or violence in the name of honour can never be qualified as an expression of collectivist or patriarchal social norms under the guise of religious freedoms or cultural customs. These practices are seen as violence against girls and women and as such are prosecuted under the rule of law. Awareness of this must be raised at events, workshops and other formats for the people who work with immigrants and relevant groups (e.g. in schools, at the Public Employment Service and in values and orientation courses of the ÖIF) so that this reality can be conveyed effectively. A wide range of initiatives within civil society play an important role here.

It requires targeted and direct communication with immigrants. The interfaces for this communication must be identified in order to achieve these goals. Schools with scheduled ethics education and the Austrian Integration Fund’s values and orientation courses e.g. provide opportunities here. There is also a need for greater consideration of which offers can be developed aimed directly at immigrants outside of these structural measures, and that promote a more sophisticated examination of gender roles.

In this regard we need to focus more on the individuality and development possibilities of the individual (strengthening of the person as an individual) and less on the totality of the communities in order to avoid the unconscious transfer of patriarchal structures or traditional forms of violence in communities to the next generations.

Since patriarchal and traditional forms of violence are very difficult to recognise from the outside and since those affected have a high inhibition threshold when it comes to turning to the appropriate institutions, women should be strengthened and empowered together with men to act as role models in their communities. Major significance is also attached to counselling for men as well as to work with men in the aim of dealing with ideas surrounding honour-related culture, excessive concepts of masculinity as well as honour-cultural violence. There must be an awareness established that violence in the family is not a private matter in Austria and that it has (legal) consequences.

The Austrian Integration Fund’s measures for persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection are a first step in this regard. In addition to the values and orientation courses required by statute which cover the issue of gender roles in Austrian society, new focused consultation initiatives have also been developed on the topic of women and men in Austrian society and these are already offered nationwide.

The family factor and parental work in conjunction with youth work are also central starting points which should be used (more details in the following chapter) to improve the levels of participation for girls and women in Austrian society.
Young people as an important target group for integration work

Integration policy must focus in particular on young people as a target group. The potential for integration of these is significantly higher than that of adults due to their greater capacity for absorption at the learning stage. Their speed and quality when learning German generally support the integration process more effectively than is possible with adult migrants.

At the same time there is also an opportunity for familiarising young people with the values of the receiving society in a way that is suitable for everyday purposes as they mature. Young people with or without a migrant background spend a substantial part of the day. This provides a framework in which young people feel accepted and cared for as a natural part of a society in which they can play an active role, and thereby reinforcing their sense of belonging. A special evaluation of the last PISA study showed that children with a migrant background have a high degree of motivation potential in most OECD countries. This potential must be exploited as effectively as possible for successful integration.

The target group of “young people” is large in number and therefore significant in terms of integration policy. In addition to young people from the countries of origin of the current refugee cohorts, it also includes the descendants (2nd and 3rd generation) of those individuals who came to Austria as part of the earlier migration of guest workers, former refugee cohorts, family reunification processes, as well as through the high levels of immigration from EU Member States. The increasing proportion of young people with a migrant background has a significant impact on society as a whole, e.g. on education and the labour market.

The state must be aware of its responsibility and role in the education and training of young people. Supporting young people as effectively as possible is in Austria’s and every other country’s interest in the aim of positively shaping the society of the future. While the integration process works well for the majority of young people with a migrant background, it is much more difficult for young people from families in which the family members, in particular the parental generation, have a low educational level; this is also due to the social inheritance of educational opportunities which features prominently in the Austrian school system. Greater success in the educational process requires a joint effort by all participants, including the young people and their families as well as teachers/educational specialists/social workers.

Young people also bring the integration-related aspects that they have experienced and learned in schools and other social groups into their families and communities. They can therefore act as important multipliers for relatives and friends and thus also make an active contribution towards integration. Multiplier effects have already been successfully implemented over many years through proven measures. People with a migrant background who are well integrated into Austrian society act as role models and pass on their experiences related to life in Austria. Young people in particular can benefit from these role models, which at the same time strengthen their ability to question traditional role models and basic attitudes.

---

48 OECD (2018), The Resilience of Students with an Immigrant Background, pp. 73ff.
49 Oberwimmer, Konrad et al. (Eds.) (2019), Nationaler Bildungsbericht Band 1.
On the other hand, young people from traditional families face a particular challenge, as depending on their ethnocultural background, they may find themselves positioned between somewhat patriarchal values on the one hand and expectations from within Austrian society on the other. The more these values differ, the more difficult it becomes for young people to accept them. There is often a tension that exists between the habits and reality of life at the parental home and those of society in Austria and this can unsettle young people with a migrant background and can lead to emotional disintegration.

In terms of integration policy, the best possible education, learning German at the earliest stage possible and enabling German to be practised and spoken intensively outside the classroom are indispensable prerequisites for a successful integration process for young people. Moreover, multilingualism at a high level can be an advantage when it comes to labour market integration.

Keeping young people within the education system for as long as possible and guiding them towards a formal educational level are just as crucial for their successful integration. Success in education is not only a question of origin; early withdrawal from the education system e.g. affects pupils both with or without a migrant background, although the impact on the latter group is more significant. At the end of the school year 2016/2017 for instance, the percentage of young people whose everyday language was not German and who left the school system prematurely without completing compulsory schooling was 8.1%. This figure was 2.6% in the case of pupils whose everyday language was German.50

Pupils can leave the education system prematurely for many reasons, ranging from economic obligations, such as contributing towards the family’s livelihood, to parental expectations, to language and school-related difficulties. The parents’ educational background can also play an important role. The “mandatory education up to the age of 18” was an initial legal measure implemented in order to keep young people in training for longer. This stipulates that young people must be in education until they reach the age of maturity. It is essential for young people and parents to understand that the best possible education for children is an indispensable prerequisite for optimal self-development in Austria.

### Ideological and religious-cultural devaluations

Young people with a migrant background represent a special area of responsibility for the education system and its stakeholders.51 So-called “hotspot schools”, i.e. schools with a high proportion of pupils from educationally deprived backgrounds, often with a migrant background and a high degree of cultural diversity, are at the centre of media reports every now and then.52 The dissemination of outdated role models, culturally induced violence, religious radicalisation and a stronger sense of honour among young people is documented time and time again. Girls in particular are increasingly coming under pressure with regard to desired behaviour or dress codes from their male classmates. At the same time, more and more young people with a Muslim background are perceiving both their own everyday life and that of their fellow pupils with regard to cultural-religious norms, and pointing out any potential “misconduct” to others.

Tension and conflict can ultimately be intensified in schools. Discrimination against young people is also to some extent increasing in parallel with certain types of social polarisation. Young people from certain groups of Muslim origin in particular increasingly point to subjective experiences of discrimination, while at the same time belonging to the group that often devalues others. It is therefore important to see the entire picture. Discrimination and disadvantages must be countered from all directions. The Austrian Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research

---

51 See Oberwimmer, Konrad et al. (Eds.) (2019), Nationaler Bildungsbericht Band 1.
(BMBWF) has recently set up a corresponding ombudsman’s office in order to observe and record those conflicts that do exist and the challenges faced by the teaching staff as well as the pupils.\(^\text{53}\)

One notion does need to be highlighted, however: the school as it is today cannot respond to all socio-political demands. A good social and ethnic mix and sufficient resources in schools are key to a sustainable education system. Intensive integration efforts within families themselves are also required at the same time.

Parental work as the key to success in school and integration policy

Although young people spend a lot of time in school, educational institutions can only be part of the solution to learning and social problems. In this context, great importance is attached both to afternoon care for school children (ideally with support in dealing with homework) and to all forms of all-day schooling. They benefit children and young people with and without a migrant background, not least when both parents are employed or one parent is raising the children alone. Measures that lead to improvements in the care situation in schools and leisure facilities are a basis for the educational success and successful integration of young people with a migrant background. At the same time, parents and family as well as the social environment within the communities play a crucial role in successful education and integration. Integration must also be actively implemented in the communities and with the help of parents. The corresponding offers and voluntary formats in extracurricular periods promote integration and constantly need to be made more appealing.

Parents represent an inherently significant authority when it comes to shaping a human being. In addition to social interactions at school and during leisure time, parents have a particularly strong influence over their children – their influence on the identification with and emotional attachment of young people both to Austria and to their country of birth or origin is therefore just as relevant. Children's educational achievements can also be strongly linked to the education that the parents received themselves and to how important they consider a comprehensive education for their own children.

Working with and involving parents is an important approach to integration policy. Cooperation between educational stakeholders and parents has therefore a crucial role to play. The Austrian education system requires a certain degree of parental cooperation and support, especially where there is a lack of all-day schooling and afternoon care involving support with learning. Yet language barriers can make communication between teachers and parents difficult.\(^\text{54}\) A poorly integrated family can significantly affect the positive development of the child or of young people, irrespective of how effective integration is in schools and educational institutions. Parents must therefore be seen as a factor in integration work for young people and be more closely involved in the process.

\(^{53}\) Ombudsman for issues related to values and cultural conflicts in the Austrian Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research (BMBWF).

\(^{54}\) For an evidence-based insight into the parent-school integration work see Biffl, Gudrun et al. (2019), Integration in Wels.
Side note: Health of children and young people

Children and young people with a migrant background are an important target group for integration and health policy in light of their increasing share of the total youth population in Austria. Between 2008 and 2014, the number of 0 to 14-year-olds without a migrant background fell by around eight per cent, while the number of young people with a migrant background rose by around 14 per cent.\(^{55}\) As of 1 January 2016, 381,500 (16.8\%) of the 2.27 million young people (0-24 years) living in Austria held foreign citizenship. An average of 551,500 young people with a migrant background (24.3\% of all young people) were also living in Austria in 2016.\(^{56}\) These figures include the latest refugee cohort only to a certain extent, and it can therefore be assumed that the number of young migrants is higher today.

Important steps are taken in childhood and adolescence which have a decisive influence on subsequent health in adulthood. Despite the major importance of the health of children and young people, there are hardly any studies on the state of their health in Austria. The routine statistics (cause of death statistics, diagnosis and performance documentation of Austrian hospitals, cancer statistics) only provide a rudimentary picture of the health status and incidence of disease among children and young people. The results of routine preventive examinations (mother-child-booklet examinations, school medical examinations, young people’s examinations) are also predominantly not recorded electronically and are therefore only available to a very limited extent for epidemiological evaluations. Examinations of schools have not been evaluated since the mid-1990s due to the inadequate quality of the surveys. Recording the health behaviour of young people precisely would be important in order to ensure optimal health care and preventive health care. With respect to integration policy, collecting appropriate information would also be necessary, taking into account the migrant background of children and young people, in order to identify possible differences specific to origin and migration in the same aim of providing the best possible health care and prevention. Social security only offers a screening service for young people in work resulting primarily from an apprenticeship in the form of the youth survey. Blanket standardised screening for all children and young people would be an appropriate measure here and would be particularly important for vulnerable population groups. Physically and psychologically stressful experiences, in particular fleeing experiences, as well as social and material marginalisation and socio-economic disadvantages can have a lasting negative impact on the health of children and young people. Experience in Austria has also shown that parental attitudes differ according to origin when it comes to vaccinating their children.

The “Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC)” series of studies provides some insight into the health situation of pupils with a migrant background.\(^{57}\) According to this survey, 30\% of pupils with a migrant background in Austria are overweight according to self-declarations on height and weight, while only 14\% of pupils without a migrant background are overweight. In addition, pupils with a migrant background move less and sit longer in front of the television and digital games each day. Just 44\% are physically active for 60 minutes on at least five days a week compared with 50\% of pupils without a migrant background.\(^{58}\)

According to the HBSC data, young people with a migrant background often report eating unhealthy food. At the same time, however, they rarely drink alcohol. A cultural effect could play a role in the case of alcohol consumption, as alcohol consumption among young people is less common or socially accepted in many countries of origin. However, the greater popularity of junk food among children and young people with a migrant background could be explained by the fact that it still has a better image in the countries of origin and that it is considered to be something special.\(^{59}\)

\(^{55}\) With respect to these statistics, these are the young people with at least one parent born in Austria. Griebler, Robert et al. (2016), Österreichischer Kinder- und Jugendgesundheitsbericht, p. 15.


\(^{57}\) The “migrant background” criterion refers to a foreign birthplace for both parents irrespective of nationality.

\(^{58}\) Griebler, Robert et al. (2016), Österreichischer Kinder- und Jugendgesundheitsbericht, 2015, p. 214.

\(^{59}\) Ramelow, Daniela et al. (2015), Gesundheit und Gesundheitsverhalten von österreichischen Schülerinnen und Schülern, pp. 85-86 and 106.
Young people with a migrant background in a conflict between cultures

As the most important time for development and searching for an identity, puberty does not represent a cultural issue and affects young people equally whether they have a migrant background or not. However, those with a migrant background are frequently part of a conflict between the expectations and values of their parents and their community on the one hand and the more liberal values and social expectations of migrants in Austria on the other. This situation between everyday life, in which German is used as an everyday language and fundamental Austrian values are expected, and the parental home, which is often shaped by religious tradition, particularly with regard to role models, attitudes and values, can lead young people to question their own identity. Pressure both on the young people and on the family from their own community can represent an additional strain on this situation. Members of the first generation tend to be more distant from the receiving society and often pass this onto their descendants – which can in turn lead to problems for them in their social environment.

A comparison between generations shows that children tend to be less religious compared with their parents’ generation. The significance of religious norms in real-life areas involving individual freedom and sexuality is declining in particular. For example, children’s participation in sex education and joint swimming classes is more frequently advocated by migrants of the second generation than was the case with their parents. On the other hand, differences between generations are less pronounced when it comes to specific religious principles, such as whether one’s own religion is the only true one or only followers of one’s own religion can enter Paradise. Identification with their own religious community continues to be a central feature of identity for members of the second generation, even though they tend to be less religious as compared with their parents’ generation. Strict religious values are also more likely to be passed on in socially weaker households that have a segregated social network.

Recent data on the values held by young people with a migrant background paints more of a positive picture. In a recently published study of more than 1,000 young people with a migrant background around 87% of respondents advocated European values, with 61% of these even advocating them very strongly. By contrast around 15% had a very conservative role model. Only 5% of participants were categorised as “religiously intolerant” with regard to their values. On the other hand, the figures in the study on xenophobia and anti-semitism are worrying. For instance 42% of participants felt that people of Jewish faith had too much global influence.

Empirical data from these studies also shows that both religious rules and state laws are important for some of the young people, which supports the theory that it is difficult for young people to find their identity. However, there is also evidence of a tendency for the values of young people with a migrant background to converge with the attitudes of the receiving society as their length of stay increases. From this it can be deduced that while the phase of searching for an identity is a difficult one for young migrants, at the same time a large majority manages to remain faithful to their cultural habits while respecting the rights and values of the receiving country.

60 Weiss, Hilde (2014), Der Wandel religiöser Glaubensgrundsätze in muslimischen Familien.
61 Peter, Zoltan et al. (2019), Integrationsthema Toleranz.
62 Ibid. Tab. 179: 2/3 of the young people interviewed said that they considered state laws to stand above religious rules. Of the members of Christian religions, 75% agreed to this statement; of the Muslims, 62%.
It should be noted that the young people interviewed who stated that they felt they were foreign in Austria tended to hold more fundamentalist and religiously intolerant views.\textsuperscript{63} The importance of anti-discrimination measures should be mentioned in light of this. Young people who find themselves involved in a conflict between their community or their parental home and the receiving society and who also feel that they do not belong to society may be restricted in their search for an identity. A special evaluation from 2018 of the last PISA study which found a high sense of belonging among pupils with a migrant background in Austrian schools provides some assurance. More than two-thirds of the pupils said that they felt a sense of social belonging at school. Austria is therefore more than 7 percentage points above the OECD average. Almost three-quarters of second-generation migrant respondents state this. The authors of the study conclude from this that the comparatively poorer results in the performance test of pupils with a migrant background are not primarily attributable to social exclusion, but rather that a lack of language skills acts as a barrier.\textsuperscript{64} Introduction of German support classes represents an initial positive step in improving the educational opportunities of pupils with a migrant background on the one hand and associated opportunities for social inclusion on the other. Building on this, work to support parents will be necessary in the future in order to reduce the pressure on young people and to counteract tensions in the development process.

\textsuperscript{63} ibid.

\textsuperscript{64} OECD (2018), The Resilience of Students with an Immigrant Background. pp. 64ff, 118ff and 264ff.
2.3 FAMILY REUNIFICATION AND MARRIAGE MIGRATION
Considerations on possible effects on the integration process

Family reunification as a quantitatively relevant form of migration

The issue of family reunification and the manifestation of marriage migration are two different - but integration-politically relevant - areas which, as a result of the high number of asylum applications in recent years and other forms of migration to Europe and Austria, are becoming increasingly important and have a variety of effects on integration. This influx of relatives is, however, neither a new nor a rare phenomenon. In Europe today, it is even the most important form of immigration of third-country nationals into the EU. Thus in 2017, around 721,000 family members immigrated from third countries to the EU28,65 but only 320,000 workers.66 In the same year, around 1.3 million people migrated from one EU member state to another.67 These included mainly workers, but also people who migrated within the EU for the purpose of starting a family or attending school or university. The increased mobility of workers within the EU after the expiry of the transitional periods for citizens of Central Eastern and South Eastern European EU states partly explains why the recruitment or admission of workers from third countries has become less frequent than in the previous decade.

Even in “classic” immigration countries such as Canada, Australia and the US, the inflow of family members accounts for the larger proportion of immigration (2016: Canada 55%, Australia 56%, USA 74%).68 The most important difference, however, is that in “classic” immigration countries, parents and adult siblings can also enter subsequently and join (or be sponsored by) their families. This is not permitted in most EU countries. At least in Australia, Canada and New Zealand, the selection of migrants according to their qualification or labour market demand is quantitatively significant. This makes it more likely that relatives joining them (partners, as well as siblings) will also have appropriate qualifications.69

For destination countries such as Austria, family reunification – depending on the type – has different effects from an integration perspective: not only for persons living in the country, who originally immigrated or were born here, but also for the relatives who join them and for possible common descendants. Against the background of the recent refugee cohort, which arrived in Austria mainly in 2015 and 2016, but also in view of the new marriages between partners living in Austria and abroad (marriage migration), it makes sense to consider the economic and social consequences of the immigration of family members (family reunification) or (married) partners (marriage migration) from abroad.

---

65 Residence titles issued for the first time, for a period exceeding 12 months.
66 With 650,000 first-time applications for asylum in 2017 (in contrast to 2015 and 2016) there were again fewer asylum seekers than residence titles with the immigration reason “family”. In 2017, first-time residence titles (for a period of 12+ months) with an immigration reason “education” (306,000) were also significantly lower than the figures for the category “family” in previous years. Final data are not yet available for calendar year 2018. Eurostat (2019), Asylum and first time asylum applicants.
69 For a comparison between Australia and other immigration countries, see Larsen, Gareth (2013), Family migration to Australia.
Forms of family reunification

In principle, there are three forms of immigration for family members, which all have different integration policy effects:

- First, the “classic” subsequent entry of spouses and children to foreign workers who are already living in the country and have a fixed residence title. This family migration dominated in the 1970s and 1980s, but still exists to a lesser extent today.

- Second, the reunification of families where a member has been recognised as a refugee. This refers to parents of minor children, (married) partners, and minor children who are still living abroad (family reunification with persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection). The prerequisite is that these family relationships (marriage, partnership, parenthood) already existed before the start of the flight. This form of family reunification took place mainly in 2016 and 2017 because there were large numbers of asylum seekers from 2014/2015 onwards (especially from Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria) who were recognised as refugees. This meant that an essential legal prerequisite for family reunification existed.

- Thirdly, there is marriage migration, i.e. the immigration of spouses who have recently married a person who is a legal resident of Austria or the EU, irrespective of the previously defined family reunification. In this constellation – in contrast to the two forms of family reunification described above, where a marriage or partnership already existed before the anchor person immigrated, i.e. it already was in place abroad – a conscious choice of a partner abroad is made, primarily from the same culture and language group of the anchor person. This person does not necessarily have to have migrated beforehand. This relates to both, mobile EU workers as well as people with a migrant background who have lived here for a long time or are born here, and who marry partners from the country of origin of their migrant parents or grandparents. There are also Austrians and other EU citizens resident here who marry partners from third countries and bring them to Austria.

This chapter is primarily devoted to family reunification of persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection in Austria and selected aspects of marriage migration (marriage migration to third-country nationals and Austrian nationals with a migrant background). The subsequent entry of EU citizens as well as the move to Austrian citizens without a migrant background will only be dealt with marginally.
**Legal framework**

**Family reunification with refugees**

Mothers and fathers of a minor child recognised as a refugee, and spouses or registered partners and minor unmarried children of persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection can apply for visas at Austrian embassies with which they may enter Austria in order to subsequently file an asylum application. Such visas are issued when the following supporting evidence is presented: Legal entitlement to an accommodation such as is customary in Austria (proof of this can be, for example, a rental contract); comprehensive health insurance valid in Austria; no social assistance benefits may be claimed, i.e. the person entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection must have a fixed and regular income. Such proof need not be provided if the application is lodged by the family members of a person entitled to asylum within three months of the granting of the status or by a parent of an unaccompanied minor, or if the fundamental right to respect for family life gives rise to a right to family reunification. In all cases, however, the Federal Office for Immigration and Asylum (BFA) must predict that asylum or subsidiary protection in Austria is likely to be granted. In 2018, the Austrian Federal Office for Immigration and Asylum (BFA) made 3,068 such predictions. According to Section 35 (4) of the Asylum Act (AsylG), the Austrian Federal Office for Immigration and Asylum (BFA) may only give a positive notification if no revocation proceedings are pending against the anchor person and the public interest is not contradicted by the entry of the subsequently immigrating person and – in the case of an application filed more than three months after the asylum status is granted – the above-mentioned evidence is provided in accordance with Section 60 (2) of the Asylum Act (AsylG), unless there is a reason to maintain private and family life in accordance with Art. 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR).

In principle, family members of persons entitled to subsidiary protection can only apply for a visa three years after the status has been granted in Austria. Persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection, both the anchor person and the subsequently immigrating persons, are obliged to sign an integration declaration and to attend German as well as values and orientation courses.

**Marriage migration: Immigration to join third-country nationals and Austrian nationals with or without a migrant background**

Spouses or registered partners who are older than 21 and do not have an EU citizenship can apply for a residence title abroad if the spouse lives in Austria (with Austrian or EU citizenship or fixed residence). The marriage or registered partnership does not have to have existed prior to the unification.

As a rule, the spouse or partner from the third country must provide proof that he or she has accommodation customary for the location in Austria, as well as comprehensive health insurance. The person must not be claiming social assistance benefits, i.e. he or she must have a fixed and regular income or have income from claims to maintenance against the partner already living in Austria. Depending on the origin and type of the residence title, the family members moving to Austria may be required to provide proof of German language skills at A1 level. In order to obtain a permanent residence title, the person must be able to show that they have improved their knowledge of German in Austria.

There are different types of residence titles that can be applied for by family members. In general, these residence titles are limited by quota, except where the fundamental right to respect for family life gives rise to a right to family reunification. Family members of holders of a residence title “Red-White-Red – Card”, “Blue Card EU” or a “Settlement Permit – Researcher” as well as family members of Austrian and other EU citizens are generally exempt from the quota restriction.

---

70 For further information, see also Lukits, Rainer (2015), Die Familienzusammenführung von Drittstaatsangehörigen in Österreich.
71 The marriage or registered partnership must have existed before the person entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection came to Austria.
72 See BMI (2019), Article no.: 16682 of Wednesday, 6 February 2019.
Side note: EU-Turkey Association Agreement

Due to the Association Agreement between the European Union and Turkey, which together with the Additional Protocols has been in force in Austria since its accession to the EU on 1 January 1995, Turkish nationals are to be treated differently from other third-country nationals in certain cases. The so-called “standstill clauses” must ensure that the legal situation in force at the time the Association Agreement was concluded does not deteriorate for this category of persons and thus does not affect their working lives. In concrete terms, this means that neither the obligation to provide evidence of German language knowledge prior to immigration nor the minimum age of spouses or registered partners applies to Turkish citizens. In its decision of 25 April 2019 (Ra 2018/22/0043), the Austrian Supreme Administrative Court (VwGH) stated that the obligation to prove knowledge of German is permissible within the framework of the Integration Agreement. The VwGH recently determined that the obligation to prove knowledge of German is permissible within the framework of the Integration Agreement. The European Court of Justice also declared restrictions on access to the labour market to be admissible, if they are for compelling reasons of general interest (such as integration), provided that the measures are proportionate, which must be carefully examined.

Family reunification for refugees

Especially in the strong years as regards to applications 2015/2016, many of those now entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection came to Austria alone, whereas recently, with the overall number of asylum applications decreasing, the proportion of persons fleeing together with family members has increased. The number of applications for family reunification has fallen in recent years, as has the overall number of asylum applications. While there were about 9,500 applications in 2016, there were only about 2,300 applications for family reunification from persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection in 2018. These applications also appear as first-time applications in the asylum statistics. In addition to the general decline in the number of asylum applications, the change in the Austrian legislative environment also plays a role, as the conditions for enabling family reunification have been redefined. It should also be borne in mind that even before 2018, a large proportion of the refugees recognised in 2016 and 2017 applied for family reunification. Analogous to the main countries of origin of refugees in recent years, most applicants for family reunification in 2018 came from Syria, Afghanistan, Somalia, Iraq and Iran.

International and EU legal requirements as well as Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), which has constitutional status, and the related case law of the European Court of Human Rights on this issue determine the framework conditions under which refugees can reunite with their families. The concrete rules on family reunification are laid down within this framework by ordinary law. Bringing their own core family to Austria is an important concern for refugees: the family is to be given security and protection in Austria, the family unit should be restored and living together with the closest caregivers made possible. However, it should be borne in mind that the subsequent entry of family members has implications for socio-economic and cultural integration. It primarily helps with integration but can also be an obstacle to integration.
Family reunification is helpful to integration if the family group gives stability and perspective to the lives of those entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection, in order to support educational, training and gainful employment intentions and to facilitate their socio-economic integration into the receiving society.\textsuperscript{75} In this sense, not having to constantly worry about spouses and children in crisis regions also has a positive influence on the integration process. The importance of the family for the individual is underlined not least by the fundamental right to the protection of family life.

On the other hand, family reunification can be an obstacle to integration if it restricts external social contacts, thus delaying, complicating or even impeding the structural integration process of the person already living in Austria (language acquisition, labour market integration), their adjustment to the receiving society and the development of an emotional bond with Austria.\textsuperscript{76} Persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection (i.e. anchor persons already living in the receiving country) who are themselves only at the beginning of their own integration process, can only provide limited support to family members who join them in the integration process.

Marriage migration of third-country nationals

Marriages between persons with and without a migrant background are often seen as an indication of successful integration of immigrants and their children. In the case of marriage migration, however, there are also other diagnoses.\textsuperscript{77} Usually these are people born and raised in Austria with a migrant background who marry a partner from the country of origin of their parents or grandparents. If this happens, it can perpetuate integration problems. In the case of anchor persons who have been living in Austria since birth, the language of origin of the parents or grandparents and the subsequently immigrating spouse may again become an everyday language in the newly founded family, and German may recede into the background. At the same time, this can reduce the cultural identification of those who were born in Austria, are structurally integrated and speak German.\textsuperscript{78} The above-mentioned perpetuation is particularly problematic if the anchor person, who has been living or born in Austria since childhood, has a low socio-economic status and a low level of education and marries a partner from the country of origin of the parents or grandparents who also has low qualifications.\textsuperscript{79} For example, it can be seen that immigrant spouses from Turkey are under-qualified and rarely have a vocational qualification, which makes a self-determined working life more difficult.\textsuperscript{80}

Traditional role models and attitudes of men in the destination country also increase the likelihood of a transnational choice of partner within their own ethnic group.\textsuperscript{81} Unmarried women from the original country of origin of their parents or grandparents, due to their generally young age, their socialisation and a rather patriarchal understanding of roles, are more in keeping with the ideas of these men or the parents or grandparents who have a say in marriage matters. Women who come to Austria through marriage migration under such conditions are expected to have children soon. This in turn can reduce the likelihood of early integration into the labour market (for an in-depth analysis see also the chapter on role models). But well-educated women of the second or third generation also marry men from their original milieu of origin, for example from Morocco or Turkey, because these men more strongly stick to the goal of starting a...

\textsuperscript{75} Geserick, Christine et al. (2019), Integrationsfaktor Familie.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{77} See e.g. for example Spencer, Sarah and Charsley, Katharine (2016), Conceptualising integration.
\textsuperscript{78} Other problems are faced by people without a migrant background who marry foreign partners who do not have sufficient knowledge of the German language, and bring them to Austria. In these cases, it is exclusively a question of the integration of the immigrant spouses and the chances of their joint children.
\textsuperscript{79} There are empirical findings that marriage migration can have negative economic effects on working life. See e.g. Çelikaksoy, Aycan (2006), A Wage Premium or Penalty.
\textsuperscript{80} See Hofmann, Martin et al. (2015), FAMINT. Familiengründungsintegration, Heiratsverhalten und Integration von Drittstaatsangehörigen in Österreich, p. 62; Büttner, Tobias and Stichs, Anja (2014), Die Integration von zugewanderten Ehegatten in Deutschland.
\textsuperscript{81} See e.g. Baykara-Krumme, Helen and Fuß, Daniel (2009), Heiratsmigration nach Deutschland.
family, according to the respondents to a survey in Germany. More conservative role models, which are handed down within an ethnic diaspora and reinforced by marriage migration from the countries of origin of the ancestors, not only influence the integration of the partners who move to Austria, but also the socialisation of their children born and growing up here. On the one hand, remaining within one’s own ethnic-linguistic community can have a detrimental effect on the language acquisition of the (spouse) partner who has moved to Austria and perpetuate the values and attitudes passed on to their children. On the other hand, it can have an impact on the later educational and working life and thus on the socio-economic position of the next generation with a migrant background; for example, if the employment of women and mothers is not a high priority or is lacking as a role model. The educational level of parents also has implications for the educational pathways of the children, and can favour or disadvantage their social advancement.

In the Austrian education system in particular, this also applies within the majority society without a migrant background, but has even more serious consequences for children from socially weak families with a migrant background.

82 Weiss, Hilde (2014), Der Wandel religiöser Glaubensgrundsätze in muslimischen Familien.
83 See e.g. Oberdabernig, Doris and Schneebaum, Alyssa (2016), Catching up?
84 Bacher, Johann et al. (2012), Soziale Ungleichheit im österreichischen Schulsystem.
Religious diversity in Austria

One consequence of migration to Austria in recent years and decades is that religious affiliation has become more varied within the Austrian population. In 2016 about 63% of the Austrian population were Roman Catholics (2001: 75%), the share of the Orthodox was 5% (2001: 2%), that of Protestants about 5% and the share of Muslims was 8% (2001: 4%). Forecasts show that these trends will intensify.

Religious plurality is in the first instance a sign of a society in which one can live peacefully, make one’s way and find one’s place without regard to religious affiliation. Especially for people who come from regions of the world in which a certain religious affiliation is a cause of discrimination, in which, conversely, a certain religious affiliation is a prerequisite for social success and affiliation, or in which religion is even a cause of more or less violent conflicts, Austria, as well as other European states, appears to be a country in which everyone can lead a self-determined life quite independently of their religious convictions. At the same time, the increasing religious plurality can also lead to controversies and disputes in Austria. Co-existing peacefully in a society which is not religiously uniform presupposes, in any case, the readiness of each individual to accept that those people with whom one has to deal in everyday life believe something different than oneself.

The homogeneity with regard to religious convictions is also decreasing because more and more people in Austria do not profess any faith at all or are atheists. While the proportion of persons without confession was 12% in 2001, it rose to around 18% in 2018. The relative shift is not only caused by migration. It is also the native population of Austria, whose confession to the Catholic Church in particular has declined in recent years. While in 2001 3 out of 4 Austrians were Roman Catholics, in 2016 it was just under two thirds. In addition, empirical findings of recent years suggest that Muslims in particular, who have increasingly come to Austria as part of the recent refugee cohorts since 2015, have a comparatively high degree of religiosity compared to the receiving society, and this also because in some countries of origin there is neither a formal nor a practised separation of state and religion. This change requires an acceptance of religious matters from non-religious people, and vice versa. Misunderstandings and conflicts can arise where this acceptance or understanding for the other person is lacking.

---

85 In contrast to the Christian religions, whose members are counted separately, persons of Muslim faith in Austria form a “collective category”, although there are considerable differences between different strands of Islam.
86 This is also shown by a survey of religious affiliation done in Lower Austria in 2015/2016. According to this survey, religious diversity increased markedly between 2001, the last year of the national census in which religious affiliation was surveyed, and 2015/2016; while the proportion of persons with a Roman Catholic background fell by 13.9 percentage points to 65.5%, the proportion of persons of Muslim faith increased from 3.2% to 4.2%. For details see Fürlinger, Ernst (2018), Religionsgemeinschaften in Niederösterreich im Kontext von Migration und Globalisierung.
87 Goujon, Anne et al. (2017), Religious Denominations in Vienna & Austria. The proportion of the population of Jewish faith in Austria is estimated at approx. 0.1-0.2%; see religion.orf.at (2014), Judentum in Österreich.
88 Goujon, Anne et al. (2017), Religious Denominations in Vienna & Austria.
Overview: Churches and religious communities in Austria

In Austria, there are 16 legally recognised churches and religious communities, including the Catholic Church, the Protestant Church in its various confessions (Augsburg Confession A.B., Helvetic Confession H.B.), Orthodox religious communities, the Israelite religious community as well as the Islamic Religious Community in Austria (IGGÖ) and the Alevi Religious Community in Austria (ALEVI). In addition, there are nine state-registered religious denominations in Austria.90

The relationship between state and religion

In Austria, every person, regardless of nationality, enjoys freedom of religion. This fundamental right is one of the central guarantees of a catalogue of fundamental rights and is protected both in domestic constitutional law and in human rights treaties under international law. Every religious conviction, regardless of whether it is traditionally widespread in Austria or not, receives protection as a fundamental right. As an individual right, the fundamental right of freedom of religion is not conditional upon the respective religion being recognised in Austria as a religious denomination or as a religious community by an act of government. The freedom to have no religion at all or to reject a specific religion for oneself is also protected. The protection of freedom of religion includes forming and living a religion, changing and rejecting a religion, bringing up and educating children in religious matters, performing religious acts, participating in religious events such as religious services and prayers. Conversely, no one may be forced to participate in religious activities or events: participation in religious education in state schools is voluntary, an oath may be taken without religious affirmation, and there may be no obligation to pray in state institutions.

In Austria, the state and religious communities are separate; in this respect one can call it a secular state. In details, the relationship between the state and religious communities is shaped by a number of constitutional provisions that allow the state to cooperate with recognised churches and religious communities in areas such as hospital, prison and military pastoral care, religious education in public schools, and others. One can therefore speak of a cooperative model of the relationship between state and religious communities, in which the state on the one hand and churches and religious societies on the other are in dialogue and cooperation with each other. The secularity of the Austrian state does not exclude such cooperation – unlike in laic states. However, it does require that the state does not justify its decisions on a religious basis. It is also not allowed to make any evaluations of the religions, to determine its own cult or to decide which beliefs or content-related convictions within a religion shall be the “right” ones. It is barred from interfering in the so-called internal affairs of recognised religious communities, such as their organisation or internal opinion-forming on organisational or content-related issues. The state and all its executive bodies must be neutral in religious matters and must not favour or disadvantage one or the other religion.

90 See: Kultusamt des Bundeskanzleramts, Kirchen und Religionsgemeinschaften.
Secularity and cooperation

This well-established and successful model of cooperation allows collaboration and dialogue between the state and various religions. However, in an increasingly heterogeneous society and one characterised by migration, it can also face certain challenges. It is the responsibility of the state to ensure that constitutional principles and laws applicable to all are also observed and respected by recognised churches, religious communities and religious denominations. If this is not the case, state institutions such as authorities and courts must react accordingly. A recent example of current challenges includes increased tension and conflict with some Islamic associations in Austria. Such conflicts must, however, be resolved with the necessary openness and clarity on the basis of existing law. In terms of integration policy, it may also be a question of making the necessary clarifications of the common social foundation, and agreeing on them.

The separation of state and religion secured by constitutional law is an essential basis for a non-discriminatory coexistence of people of different religions in Austria. In its basic features, state neutrality in religious matters is also secured by the fundamental right of freedom of religion and forms a common European standard, even if the models for shaping the relationship between state and religions vary considerably between the individual European countries.

Religious freedom as a basis

Against this constitutional background, and precisely in a society in which there is plurality of religious beliefs, the limits of freedom of religion and of freedom that religious communities can claim have to be sounded out repeatedly, despite the fact that there is occasionally a certain potential for conflict. This is done, not least, through the jurisprudence of the Austrian supreme courts, the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg and the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg, which in this respect offers a wealth of case materials in which the scope of the fundamental right of freedom of religion was determined in individual cases. However, it is also the task of society and politics to repeatedly reach agreement on the framework conditions that enable every person in Austria to develop his or her own personality in religious terms and at the same time allow peaceful social coexistence. Mutual openness is a key to this: nobody has to understand or even share the religious or non-religious belief of another person, but they must accept them. Getting to know each other’s religions creates a basis for a constructive dialogue at eye level.

Religious education in public schools as well as ethics education, which is to be introduced, offer the possibility of making religions the subject of discussion in schools. For the confessional religious education guaranteed under constitutional law – in Austria, this is offered not only by the Christian churches but also by Muslim and other recognised religious communities – the organisation ensures a certain pedagogical level within the state school system which the school authorities must secure. Another measure under consideration is the creation of a compulsory ethics education for those who do not attend confessional religious classes. The Expert Council welcomes the planned establishment of ethics education as this represents the implementation of a long-standing recommendation. Within the framework of ethics education, pupils who do not take part in religious education should be able to engage in a broad individual discussion of values and principles that form the basis for their own reflective actions and at the same time the basis for social coexistence. Addressing ethical topics is an important contribution to responsible coexistence in society. The experience to be gained in the coming years can serve as a basis for the further development of the subject in terms of content and didactics and will help make plans for the expansion of ethics education in the future.
Tolerance and its limits

Tolerance also has its limits. A wrong understanding of tolerance must not be used as an excuse to conceal undesirable developments or problematic situations or even to misuse the concept of tolerance. Openness and tolerance are based on reciprocity and cannot only be claimed from one side. Denigration, insults or degradation of individuals or groups on the basis of their religion contradicts this idea and disturbs religious and social peace in the long run.

In the case of children and young people, schools and other educational institutions in particular are called upon to convey a respectful coexistence to them and, on the other hand, to clearly oppose any vilification on the grounds of religious affiliation (or precisely because of their non-affiliation). Children and young people in particular, while they are growing up in a society characterised by migration and religious diversity, can quickly find themselves in difficult situations due to religious, traditional, family or cultural reasons (more on this in the chapter “Integration of young people”). But there is also much to expect from the religious communities and their institutional representatives and association structures. They must take responsibility for practicing openness and tolerance towards other religions and their followers, instead of disparaging them as unbelievers or as non-believers or positioning them against each other.

Any form of discrimination, disparagement or hate speech of religious groups must be vigorously opposed. This refers to public authorities as well as civil society and every single person. A study on anti-Semitism in Austria published in 2019\(^1\) shows, among other things, that anti-Semitism is still a pressing social problem. In this respect, strikingly high antisemitic tendencies, especially among Turkish and Arabic speaking persons, pose a major challenge in terms of integration policy. It can be assumed that socialisation in the culture of origin has a considerable influence on attitudes in this respect.

Any form of religious extremism opposes the idea of a religious-tolerant society and can permanently disrupt religious and social peace in a society. Extremism on religious grounds can be defined as movements that follow a view or interpretation of religion which does not tolerate any other belief beside its own. In recent years, above all the phenomenon of Islamist extremism can be observed as a form of religious extremism that is present in Europe. Corresponding movements claim to be founded in Islam and strive to establish a religious and, more specifically Islamic, social state order.\(^2\) Religious extremism cannot have a place in a society based on freedom of the individual. It must be countered with all the constitutional means available to a liberal society. As a central government measure, the National Network for Prevention and Countering Violent Extremism and De-radicalisation (BNED) should be pointed out. It deals, among other things, with the phenomenon of religiously motivated extremism and in which a large number of governmental and non-governmental stakeholders are involved. But also, civil society and each and every individual is called upon to oppose religious extremism in its various forms, and not to let themselves be taken in by respective influences.\(^3\) In this respect, the case law of the European Court of Human Rights has also made it clear that the state can take measures against religious or religious-political currents that seek to use force to abolish the democratic foundations of a state.\(^4\) The democratic constitutional state may use the means it has at its disposal to combat the opponents of democracy, individual freedom and the secular rule of law.

---

\(^1\) See Zeglovits, Eva et al. (2019), Antisemitismus in Österreich 2018.

\(^2\) Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, Islamismus - Was ist das überhaupt?

\(^3\) This applies not only to extremist ideologies, but also to discourses that inhibit integration and polarise society strongly, such as those found in some mosques. See, for instance, Heinisch, Heiko (2017), Die Rolle der Masche im Integrationsprozess.

Social change and shared foundations

Historically, Austria is a country characterised above all by Christianity. Jews and Muslims have also played a role in our history. These imprints can be seen in old and new buildings that define the image of cities, towns and landscapes, on holidays, even in the division of the week and the calendar, and in many traditions that are of more or less religious origin. All this helps make up the culture of a country and contributes to the sense of belonging of the people who live in it. Even in a neutral state such religiously shaped traditions can and should be lived and passed on. However, they are not static, but – like society as a whole – are subject to constant change. With the pluralisation caused by the decrease of religious ties in general and the diversification of religious beliefs, rituals and traditions are also subject to change, in the cities differently than in rural areas, in different regions in different ways. For a long time now, not everyone goes to church on Sundays or religious holidays, and non-religious traditions such as Halloween, Mother’s Day or Valentine’s Day have long since found their place on the calendar.

The more diverse a society shaped by migration is, the more important is the existence of a strong common social foundation based on a sound consensus about constitutional and fundamental rights. It is equally important to create awareness of this among all the people living in Austria and to communicate this concept in particular to the new immigrant members of society.

In a secular state, a heterogeneous and religiously diverse society must ensure that believers and non-believers can live together in a respectful manner, thus avoiding a multitude of conflicts from the outset. Religions can provide answers to ultimate questions and be an important pillar in the lives of the individual. If churches and religious communities promote a peaceful way of life, social well-being and open coexistence, religious freedom can be an important factor influencing the success of integration.
Women can play an important role in the integration process. In the Integration Report 2018, the Expert Council therefore placed a focus on the integration of women, with special emphasis on understanding women with a migration history as a heterogeneous group that requires differentiated integration policy approaches. Building on these ideas, this year the Expert Council dedicated a focus chapter to the importance of gender roles for the integration of immigrants. On the one hand, the purpose is to reflect on why some women face special challenges in the integration process, but on the other hand it should also make clear that certain gender roles also have effects on the process of integrating men. In any case, it can be stated that gender roles play an important role in the integration of immigrants – whether women or men. In many countries of origin of refugees who have immigrated in recent years, patriarchal societal systems are strongly anchored and shape people’s attitudes even after the migration process. The incompatibility of gender role models, in which male dominance is the rule, and the Western ideal of women’s equality and self-determination can give rise to tensions that can lead to conflicts in schools, for example, but also in social interaction in Austrian society.

Conflicts leading to physical, psychological or sexual violence, in particular against women, must be countered through state protection against violence and preventive measures in order to guarantee the right to the integrity of every person. It takes time for attitudes towards gender roles to change. Politics and society can initiate or accelerate these processes within the possibilities of a liberal democratic society. The focus must be on strengthening the development possibilities of the individual and on the clear communication of Austrian values and norms, and it must be made clear that collectivist, patriarchal structures contradict this. Suppressive role models and violence must not counteract emancipatory achievements under the guise of religious freedom or misunderstood tolerance. In this respect, there is a connection to the idea of tolerance and its limits discussed in the section on dealing with religious diversity. Even in a state that guarantees freedom of religion, this freedom is not without limits. No one can invoke freedom of religion in order to restrict the freedom of others – for example by imposing behaviour, dress codes or even the obligation to marry. Society and politics must constantly strive to reach an agreement on the framework conditions that enable every person in Austria to develop their personality and live together peacefully.

Gender role models, which are passed on to the next generation within the family and the wider social environment, also have an impact on the integration success of young people. Because they are structurally anchored in the education system and more receptive, young people have a great potential for integration. However, young people with a migrant background can find themselves in a state of tension between different expectations and influences, between cultural-traditionalist parental homes and communities on the one hand and Austrian values, norms and customs on the other, which can lead to identity conflicts. Schools and other educational institutions are often the spaces in which these conflicts take place or become particularly visible. Education policy measures are therefore of particular importance: Supporting schools and other educational institutions in their manifold tasks by providing sufficiently qualified pedagogical and social work personnel, good teacher/pupil ratios, adequate equipment including buildings and materials is a key for a successful integration of migrants and for creating the best possible basis for the shaping of the future of all pupils in Austria. This is the basis for the daily work that educators do. At the same time, however, teachers and social workers also need adequate support and options to react appropriately to conflicts in everyday school life. When working with young people who are not in education, employment or training (NEETs), not only youths with a migrant
background but also youths without a migrant background must be given intensified attention, since rapid integration into education and working life is important for all youths and has a major impact on their careers. However, it must also be noted that the school, which is designed as a training centre, is simply not structured to respond to all challenges of a social nature. Special attention should therefore also be paid to the work with parents and communities as well as to the after-school work and time use.

A group of migrants who should be given more attention in the framework of the integration policy in the future are people who come to Austria as family members (also in the context of marriage migration): These are in particular people with a migrant background who already live in Austria and marry partners from the countries of origin of their parents and grandparents and bring them to Austria. Family reunification through marriage migration can cause a first generation of immigrants becoming “perpetuated”, so to speak, and this does not stay without effects on integration processes. The future consideration of this topic will be dominated by the question of the extent to which marriage migration promotes or inhibits integration and which specific integration policy approaches must accompany this form of migration.

Already in the context of the discussion on how to deal with different gender roles, it became clear that in the countries of origin of some migrants daily life is shaped by religious norms and rules of conduct and that belonging to a religion is a basic prerequisite for participation in social life. Against this background, the separation of religion and state in Austria is a basic prerequisite to live a self-determined life independent of confessional world views. At the same time, though, the model of the relationship between state and religion in Austria is not strictly separated as in laic states, but is based on a cooperative togetherness in certain areas. For example, it is possible for recognised religious communities to offer confessional education in public schools for children and young people. This cooperation model offers chances especially for integration policy, since it makes different religions visible and grants them space. At the same time, one prerequisite for making use of the cooperation offer of the state is that the religious communities be based on the constitutional principles of Austria. Against this background a cooperation with a religious community always has to be questioned if there are doubts about the latter.
3 From the National Action Plan to the Integration Report 2019
### Integration Report Creation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>National Action Plan for Integration (NAP.I)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>EXPERT COUNCIL FOR INTEGRATION WORKING PROGRAMME Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Perspectives and recommendations for action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Integration issues in focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Achievements to date and guiding principles for the future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**50 Action Points** - a plan for the integration of persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection in Austria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Expert Council for Integration</th>
<th>Statistical Yearbook Report on Indicators Volume 2</th>
<th>Advisory Committee on Integration Establishment Volume 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>20-point programme</td>
<td>migration &amp; integration 2011</td>
<td>Conclusion about previous measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>migration &amp; integration 2012</td>
<td>Conclusion about previous measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Perspectives and recommendations for action</td>
<td>migration &amp; integration 2013</td>
<td>Integration database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Integration issues in focus</td>
<td>migration &amp; integration 2014</td>
<td>Integration database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Achievements to date and guiding principles for the future</td>
<td>migration &amp; integration 2015</td>
<td>Integration database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Interim evaluation of the 50 Action Points</td>
<td>migration &amp; integration 2016</td>
<td>Integration database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Evaluating refugee integration – Refocussing on regular integration</td>
<td>migration &amp; integration 2017</td>
<td>Integration database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Figures, trends and analyses – A focus on the integration of women</td>
<td>migration &amp; integration 2018</td>
<td>Integration database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Integration in Austria – statistics, developments, priorities</td>
<td>migration &amp; integration 2019</td>
<td>Integration database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 The Expert Council for Integration
4.1 THE MEMBERS OF THE EXPERT COUNCIL FOR INTEGRATION

Chairwoman

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Katharina Pabel
Dr. Pabel has been a University Professor of Public Law at the Johannes Kepler University of Linz since 2010 – following positions at the universities of Bonn, Graz and the Vienna University of Economics and Business – and has been Dean of the Faculty of Law there since 2015. She is the author of numerous specialist publications on various fields of constitutional and administrative law, with a special research focus on national and international human rights protection. Since February 2018 she has chaired the Expert Council for Integration.

Members

Univ.-Prof. iR. Mag. Dr. habil. Gudrun Biffl
Prof. Biffl is an associate member of the Department for Migration and Globalisation at the Danube University Krems. From 2008 to September 2017 she was the Chair of Migration Research, Head of the Department of Migration and Globalisation, and she was Dean of the Faculty of Economics and Globalisation from 2010 to 2015. From 1975 – 2009 she worked as an economic researcher at the Austrian Institute of Economic Research (WIFO). Her research focuses on the labour market, education, migration, gender, industrial relations and institutional change as well as work-related diseases. Prof. Biffl is Chairperson of the Statistics Council of Statistik Austria, a member of the Scientific Advisory Board of the Sir Peter Ustinov Institute for Prejudice Research and Prevention, and member of the “Expert group on migration” of the OECD.

Rasha Corti
Rasha Corti, born July 20, 1982 in Raqqa. After graduating from high school in Raqqa, she studied literature in Aleppo and trained as a television presenter in Cairo. During her studies she worked at the French Cultural Centre in Damascus and produced documentaries about Syria for various broadcasting services (BBC, Al Jazeera). In 2009 she moved to Vienna where she now works as a tourist guide and translator. She is also involved in various projects in the field of integration.
Mag. Dr. Eva Grabherr
Mag. Dr. Grabherr studied history and Jewish studies at the universities of Innsbruck and Vienna and completed a research PhD at the Department for Hebrew and Jewish Studies at the University College London. From 1989 – 1990, she was a university lecturer at the University of Hull (UK) and from 1990 – 1996 construction director of the Jewish Museum Hohenems. From 1996 – 2001, she conducted research, taught in Vienna, London, Innsbruck, Graz and Munich, and organised exhibition projects on the subjects of Jewish studies, museology, Austrian history and current politics. She has been an active leader in the construction of the project site for immigration and integration at okay.zusammen leben since 2001. In addition, she holds lectures and seminars, including the course Migration Management at the Danube University Krems.

Dipl.-Soz. wiss. Kenan Güngör
Kenan Güngör, Dipl. Soz., is the owner of the office for society, organisation and development [think.difference] in Vienna. As one of the most prominent experts on integration and diversity issues in Austria, he advises and supports governmental and non-governmental organisations on a federal, state and municipal level. Among other things, he has headed multiple studies and integration-related model processes at the federal province and city levels. As a strategic consultant he accompanied, among others, the City of Vienna for several years in integration and diversity-related issues and was visiting professor at the University of Vienna. He was the chairman of the expert_forum Prävention, Deradikalisierung & Demokratiekultur (Expert_Forum Prevention, De-radicalisation & Democratic Culture) of the City of Vienna and accompanies a comprehensive prevention programme for schools in Vienna that are free from violence and fear.

Prof. MMag. Dr. Ilan Knapp
Prof. Knapp was born in Tel Aviv/Israel, graduated from a musical education programme in Israel and Vienna as well as business administration studies, business education and business psychology at the Vienna University of Economics and Business. Founder and director of important public institutions, amongst others in education (JBBZ – Jewish Vocational Training Centre – 1995) and in research (ÖIBF – Austrian Institute for Vocational Training – 1970). Lecturer at the Vienna University of Technology. Since 2014, he has been the official representative of the Jewish Agency for Israel (Sochnut) in Austria. Furthermore, Prof. Knapp was active as a lecturer at the University of Vienna, Vienna University of Economics and Business, and FU Berlin for many years. He was also formerly the Managing Director of EcoPlus and NÖG Lower Austria as well as parliamentary advisor on labour market, economy, youth, social affairs and education. In 2018 Prof. Knapp was awarded the Austrian Cross of Honour for Science and Art, First Class.

Prof. Dr. Klaus Lugger
Prof. Klaus Lugger, born 7 March 1948, was CEO of NEUE HEIMAT TIROL Gemeinnützige WohnungsGmbH (EUR 114 million p.a. building volume, 34,000 managed units, of which 17,571 rental and owner-occupied) from 1989 – 2016, and Managing Director of its commercial subsidiary, INNSBRUCKER STADTBAU GMBH, from 2004 – 2016. From 1995 – 2016, he was Chairman of the Supervisory Board for the Austrian Federation of Limited-Profit Housing Associations (GBV) and Austrian representative for CECODHAS HOUSING EUROPE, the EU-lobby for not-for-profit housing providers.
Univ.-Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Mazal

Prof. Mazal was born in Vienna, studied law at the University of Vienna, where he received his doctorate in 1981 and has been a professor at the Institute of Labour and Social Law since 1992, where he is currently Director. Besides a broad range of teaching, research and publication activities, amongst others, in Vienna, Graz, Linz, Innsbruck, Beijing, and Kyoto on issues of labour law, social law, medical law and in family matters, Prof. Mazal is also Head of the Austrian Institute for Family Studies at the University of Vienna, Chair of the University Council of the Danube University Krems and Vice-President of the Board of the Agency for Quality Assurance and Accreditation (AQ Austria).

Dir. Dr. Arno Melitopulos

Dr. Melitopulos, born in Innsbruck, graduated from graduate and doctoral studies in law in Innsbruck. He has been Director of the Regional health insurance organisation for Tyrol (TGKK) since August 2011. Previously, he was Managing Director of Gesundheit Österreich GmbH (GÖG) in Vienna from June 2009 to July 2011, where he has been active as a member since 2008. From 2005 – 2008, Dr. Melitopulos was Head of the Strategy and Law Department in the TGKK and simultaneously Managing Director of the Tiroler Gesundheitsfonds [Tyrolean health fund, TGF] from 2006. Between 2003 and 2005, he was an advisor to the Austrian Ministry of Health during the health reform. Dr. Melitopulos is a university lecturer in Social Law and holds teaching positions at the Management Center Innsbruck, the private university UMIT, and the Medical University of Innsbruck.

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Rainer Münz

Prof. Rainer Münz is a Senior Advisor at the European Political Strategy Center, the Think Tank of the President of the EU Commission. He teaches at the University of St. Gallen and at the Central European University in Budapest. He is chairman of the Migration Advisory Board of the UN Organization for International Migration (IOM) and one of the programme coordinators of the World Bank Programme Global Knowledge Partnership on Migration and Development (KNOMAD). Prior to this, Rainer Münz headed the research department of Erste Group and was a senior fellow at the Brussels Think Tank Bruegel, at the Hamburg Institute of International Economics (HWWI), and at the Migration Policy Institute (Washington DC). In the years 2000 – 2001, he was a member of the Commission on the Reform of the Immigration Policy of the German Federal Government (Süssmuth Kommission). From 2008 to 2010, Rainer Münz was a member of the reflection group “Horizon 2020 – 2030” of the European Union (known as the “EU-Weisenrat”).

Dr. Thomas Oliva

Dr. Thomas Oliva was long-time manager of the Industrial Association of Vienna and the Austrian Association of the Branded Goods Industry. He became focused on integration and immigration early on – for example within the Viennese Immigration Fund and as Chairman of the Vienna Immigration Commission and until the summer of 2017 in Forum Wien Welt Offen. He is Chairman of the Board of the Vienna Science and Technology Fund (WWTF) and is particularly active in Vienna concert and cultural life.
Prof. Emina Saric, MA
Prof. Emina Saric, MA, born 1969 in Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina. German Studies at the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo, Montessori education at the University College of Teacher Education Styria in Graz, gender studies at the University of Graz. In 2007 she worked as a teacher of German as a second language (DaZ) and in the field of intercultural learning at Caritas Graz-Seckau. 2011 Co-founder of DIVAN, a counselling centre dedicated to women, where she worked as an advisor and deputy lead until 2018. She currently teaches at the Ausbildungszentrum für Sozialberufe (educational centre for social professions) in Graz and is project manager of the project Heroes Steiermark. She researches and works on the topics of violence in the name of honour and traditional forms of violence in the context of gender relations.

Ao. Univ.-Prof. DDr. Christian Stadler
Prof. Stadler holds doctoral degrees in law and philosophy. Since 2000, he has been an associate professor at the Institute for Legal Philosophy of the Law Faculty of the University of Vienna. He is, amongst other things, a member of the science committee (Strategic Security Policy Advisory Board) at the Federal Ministry of Defence (BMLV). Prof. Stadler regularly holds guest lectures at the Security Academy of the BMI (SIAK, Vienna or Wiener Neustadt), at the Theresian Military Academy (MiIAk, Wiener Neustadt) and at the National Defence Academy (LVIAk, Vienna). He is currently Head of the research group “Polemology and Ethics of Law” at the National Defence Academy Vienna (in cooperation with the University of Vienna). His key areas of activity include, among others: political philosophy of modernity (rationalism, idealism, political romanticism), ethics of public security, political philosophy of international relations, polemology and geopolitics as well as European legal and constitutional culture.

Dr. Hans Winkler
Hans Winkler is an independent journalist and columnist for the daily newspaper Die Presse and guest author of the Kleine Zeitung and other media. From 1995 to 2007 he was head of the Vienna editorial office as well as deputy editor-in-chief of the Kleine Zeitung. He studied law at the University of Graz.

Mag. Renate Winter
Mag. Renate Winter became a judge in Austria in 1981. Her areas of expertise include women’s and youth rights, war crimes, crimes against humanity, gender issues, organised crime and restorative justice. As part of the UN Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), Mag. Winter worked as an international judge at the Supreme Court of Kosovo. In 2002, she was appointed to the Special Court for Sierra Leone, of which she was President. In 2013, she was appointed a member of the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and elected its President. Mag. Winter has worked in more than 40 countries as a judicial advisor to governments and international bodies. She is currently Vice-President of the CRC, member of the Residual Special Court of Sierra Leone (RSCSL) and team leader of an EU project to promote the rule of law in Georgia.
The Expert Council sees integration in the immigration society as an empirically measurable and consciously promoted participation, providing equal opportunities as much as possible in the central areas of social life, i.e. in pre-school institutions, school education, vocational training, employment and housing, in the field of voluntary work, in politics and in the various protection and welfare systems in the legal and welfare state, as well as the recognition of and identification with Austrian values.

Integration-promoting measures are considered to be all efforts to enable equal opportunities for participation and to counter existing fears and prejudices. Knowledge of German, school and vocational qualifications, but also educational and symbolic political measures are essential in order to increase the participation chances of immigrants. On the other hand, the Expert Council for Integration regards the increasing integration competence of the government’s basic institutional structures, which is also to be consciously promoted, as a further and important prerequisite for successful integration. Schools, the Public Employment Service (AMS), the authorities, hospitals, civil society and other important institutions should be increasingly put in a position to develop intercultural (communication) competence.

Thus, on a conceptual scale, the Expert Council does not place the concept of integration between assimilation on the one hand and integration as a patchwork of different population groups that possess and live their own systems of culture and values on the other, but rather places it above them. In its understanding of the term, the Expert Council for Integration also pushes aside a concept of culture that can only be defined vaguely and is ideologically burdened. A static and essentialist concept of culture would not do justice to the reality of a pluralistic and changing immigration society. At the “end of the road” there is neither a perfectly assimilated society, nor a patchwork of different social groups that has become alien to itself, but rather a plural coexistence that has to be negotiated again and again. Both sides of the immigration society must therefore develop something like a pluralism competence in addition to a receiving and integration competence, because over time, society becomes more similar and more diverse at the same time. Accordingly, integration continues to be seen as a two-way process, and it takes effort to make it work.

The immigrants are just as responsible for successful integration as the people already present. Both sides of the immigration society operate within an integration policy framework defined by politics, which can promote or prevent processes. The necessary adjustment efforts are not distributed symmetrically, because the logic of quantities alone places more demands on the immigrant population than on the host society. This should be clarified in order to avoid false expectations and misunderstandings. Nevertheless, this also applies to the host society: “making room” as a prerequisite for “taking room”. The integration process cannot function without a mutual willingness to open up and without mutual acceptance of the supposed “others”. A constructive integration policy must always take this into account.
Asylum procedure
The first step in the asylum procedure is to determine whether Austria or another EU country is responsible for dealing with the asylum application (admission procedure or Dublin procedure). If Austria’s competence is affirmed, the procedure in respect of the content is then continued in Austria. An accelerated procedure (“fast-track procedure”) is used when an asylum seeker lodges an asylum application from a safe country of origin. Safe countries of origin are countries in which no political persecution or inhuman or degrading punishments take place. The competent authority for both the admission procedure and the further substantive examination is the Austrian Federal Office for Immigration and Asylum (BFA), which is subordinate to the Federal Ministry of the Interior (BMI). If the Austrian Federal Office for Immigration and Asylum (BFA) takes a negative decision, the person concerned may lodge an appeal with the Austrian Federal Administrative Court (BVwG), which not only reviews the decision of the BFA regarding its legal appraisal, but also the facts themselves. Rights of appeal against the decisions of the Austrian Federal Administrative Court (BVwG) are possible; an appeal can be lodged before the Constitutional Court of Austria (VfGH) with the claim that the BVwG made constitutional errors in the procedure, or an appeal can be lodged, in selective cases, before the Austrian Supreme Administrative Court (VwGH).

Asylum seekers
The term asylum seeker refers to a person in an ongoing asylum procedure. Asylum seekers are legal residents of Austria for the duration of the proceedings, although they generally have to stay within the district area assigned to them during the admission procedure.

Austrian means-tested minimum income (BMS)
The means-tested minimum benefit system was introduced throughout Austria in September 2010 by way of an agreement between the Federation and the provinces. This Agreement expired in 2016 with laws specific to the provinces enacted after this. The statutory regulations have meanwhile been amended at federal level, and social assistance will replace the means-tested minimum benefit system from 1 January 2020.

In contrast to unemployment benefits and unemployment assistance, the BMS is a social security benefit rather than an insurance benefit. It can be claimed as a supplement to earnings, unemployment benefits or unemployment assistance, if a certain minimum income level is not achieved (standard rate supplement).

Anyone who is able to work and entitled to permanent residence in Austria has the right to claim BMS benefits. According to current law this includes Austrian citizens and their families, persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection, EU/EEA citizens, Swiss citizens and their families, third-country nationals with a specific residence title (Long-term Resident - EU, Long-term Resident - Family Member) and third-country nationals with proof of settlement or long-term settlement permit.

Integration Act (IntG)
In the areas of language and orientation, the Integration Act regulates the central framework conditions for the integration of persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection, and legally settled third-country nationals, by establishing integration offers and cooperation obligations. Integration offers for persons entitled to asylum or subsidiary protection include German training and values courses; legally settled third-country nationals must prove their knowledge of German within the framework of the Integration Agreement.
Integration monitoring
The Integration Act introduced the integration monitoring in 2017, according to which the responsible members of the Advisory Committee on Integration make legally mandated, non-personal data available annually for the purpose of enabling cross-competency linkages. The data includes the areas: asylum and residence, school education and adult education, apprenticeship training, welfare benefits, labour market, German lessons, values and orientation courses, and science. In the Integration Report, the Expert Council for Integration discusses and contextualises the annual development on the basis of the integration monitoring.

National Action Plan for Integration (NAP.I)
NAP.I depicts the national Austrian integration strategy. Its aim is to optimise, pool and systematically develop the measures for successful integration of the Republic of Austria, the federal provinces, cities, municipalities, social partners and civil society organisations. The National Action Plan is the basis for further measures in the seven key areas of action: Language and education, work and employment, rule of law and values, health and social issues, intercultural dialogue, sport and leisure, housing and the regional dimension of integration.

Persons entitled to Asylum or Recognised Refugees
Persons entitled to asylum or recognised (Convention) refugees are persons whose asylum application has been decided positively. Asylum applications must be dealt with positively if the requirements of the Geneva Refugee Convention (GRC) are met. If asylum seekers can demonstrate that they are facing individual persecution in their country of origin on the grounds of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political conviction and that they cannot claim the protection of their country of origin, they are entitled to asylum. They are granted a residence permit in Austria, initially limited to three years (“temporary asylum”). This period is extended to an unlimited period of validity if the conditions for a revocation proceeding are not met or if such a proceeding is discontinued. The asylum status shall be dismissed, for example, if the reasons for flight are no longer present or if a serious crime has been committed. Persons entitled to asylum are equated in many respects with Austrian citizens; they have access to the labour market, to welfare benefits and to higher education.

Persons entitled to Subsidiary Protection
If a person cannot establish a persecution within the meaning of the GRC, if he or she is therefore not individually persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, his or her asylum application shall be dismissed. According to the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), which has been ratified by Austria and even has constitutional status, a person cannot be deported if his or her life or health is threatened in the country of origin as a result of war or torture (“refoulement ban”). This is also spelled out in Union law. These persons are designated as persons entitled to subsidiary protection and receive a one-year temporary right of residence, which can be extended (several times) by two years in each case. The status may be revoked under certain circumstances. Persons entitled to subsidiary protection do not have to have the same rights as those entitled to asylum.

Unaccompanied Minor Refugees
According to public discourse, unaccompanied minor refugees are referred to as persons entitled to asylum and asylum seekers who are under 18 years of age and who are without their legal representative in Austria. They are particularly worthy of protection in many aspects, this fact is considered in different special provisions (e.g. special provisions during the admission procedure or accommodation and care). The Austrian legislation, however, only refers to “unaccompanied minors”. This takes account of the fact that specific provisions exist, particularly during the asylum procedure, i.e. during a period in which it is not yet decided whether the minor shall be recognised as a refugee.
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