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Refugee policy matters, both for academic researchers and real-world policy debates. The topic of refugee integration is just as relevant. Xenophobia has been on the rise and is an important theme in the realm of refugee policy discussion as well. Does xenophobia lower the likelihood of a nation’s policies helping to integrate refugees with the rest of society? If host-nation citizens fear that refugees will harm the economy, increase terrorism and heighten crime rates, lawmakers will have little reason to prioritize integrative refugee policies. These factors suggest that when a country is more xenophobic, integrative refugee policies will not be high on the lawmakers’ agenda. To examine this question, this study uses information about 67 countries from a variety of sources including the World Values Survey, UNHCR country reports and the European Social Survey. A multivariate regression controlling for region, economic downturns, whether the country is in the European Union as well as additional confounding variables shows that higher xenophobic tendencies among a country’s population do in fact lead to a lower likelihood of a nation’s implementing an integrative refugee policy. Also analyzed was whether percent increase in incidents of terrorism, crime rates and economic health had statistical significance in terms of percent change in refugee acceptance over the span of 2012–2016. The results of this analysis show that there is not statistical significance that a high percent change in refugee admittance leads to a high percent increase in incidents of terrorism, crime rates and safety rates. However, a high percent change in refugee admittance leads to a high percent change in economic growth.
Future research should further investigate the implications of xenophobia at a governmental level on integration policies.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The policy debate surrounding not only refugee acceptance, but also refugee integration, is extremely relevant in that refugee numbers around the world are at the highest level ever recorded by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCR). It should be noted for the purpose of this research that the terms “integration” and “assimilation” are defined. Integration, in regard to refugee policy, refers to the host nations’ intermixing of refugees with its citizens. Assimilation, though, refers to the refugees’ becoming similar to the citizens of the host nation. These terms are important to distinguish because refugee integration is the main topic of this research, and assimilation can be a byproduct of refugees entering a host country as well.

This work provides an account of the literature on the topic and tests the relationship between xenophobia in terms of the civilian population of a country and refugee integration policies. The countries in this work are of no particular category, but of a variety of economic tiers and regions around the world. Also illustrated will be the implications of refugee acceptance rates on the economy, safety rates, crime rates and incidents of terrorism. The topic of xenophobia is critical to this analysis because it is a form of public opinion. This public opinion may have shifted as a result of various right-wing platforms on anti-immigration and anti-refugee policies. There has been a rise in radical right-wing parties since the period of political turbulence which began in the 1970s. These parties reject societal impartiality, oppose social integration and attract xenophobic loyalists (Betz, 1993). Xenophobia rooted in such parties is what leads to opposition of social integration. As a result of the rise in right-wing parties, the Western world has experienced the trend of
opposition to integration of immigrants into society as most prominently evinced by the Brexit vote (Yakovenko, 2017). The xenophobia evident during the Brexit campaign was an underlying reason behind leaving the European Union (EU) and this example is relevant in that it suggests a possible shift towards anti-foreigner sentiment. It is because of these postulations that I believe that xenophobia plays such a large role in integrative policy outcomes for refugees. This work asserts that fear of people from other countries will result in a lack of integrative policies for immigrants, and this will specifically be applied to refugees. To further examine this relationship, a quantitative analysis is used to infer the relationship between xenophobia and integration policies. The data being compressed will sufficiently represent the variable of xenophobia and a proper refugee integration policy variable will be created by accumulating data on a country by country level. In doing so, this thesis extends the current literature, which primarily covers economic indicators for anti-refugee sentiments and does not link xenophobia to particular integrative-policy outcomes within the host nation.

**Literature Review**

**Xenophobic and Racist Tendencies and Attitudes on Immigration**

The various political science literature on xenophobic tendencies largely considers Islamophobia, racism and nationalism as what lead to xenophobia. When considering the links of prejudice and fear with policy outcomes, integration and assimilation of both refugees and immigrants in countries around the world are prevalent in political writing as well. Sundstrom and Haekwon (2014) write on the intertwinement of racism and xenophobia. While racism involves dislike or discrimination against those of other races, xenophobia is broader in the sense that it involves dislike of individuals from other countries. An important
point that the authors make is that the concept of “international” can make immigrants feel as though they are isolated from society, or, perpetual foreigners. When it comes to xenophobia, racist tendencies often add to the framing of immigrants as perpetual foreigners, subsequently perpetuating the fear and disdain of those from other countries. In all, Sundstrom and Haekwon (2014) assert that though xenophobia and racism are different, and racism involves a dislike rather than a fear, it is dangerous to neglect the seriousness of xenophobia as a societal problem and avoid it by justifying that it is not racism. Psychologically, racism could lead to xenophobia in that humans generally do not like what they do not understand, for example, different types of people culturally, ethnically, or racially and they therefore fear what they do not like. Contrarily, xenophobia could lead to racism in that humans fear what they do not know, and because of this, they do not like what they do not know. Sundstrom and Haekwon (2014) aid in the current work because of how the variable of xenophobia will be constructed. Sundstrom’s and Haekwon’s (2014) addition aid in understanding what goes into the notion of xenophobia and this is important in this construction.

Since immigrants are generally culturally, ethnically, religiously or racially different than natives in various ways, the link is made that many xenophobic individuals would likely be fearful of immigrants in the host-nation. Using the word of xenophobia is often times avoided by associating other fears with the fears of immigrants entering a country. Dustmann and Preston (2007) explain that there are three main concerns regarding immigration, labor-market concerns, welfare concerns and racial or cultural concerns. The assertion expressed by the authors is that welfare concerns, racial and cultural prejudice and labor-market concerns all play a role in attitudes towards immigration. It should be noted that these
concerns and prejudices are found to be significant exclusively in countries which the immigrants come from ethnically different backgrounds. Dustmann and Preston (2007) add to the current research in that attitudes on immigrants regarding the economy, welfare and racial and cultural prejudices have ties in the second hypothesis of this research. For the purposes of this work, crime rates, safety rates, incidents of terrorism and economic health will be analyzed in terms of refugee intake. The attitudes towards immigrants that Dustmann and Preston (2007) imply have ties with attitudes towards refugees, though the indicators chosen to examine for this research are more refugee-based. For example, since refugees are foreigners that did not have to go through the bureaucratic process of immigrating to the host country, there are concerns with criminality that refugees may bring. Not only this, since refugees are accepted in mass numbers, fears of potential terrorists entering the host country in the masses are present. The economic attitudes associated with immigrants hold true for refugees in the sense that the host country may be concerned with a decrease in available jobs for the country’s citizens.

Anna Maria Mayda (2006), a leading scholar on attitudes in the realm of immigration politics, examines sources of attitudes on immigration and migration. She utilizes two individual-level surveys covering both developing and developed countries to identify consistencies in the ways that individual skill level and labor-market factors affect preferences over migration policy. Mayda finds that economic variables are of greater influence than non-economic variables in attitudes about immigration when vocational skill levels of immigrants are considered. She does find that in countries with high GDP per capita, workers with higher skill levels have pro-immigration tendencies whereas in countries with low GDP per capita, there is no correlation. This could mean that such countries rely on
immigrants who are skilled workers to supplement the workforce and therefore appreciate their presence. Anna Maria Mayda (2006) and Dustmann and Preston (2007) express the thought that the economic health of the host countries and the perception of what immigrants might do to the workforce are important influencers to overall attitudes towards acceptance and policy. These economic concerns, of course, carry over to refugees for reasons previously mentioned. Though Mayda (2006) has found that economic concerns are of primary relevance for immigrants, for the purposes of the current work, it is inferred that refugees come with their own set of concerns additionally. As previously mentioned, these may include attitudes regarding crime rates, overall safety and incidents of terrorism increasing, and these will be investigated in this research.

To look more specifically into attitudes on immigration in the instance of European Union, Gang, Rivera-Batiz, Francisco and Myeong-Su (2002) analyze European attitudes towards non-nationals in countries in the European Union. They found that in European neighborhoods that experience a large influx of immigrants, attitudes towards such immigrants shift to be more negative. They also note that there has been increasing racial prejudice in Europe. With an increase in racial prejudice in Europe, and racism’s corresponding ties with xenophobia, there is potential for negative attitudes towards immigrants broadening with the global refugee influx, since both refugees and immigrants are foreigners entering the countries. Since attitudes were already shifting to be negative towards immigrants in Gang, et al.’s research in 2002, it is likely that attitudes in Europe surely, and likely in other countries as well have been increasingly negative towards refugees. This is a result of the increasing racial prejudice asserted by the authors. Gang et al.’s work leads into the current work in that it gives reason to believe that there has been an
increasing shift towards prejudices and potentially xenophobic attitudes that would have implications on refugee policies, and correspondingly refugee integration policies, at least in Europe.

**Attitudes and Refugee Policies**

Xenophobia is an attitude that is, in some cases, applied to refugees politics. Achiume’s (2013) work asserts that structural xenophobic discrimination is prominent within developed communities. In this sense, xenophobia is built into the framework of the policy in societies, and these societies must incorporate this in their proposals on xenophobic discrimination. Eliminating the structural xenophobia in frameworks of policies could have important implications on refugee acceptance policies and potentially integration policies as well. Achiume (2013) proposes that xenophobia is inherent within many nations’ policies, and subsequently, a quantitative exploration of the consequences of such tendencies on potential integration policies, or lack thereof, is warranted. This adds to Auchime’s research in that it makes a link between xenophobic attitude and policy outcomes, but future research must be conducted to explore xenophobia at the bureaucratic level.

Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann (2000) investigate the attitudes that the natives of a country express towards non-natives and how this can, depending on the particular attitude, lead to either sentiment or insensitivity. The authors, in line with previous literature, find that labor markets are in fact of concern in terms of immigration policy and corresponding attitudes. Citizens in countries that have high refugee influxes have a higher likelihood of being worried about immigration policies and how they impact society in the regard to crime rates and job markets. This has relevance as refugee acceptance rates and the effects on crime rates and economic health will be analyzed in this research. From a mainly economic
standpoint, the authors also find that citizens of host countries are likely to be more favorable of immigration if the policies emphasize employment prospects, because the immigrants would be diligent in supporting themselves and the economy and not freeloading. The authors also assert that when immigrants are filling gaps in the workforce, this is seen as a form of economic assimilation which could lead to assimilation in other aspects of life as an immigrant. This work by Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann (2000) has much to lead into the current work. Firstly, they express that attitudes towards non-native can result in either sentiment or insensitivity. Also, the authors show that regions with high refugee inflows lead to concern about immigration policies. This finding has causal force in that it shows how attitudes, for example, xenophobic, could lead to concern about policy. Additionally, concerns of crime rates and job market concerns are prevalent in the study by Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann (2000) as well. This has merit in the study of the current research in investigation of such concerns associated with refugee acceptance rates.

Jacobsen (1996) is concerned with what influences less-developed countries’ government response to mass refugee influxes. He specifically considers why some nations have very restrictive policies, citing a set of factors that potentially influence refugee policy: the costs and benefits of accepting international assistance, relations with the sending country, political calculations about the local community’s absorption capacity and national security considerations. The investigation’s findings are mixed, because host governments also struggle with bureaucratic politics, the view of refugees in domestic politics, power clashes within government bureaus and among policy-makers, scarcity of evidence, bureaucratic inactivity and other problems that were difficult to eradicate empirically. The takeaway from this work is that less-developed countries could respond to mass refugee
inflows with either restrictive policies or nonrestrictive policies. This has relevance in that causally, the response is leading to the policy. Since one of the key concerns is the influence of security considerations on policy outcome, this could also be linked to fears by the host country regarding refugee intake. Security considerations are a key indicator in the second hypothesis of the present work as well. There are less-developed countries in the dataset of the current research, and therefore the Jacobsen (1996) article is relevant.

**Integration Policies**

Bleich’s (2008) “Immigration and Integration Studies in Western Europe and the United States” investigates mass human movement across borders and the societal and political reaction this creates in terms of policy. The first section of the work advances a system for examining four types of scholarship and applies it to the investigation of immigration and integration. The second section evaluates four books that observe immigration and integration research and show the advantages of each kind of scholarship. The conclusions state that scholars have made great strides towards conceptualizing and analyzing immigration and integration politics in that identity plays a big role in integration and immigration policies. For example, one could identify as hard-working, an aspiring citizen and family-oriented. From the outside, these identities may not be perceived. There are also degrees to which outsiders recognize the identities, for example, strongly, indifferently, mildly, etc. Bleich asserts that a large component of the surrounding debate regarding integration involves a definition of and rationale behind political and nationalistic identity. What can be learned from this is that the perception and portrayal of identity is crucial when it comes to analyzing integration policy. Xenophobia disregards the how a foreigner may identify. One could perceive a refugee as a threat to safety and the economy,
whereas the refugee may identify as wholesome and hardworking. The ties of Bleich’s (2008) work to the current is that not only do refugees lack the feasibility to voice their true identify to a host country, but external perception of the refugees may lead to policy outcomes in the realm of integration.

Terri Givens (2007) studies how countries integrate immigrants and the corresponding problems with such methods. She looks into modes of integration, the contours of immigration and immigrant integration in Europe; party politics and immigrant integration; immigrants, racism and antidiscrimination policy; and more. The conclusion explains that there is often neglect of antidiscrimination and integration policies in Europe. In this, antidiscrimination laws do not consider educational attainment, labor market mobility, access to housing and other factors that are specific to integration policy for immigrants. Integration policy, though, must incorporate antidiscrimination in its framework in order to be implemented properly. Givens’ research is important in that it outlines what must be incorporated in an integrative policy. In the present work, educational attainment, labor market mobility and access to housing will be considered in antidiscrimination policies and included in the construction of the variable of integration policies.

Schlueter, Meuleman, and Davidov (2013) illustrate that less restrictive integration policies for immigrants correlate with a lesser likelihood of perceiving immigrants as a threat. This is conducted through a cross-national analysis. The authors conducted an ANOVA in order to check if there is a correlation between integration policy and perception of threat, but this work provides causation in the stance that perception will lead to policy outcome.
Despite all of this existing research, there is still a great deal we do not know. Many questions remain about who passes such policies and the timing of such policies’ enactment. This thesis, however, will focus on potential differences among different types of immigrants, looking in particular at policies targeting refugees’ integration. For instance, it is not yet investigated what effect xenophobic tendencies have on integrative refugee policies of a host nation. Some anti-foreigner sentiment towards immigrants that has been covered in previous literature will apply to refugees as well, but research will likely show more extreme feelings on mass refugee movement as opposed to traditional immigration. This research will link attitudes towards foreigners to refugee policies specifically. Many of the anti-immigration attitudes will likely carry over into anti-refugee sentiment for the reason that both groups involve foreigners entering the country. The distinction though, is that immigrants come to the country purposefully and have to meet a set of requirements in order to resettle whereas refugees have no purpose or desire to go to a particular country and are merely being placed purposelessly in an arbitrary nation. Because of this lack of affiliation and allegiance to a particular nation, feelings towards refugees may be different than towards immigrants.

Many countries, regardless of levels of xenophobia have accepted at least a small portion of refugees and this is why integration is important to identify. If a country has higher xenophobic tendencies, then that country should actively integrate refugees into the society in order to prevent any form of oppression. Natives sometimes fear that the refugees may bring crime or threat to a society. Filippo Grandi, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, has suggests that with proper integration techniques the likelihood of the fears becoming reality decreases (Radtke, 2017). This research does not attempt to understand the
correlation between xenophobic tendencies and refugee rates. Host countries are accepting refugees at some rate, and this work endeavors to understand the policy outcomes rather than focus on the numbers. If it is found that higher xenophobic tendencies among the host population leads to a lack of an integrative policy and potentially therefore some of the fears and assumptions regarding crime and economic problems, then it should be considered that such a policy approach is, in fact, an unprincipled one.

**Ethical Arguments on Refugees: Miller, Dummett and Carens**

There is an underlying ethical dilemma in the scope of this research that is addressed by theorists David Miller (2016), Michael Dummett (2011) and Joseph Carens (2015). These theories will be applicable to the current research in that many countries model the various theories and this exemplification can lead to integration policy. Miller (2016) asserts that those who migrate to a country are expected to assimilate into the social order of that nation, regardless of whether it means detaching from cultural ties from their previous nations of residence. Such an imposed obligation places the duty of assimilation on the refugee rather than the host society. This is ethically unsound for the refugee, although it is favorable to the host-society as it requires less effort. This also helps xenophobes in not having to face much of what comes with being foreign, for example, various cultural or linguistic differences. Such a viewpoint could be an indicator as to why there is a lack of integration policy in certain countries. An argument alluded to by the following theorist, is that such a viewpoint is rooted in xenophobia.

On the other extreme of the policy debate, Dummett (2011) goes as far as to say that modern political discussions approach refugees in an innately unjust way. Dummett points out that many of the modern institutions within states defy the basic rights and freedoms of
refugees including many that have been outlined by the Geneva Convention. He harshly considers the policy treatment of displaced people and deems it critical to contest the anti-foreigner attitude that has arisen in policy practices throughout Western states. He explains that one must perceive refugees as having “the right to be a first-class citizen; and its complement that no state ought to take race, religion or language as essential to its identity” (Dummett, 2011, p. 10). The main standards which challenge countries are that the countries must tend to the security of all residents and must guarantee that no resident is aggrieved, abused or victimized. He contends that everybody has the right to reside in a country where he or she can completely align himself with the identity of where he or she resides. Dummett (2011, p. 10) explains that to understand whether one resides in such a nation-state “is ultimately decided by whether that individual feels that he belongs.” Dummett postulates that identity is also key in regard to integration and that, ethically, everyone is entitled to their own national identity and this would reflect on the citizenship or residency of the individual. Integrative measures cannot force the refugee to identify with the host nation, but these measures can facilitate this. Societies will values things like identity differently. A society may value the refugee identifying with the country greatly and therefore go to measures of integrating refugees. If a society does not value that persons residing in the country identify with that country, then that government may not focus on integration. The refugee theory of Dummett (2011) is likely aligned with that of the United Nations, and thus is why the UN proposes refugee acceptance and integration to the rest of the world. Bleich (2008) also deems refugee identity and perceived identity extremely important. How the importance of identity relates to this work, is that the refugees must be able to be integrated into the host society so that they have a right to identify with that nation if they so choose to. In other
words, there should be no barriers which obstruct this right.

The previously explained theories are two extremes of the ethical dilemma but Carens’ (2015) theory takes the middle ground. Carens contends that refugee admittance should be considered an obligation and not simply a demonstration of kindness. In terms of American policy, Carens compares the hurdles and many advantages of gaining residency in the United States to feudal benefits. For example, with admission, one gains a status that upgrades life satisfaction. Also, gaining residency in the United States can seem as insurmountable as in feudalism. When conceptualizing the matter in this way, it is difficult to morally legitimize such restrictive and discriminatory citizenship laws, especially when applied to asylum seekers as they are entitled to life satisfaction as opposed to perpetual statelessness. Carens observes that after the horrific events yielding political refugees in the time of Nazi control, many democratic countries pledged that they would not be blind to those seeking political refuge through the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees. Since then, national institutions have created policy to prevent refugees from entering. Carens believes in just rights among all people including citizens of the world and rejects any arguments for favoritism and unfairness. His belief is that everyone deserves to find their highest quality of life without such barring restraints. Along with this, an inference of a right to a high quality of life in a country migrated to can be made. If all individuals ethically have a right to seek their highest quality of life, lack of integration is not a high quality of life whereas integration into a host society, without any inhibitors to that a citizen would not have, is. Therefore, this research asserts that it is ethically necessary to integrate refugees upon admittance.
These various moral beliefs are exemplified by different countries around the world in regard to policy. This is important because this research discusses xenophobia, and xenophobia is an important part of the ethical theories surrounding refugees. There are implications of such theories, modeled by countries, on policy, more specifically, refugee integration policy. These opposing moral beliefs also have likely influenced various political parties. Generally conservative parties tend to take a more closed-border approach to the ethics of refugee policies whereas liberal parties tend to take a more open-border approach. These party-based ethical positions have ties with xenophobia (Sundstrom, 2013). Dummett (2011) proposes that racism and xenophobia are deeply engrained in various Western political institutions and cultures such as those of the United States and the United Kingdom, and in this lies the root of such policy discourse. An ethical concern for the closed-boarder approach is that acceptance of refugees may be unethical for the countries citizens in that, according to their arguments, it potentially induces terrorism. Since the incident of terrorism on September 11, 2001, many people have felt that terrorism posed an existential threat to the security and livelihood of them and their fellow citizens. It was not until the Obama administration that a powerful member of the administration articulated that terrorists do not in fact pose an existential threat to the United States. The articulation of the lack of existential threat was an attempt at a shift in public opinion on the part of the citizens of the United States regarding fears of terrorism that had implications on refugee policies and the corresponding linkages to xenophobia. Currently, with the Trump administration, attitudes and fears surrounding refugees are leading to xenophobic policy implications.

Theories posed by Miller, Carens and Dummett likely have indirect influences on refugee policy in general and following that, integration policy as well. These restrictive and
permissive theories are widely used in current refugee policy discussion. Dummett would argue that encouraging a society that fosters free expression and prosperity for all members will lead to an elimination of prejudices such as racism. This sort of a climate would be one in which all immigrants and migrants could express themselves and not be hindered by discriminatory barriers. That these theorists influence party ideals paired with that refugees are a relevant topic in political discussion today leads to politicians creating policy on a basis of ethical theories surrounding refugees. Such policies include integration policy for refugees. Each of these theories has ties with xenophobia. Miller’s ethical theory on refugees likely stems from high levels of xenophobia as it involves the notion that refugees must assimilate to the host culture. Dummett’s theory likely stems from a lack of xenophobia again from his assertion that, “the right to be a first-class citizen; and its complement that no state ought to take race, religion or language as essential to its identity” (Dummett, 2011, p. 10). If Carens theorizes that refugee acceptance ought to be an obligation not simply a demonstration of kindness, it is likely that this stems from a lack of xenophobia. If acceptance of refugees as a demonstration of kindness implies a lack of xenophobia, then the proposition that refugee acceptance is an obligation is even more so. In Miller’s argument, refugees must assimilate themselves, which signifies no need for integrative policies. Miller’s refugee theory is xenophobic and because assimilation is urged and integration is excluded, it can be inferred that public xenophobia will therefore induce less integrationist policy. With xenophobia at the root of these theories on refugee acceptance, it can be inferred that such tendencies just as likely have implications on refugee integration policy.
CHAPTER 2. THEORY AND RATIONALE

As discussed in the literature review, xenophobic attitudes have been on the rise in recent years. Such attitudes of populations have implications on policy. The nation’s policy implementations will reflect the attitudes of its population as the elected officials would like to appease their constituencies in order to get reelected. Some of these variables may include region of the world, whether the nation is in the EU, whether the nation has been exposed to much refugee inflow, etc. I also theorize that as xenophobia is applied to fears of refugees and dislike of them in a country, this would lead to the country not wanting refugees to be integrated into the country. Since integration involves the state implementing policy which aids the refugees in becoming comfortable in a host society, those who dislike and/or fear refugees would not want to integrate them into the society, potentially in hopes that the refugees will feel isolated and return to their nation of origin eventually. It is likely that even when a small number of refugees are accepted into a country that does have higher levels of xenophobia, that country would likely want the refugees to assimilate into the country because assimilation is on the part of the refugee, not the policies within the country. This research proposes that integration, as opposed to assimilation, is key because of its stake in policy and societal outcomes. Policy measures are what will allow refugees to have similar rights as citizens, and this is something that a refugee simply assimilating him or herself has no control over. Integration policies facilitate life for the refugee and it is likely that those who are xenophobic would not want to facilitate life for the refugee.

It is likely that higher rates of xenophobic tendencies lead to a lower likelihood of countries implementing integrative refugee policies. What makes up an integrative and/or multiculturalistic refugee policy includes access to education, access to permanent residence
and more. Higher xenophobic tendencies of a country may stem from fears that refugees will infringe on the host nation’s security affairs, economy prosperity and social wellbeing. Furthermore, public attitudes that support party ideals such as anti-immigration and closed border laws can play a role in the development of such tendencies. Regardless, this work argues that policymakers rarely make refugee-specific policy, and inevitably, refugees get caught up, whether unintentionally, or ignorantly, in policies constructed for immigrants and other migrants. The distinction between refugees and immigrant may be entirely neglected and this could very likely be a result of indignation toward refugees specifically.

On the matter of causation on public opinion and policy, Lahav (2004) stresses, using European Union policies and the Eurobarometer, that public opinion is significant for policy implementation. There are several prominent theorists in the field of refugees and their theories produced are widely used in political debate on refugee policy. Xenophobia has important ties with some of these theories as well. A link of xenophobic tendencies to policy outcomes could be that the fear of these refugees being in the country will lead to the previously mentioned problems and therefore the policy will result in a lack of accommodation for these non-natives. If countries are xenophobic and fear negative implications of refugee acceptance, they should have integrative policies for those refugees in order to assure public safety. If a country fears individuals from the outside, it is important to integrate the refugees as this may avoid potential negative consequences of oppression, or lack of integration.

In the realm of modern day immigration and refugee politics, there are various corresponding public attitudes that are responsible for such theory shifts. Public opinion in the Western world has previously been empathetic to refugee politics, for example, in the
1940s, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) was formed as a response to the extreme mistakes that the developed countries of the world at that time had made in regard to refugee movements rising from the Nazi regime (Meisler, 2011).

A case that illustrates implications of refugee policy is that of the MS *St. Louis*. Though this case illustrates refugee admittance policy rather than integration policy, refugee policy as a whole is important in regard to public opinion and corresponding implications. In the late 1930s, the MS *St. Louis* cruised to America and Canada transporting Jewish evacuees looking for refuge. Neither of these countries accepted the refugees, forcing them to return to Europe, where they finally found refuge. The Nazis later occupied European countries resulting in the many of the Jewish asylum seekers ultimately being horrifically mass-murdered. (Ogilvie and Miller, 2010). This is a lesson that seems to have been forgotten in modern-day refugee policy as a misbegotten refugee policy can lead to catastrophic outcomes. It is possible that an increase in incidents of terrorism may lead to a shift towards xenophobia. Yesilyurt (2010) and Awan (2010) find that xenophobia has risen sharply in Europe and the United States since the development of terrorism and conjecture that this type of attitude shift will have significant policy implications, likely in the realm of refugee integration policies.

Xenophobic tendencies of individuals involve fears of foreigners and suggests fear of implications of foreigners in a society. A phobia suggests an irrational fear or aversion to something, in this case, foreigners. For political purposes, xenophobes often attempt to rationalize their fears by associating them with notions that foreigners will increase crime rates, steal jobs, harm the economy and bring terrorism. These are the fears, but reality has suggested otherwise. Crime rates do not in fact rise with immigration rates (Reid et al.,
2005), though the present work will focus on how refugee intake affects crime rates. A study produced by the Refugee Services Collaborative of Greater Cleveland (2012, p. 3) shows that “at the local level, refugees provide increased demand for goods and services through their new purchasing power and can be particularly revitalizing in communities that otherwise have a declining population.” Hewins-Maroney and Williams (2013) find that policy makers have not only the capacity but also the duty to adapt to a diversifying workforce as result of mass migration. The authors also found that little evidence connects mass migration to a rise in terrorism incidents (Emmerson, 2016). These results show that there is a clear differentiation between what the public fears and what actually happens. This disconnect is important because the reality that these fears exist may have implications on whether refugees are integrated. For example, even if xenophobic countries believe that refugees should be admitted, the level to which that country integrates its refugees may vary. Specific fears of negative implications could lead to a desire to integrate refugees in order to avoid such implications. The reason why this is likely not the case is that citizens are not likely to support allocation of their tax dollars towards integration, especially since parties which are associated with xenophobic tendencies usually are not in support of welfare programs in general. It is more likely that the xenophobes in the constituency are against refugee acceptance in all, and even when the country does accept a portion of refugees, the xenophobes cannot be bothered with spending money, or promoting policy which would integrate them.

Real-world Connections

As the current refugee dilemmas progress, outturning large numbers of refugees, an increasing number of developed countries in Europe and the Americas are moving towards
isolationist, closed-border policies. Zygmunt Bauman (2002) expresses that such shifts are related to fears. In Europe specifically, Bauman asserts that the overarching fear concurs with the concept of the “precariat.” The “precariat” is explained by Standing (2015) as a societal group framed by individuals experiencing precarity, a state of presence without consistency or security, which influences physical or mental wellbeing. This state of existence is characterized by unease and fear. Bauman (2002) makes the case that in this day and age filled with mass human movement, when secure individuals view scenarios where refugees have lost so much, they consider their own weaknesses and fear losing what the refugees have lost.

The concept of Euroscepticism and the attitude of the Conservative Party in England is that has ties with xenophobia in the scheme of the refugee crisis. This movement furthered anti-foreigner sentiment. It is also an example of policy propositions that foster xenophobia while slighting refugees. There are obvious links between parties and elected officials and policy outcomes. Xenophobia within political parties results in a lack of policy implementations which favor refugees. Theoretically, political parties are used as a vessel in order to further an anti-refugee agenda. With this, these same parties are less likely to have integrative policies for the refugees that they do not want to accept in the first place. Golec de Zavala et al. (2017) state that right wing authoritarianism is one of the main predictors of xenophobia. The vote to leave the European Union was rooted in xenophobia. Ellis and Garvey (2016) assert the following regarding xenophobia and its implications for both the Brexit campaign as well as the Trump campaign:
The Brexit campaign in the United Kingdom and the election of Donald Trump as president of the United States depended not only on notions of nationalism and state sovereignty built on xenophobia, racism, and militarism, but also on discourses about ideas of community—deindustrialized communities, communities “left behind” by globalization, communities ignored by corrupt politicians, communities ravaged by drug addiction, religious communities, rural communities, communities threatened by terrorists or by “illegal immigrants.” Consider, for example, candidate Trump’s racist vision of African American communities as “absolutely in the worst shape they’ve ever been in before. Ever. Ever. Ever. . . . You take a look at the inner cities. You’ve got no education. You’ve got no jobs. You get shot walking down the street” (Jacobson). Trump’s comments imagined a degraded community—detached from facts and history—as a way to appeal to communities of white voters (p. 1).

These campaigns have successfully utilized such concepts as xenophobia and racism to rally support for isolationist tendencies. Such tendencies and promoted fears will lead to perception of refugees that affects policy and integration policy specifically. Additionally, politicians may exploit the issue of integration policy and pass bills associated with this even without explicit demand as a means of forwarding underlying xenophobia. This may, in turn, rally support for a latent xenophobic agenda. In this day and age, polarization leads to less individualistic thinking and more adhering to what a powerful party member proclaims. It is for this sheep-like thinking that the candidates or elected officials have power over the
xenophobic direction that their constituents take. Groupthink generally comes into play as a leader provides some rationale as to why, for example, we should be fearful of foreigners and subsequently everyone believes the rationale to be true and appropriate. Being fooled by elected officials or supporting those with xenophobic tendencies will have implications on refugee policy. On the other hand, there are just as likely cases where citizens with corresponding xenophobic tendencies as displayed by a political party are likely to vote that party into office in order to further an anti-refugee and anti-integration agenda. These are mere examples of such cultural shifts that lead to the assumption that high xenophobic tendencies lead to a lack of integrative policies. In essence, xenophobic attitudes often lead to political pressure from parties which push political agendas regarding policy. Attitudes concerning distaste or fear of foreigners obviously have implications on refugee policy specifically as refugees are inherently foreign. Additionally, the extent to which these foreigners should be integrated stems may stem from a political agenda.
CHAPTER 3. DATA AND METHODS

Data

Hypothesis 1: Higher xenophobic tendencies of the citizens in a country will lead to a lower likelihood of that country implementing an integrative refugee policy.

Hypothesis 2: Higher rates of refugees accepted into a country will lead to higher crime rates, lower safety rates, more incidents of terrorism and economic downturn in that country.

Hypothesis 1: Independent variable

The rationale behind why the independent variable of xenophobia was accumulated in such a way lies in the definition of xenophobia. Xenophobia is understood as the fear or dislike for foreigners or of things that are foreign. The data used for the independent variable in this research comes two surveys covering 67 countries (see Appendix A for complete list): Wave 6 of the World Values Survey (WVS) (2014) and Rounds 6 and 7 of the European Social Survey (ESS) (2014). The unit of analysis is countries and the individual respondents’ responses have been averaged to create a single value for each nation. The bulk of the variable was created by merging and averaging the following indicators from the WVS (2014) (to view specific coding, see Appendix B):

- Important child qualities: Tolerance and respect for other people
- Would not like to have as neighbors: People of a different race
- Would not like to have as neighbors: Immigrants/foreign workers
- Would not like to have as neighbors: People of a different religion
- How much you trust: People of another religion
- How much you trust: People of another nationality
The indicator that measures what qualities are important to instill in a child in regard to tolerance and respect for others is important in the makeup of the variable of xenophobia because as parents teach their children to tolerate and respect others, this will lead to less xenophobia. Even if children do not adopt the tolerant views their elders suggest, the parents’ willingness to say that they care about tolerance alludes to the parents’ likely xenophobia.

The question is framed by the surveyor providing a list of things that children could be encouraged to learn at home with ‘tolerance and respect for other people’ being one of them. The respondent either mentions or does not mention this in their response regarding important qualities to instill in a child. Oftentimes, outsiders are associated with differences in race, religion and especially citizenship status as these factors makeup a cultural identity. Trusting those from other religions and nationalities is also important in the makeup of xenophobia because, as inferred in the literature review, trust, or lack thereof, can lead to attitudes which may be a deterrent for refugee acceptance.

For the remaining countries in the sample, Round 6 and 7 of the European Social Survey (2014) utilized the following indicators to create a variable measuring xenophobia:

- Important to understand different people
- Allow many/few immigrants of different race/ethnic group from majority
- Country’s cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants
- Immigrants make country worse or better place to live (to view specific coding, see Appendix C) (2014).

These variables were chosen to appropriately represent xenophobia similar to items in the previous list. Firstly, the indicator of importance in understanding different people is similar to the variable in the WVS but instead inquires about importance on a general level rather
than instilling it in a child. A lack of understanding and tolerance for others is extremely important in what makes up xenophobia. The other three indicators address immigrants specifically, and since immigrants are those from other countries, or foreigners, the questions chosen from the EES adequately measure xenophobia. Rounds 6 and 7 of the ESS were combined and averaged together and the final independent variable is on a 0-to-4 scale with 0 being the least xenophobic, and 4 being the most xenophobic (to view more information about the independent variable, see Appendix D).

**Hypothesis 1: Dependent variable**

The dependent variable is a scale of integrative refugee policy. The Migrant Integration Policy Index (2015) deemed the following fields significant for integration policies as they pertain to all migrants: health, labor market mobility, family reunification, education, political participation, permanent residence, access to nationality and anti-discrimination. This is a frequently cited index, specifically cited 2,930 times in Google Scholar alone and is therefore a credible source. These categories will be used as a starting point to create a dataset of policy variables for refugee-integration policy specifically. There are a total of 23 indicators that fall under these topic fields. The indicators were modeled after three sources: Migrant Integration Policy Index (2015), *Towards a Refugee Oriented Right of Asylum*, by Laura Westra, Satvinder Juss and Tullio Scovazzi (2017) and the Multiculturalism Policies in Contemporary Democracies (2010) index.

In the field of health, the indicator is access to healthcare, and this measures whether refugees have equal access to healthcare as nationals (Westra, Juss and Scovazzi, 2017). Refugees must be in good health in order to participate in the workforce, care for their children, and be functioning members of society. In the field of labor market mobility, the
indicators are immediate access to labor market, measuring whether refugees have immediate access to the labor market upon arrival in the host-nation (MIPEX, 2015); the right for refugees to belong to trade unions and access to self-employment for refugees (MIPEX, 2015). Rights of refugees in the labor market are important so that they can actively participate in the workforce and subsequently not be accused of freeloding. In the field of family reunification for foreign citizens, the indicator is refugees’ access to have minor children and dependent parents/grandparents eligible for family reunification (MIPEX, 2015). Refugees should be allowed family reunification as they will integrate into society more effectively and permanently if their family is in the host-society with them. In the field of education, one indicator is the adoption of multiculturalism in school curriculum for refugees (Multiculturalism Policies in Contemporary Democracies, 2010). Also included in the indicators in the field of education are: the funding of bilingual education or mother-tongue instruction for refugees in public institutions; affirmative action for disadvantaged immigrant groups, including refugees (Multiculturalism Policies in Contemporary Democracies, 2010); access to elementary and access to higher education for refugees (Westra, Juss and Scovazzi, 2017). Refugees need to be educated in order to become active and supportive members of the workforce.

In the field of political participation, the indicator is refugees’ right to vote in national elections (MIPEX, 2015). Refugees having the right to vote in national elections is important for integration in that it provides opportunity for the refugees’ voices to be heard and their needs to be met. In the field of permanent residence, the indicators are refugees’ access to pre-departure and pre-arrival measures, including actions to prepare migrants and the local communities for the integration process (Multiculturalism Policies in Contemporary
Democracies, 2010); the right of refugees to move freely within the country; refugees’ access to housing and the right to own property for refugees (Westra, Juss and Scovazzi, 2017).

Being on a track to permanent residency and provision of housing initially is important for refugees so that they can educate their children and become members of the workforce. In the field of access to nationality, indicators include allowance of dual citizenship for refugees (Multiculturalism Policies in Contemporary Democracies, 2010) and the time of the residence period required for refugees before permanent residence can be allowed, if permanent residency can be allowed at all (MIPEX, 2015). Access to dual citizenship is coded as no accessing being 0 and access being 1. Residence period before permanent residency is coded as 3 being five years or less, 2 being in between five and ten years and 1 being any time after ten years including not at all. Allowing for refugees to ultimately be able to obtain citizenship is an important component of integration because at this point, they would no longer be a refugee but have a new nation of citizenship or permanent residency. This will likely give refugees the opportunity to flourish in the society.

In the field of anti-discrimination, the indicators are active participation and social inclusion, including actions to support exchanges with the receiving society, refugees’ participation in cultural life and fighting discrimination (Westra, Juss and Scovazzi, 2017); free exercise of religion and religious education for refugees, equal social security protection for refugees as for nationals (Multiculturalism Policies in Contemporary Democracies, 2010), exemptions from dress codes (either by statute or court cases) for refugees, constitutional, legislative or parliamentary affirmation of multiculturalism at the central and/or regional and municipal levels and the existence of a government ministry, secretariat or advisory board to implement this policy in consultation with ethnic communities (to view the coding and
explanation of the indicators in the dependent variable see Appendix E) (Westra, Juss and Scovazzi, 2017). Especially since the refugees are coming from places where they are likely fleeing oppression, it is important to have laws in place which protect refugees from discrimination so that they can grow to feel accepting in and prosper in the country. These indicators are individually researched for each country (see Appendix F for a complete listing of the references used to extrapolate these data.).

**Hypothesis 1: Control variables**

The variables that I will control for come from the 6\textsuperscript{th} wave of the World Values Survey (2014), the World Bank (2011-2015), the European Union (2018), as well as from the United Nations Statistical Division (2011). The variables that come from the WVS include: confidence in charitable or humanitarian organizations, how proud people in a particular country are of nationality, the only acceptable religion is the respondent’s religion, people who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to the respondent’s and worries of a terrorist attack (see Appendix G) (2014). Confidence in humanitarian organizations might be causal in assessment of what leads to integration policy, because it could be assumed that if humanitarian organizations are handling integration, then there might be little necessity for strong policies. Understandably, an interaction variable should be accounted for in regard to which countries are integrative in policies because of the government, or because of the humanitarian organizations in that country. Unfortunately, a limiting factor is that this data was extremely difficult to gather for this research. Fortunately though, the argument is made that this variable is irrelevant to those nations that have integrative policies stemming from the government, but there are many nations where the humanitarian organization plays a key role in integration policy implementation. This
variable accounts for those nations where it is relevant to control for.

Pride in nationality and seeing oneself as part of a religion are controlled for because they are similar to the factors that play into what xenophobia that have been selected for the independent variable. Therefore, these variables may have causal influence on integration policy. Finally, worries of a terrorist attack is controlled for because these fears may lead a country to have either lower or higher levels of integration policy similar to how fears of foreigners in general could lead to this. These fears of terrorist attacks spur xenophobic attitudes, especially when connected with international events. This is important to the independent variable in that terrorist attack may lead to a country wanting to prevent such attacks, and therefore deem it important to integrate refugees to prevent such attacks. Contrarily, countries may be fearful of these attacks, so they do not want to integrate them into the country so that when the refugee crisis is over, the refugees do not stay in the country, and return home. These responses are averaged to a singular value for each nation.

The control variables derived from the World Bank include population density (2015), refugee acceptance rates (2016) and economic health in terms of GDP per capita (PPP) (2011-2014) for each country. It is logical that the economy plays a role in policy-making as funding is key in the implementation process. Population density and economic health are important because if a country does not have the funds nor the capacity to house refugees, then this would lead to a lack of refugee integration policy, especially if such policies cannot be funded. The other variables controlled for include: whether a country is in the European Union (the European Union, 2018), region of the world (United Nations Statistical Division – Economic and Social Statistical Classifications, 2011), number of political parties in a country (The World Factbook, 2017) and voting rules (e.g. first-past-the-
post, party list PR, etc.) (ACE Electoral Knowledge Network, 2017) (see Appendix H). If the country is in the European Union that country may be more likely to have integration policies if the EU has these policies. Similarly with region, if neighboring countries have integration policies, because of assent from its neighbors, the country may be more or less likely to have integration policies. Region of the world is also important to consider because where the countries are in the world could prove to have patterned effects on integration policy because of certain demographics. The number of political parties in a country, or if there is a single, dominant party, is important to control for because it takes into account any possibility of barriers regarding reflection of public opinion at the governmental level. The voting rules in a country are also important to consider for similar reasons. Voting rules will likely play a role in how public opinion, or xenophobia in this case, is reflected at the governmental level. Lastly, the percent change of refugee acceptance over time is controlled for because rates of refugee acceptance itself will be important in leading to refugee policy overall. Unfortunately, the variable “illegal inflow” was extremely difficult to accumulate and justify so it has been omitted from this research.

**Hypothesis 2: Independent variable**

For the second hypothesis, the independent variable is refugee acceptance rates. The data used is the number of refugees accepted into each country measured in percent change from 2012 to 2016. Percent change refers to the actual increase or decrease of the value in terms of percent. For example, Algeria’s number of refugees accepted in 2012 was 94,133 and in 2016, it accepted 94,220 refugees. Therefore, Algeria’s percent change regarding number of refugees taken in from 2012 to 2016 is approximately .09. This data comes from the World Bank (2016). This time period was chosen in order to convey how the increase in
intake in 2013 due to the Syrian refugee crisis impacted facets of society such as crime and safety rates, economic health and incidents of terrorism.

**Hypothesis 2: Dependent variables**

This hypothesis tests four dependent variables. These are crime rates, safety rates, economic health, and incidents of terrorism. All of these are measured in terms of percent change as well. Crime rates and safety rates are measured spanning from 2013 to 2018 and are from the Numbe Crime Index for Country (2018). Percent change of incidents of terror is measured from the time span of 2012 to 2016 from the Global Terrorism Database (2016). Economic health is measured from 2009 to 2014 and measures the GDP (PPP) in percent change; this data comes from the World Bank (2016).

**Hypothesis 2: Control variables**

Several of the variables controlled for in the second hypothesis are taken also from the first hypothesis and these include population density, whether a country is in the European Union, region of the world, and economic health. Population density of a country could be causal in alterations of crime and safety rates simply for the reason that they have more people per unit of space. This could lead affect crime rates and safety rates because there is more crime in cities due to the sheer amount of people. Whether the country is in the European Union is controlled for when testing for the percent change in economic health over time as the European Union may reallocate funds among countries or have various safeguards instated for stabilizing economic health. Higher density populations may also be targeted by terrorists because this indicates that the country will be severely affected by a terrorist attack because people in that country are living in closer proximity to one another. Region of the world is an important variable to control for because neighboring areas of the
world could follow similar societal, political and economic patterns. Countries in the Middle East for example, statistically have more terrorism and so this could have implications on crime rates, safety rates, economic health and obviously incidents of terrorism. Economic health is important to control for because it could lead to funding for security and counter-terrorism measures. The additional variables controlled for in the second analysis are level of urbanization, percent of Muslims in a country and the dominant religion in a country. Urbanization could also play a role in what leads to incidents of terrorism because targets would likely be regions of condensed population. One of the reasons why the percent of Muslims in each host-country is controlled for is because many of the countries of origin that most of the world’s population of refugees is fleeing from are predominantly Muslim because nations may be more likely to accept refugees with similar demographics as its citizens. Percent of Muslims in a country also is important because of the Islamic State, predominantly Muslim countries may be more likely to have incidents of terrorism because of expansion purposes for the Islamic State. Dominant religion in a country is also controlled for when testing for the percent increase in incidents of terrorism over time as countries are often targeted based on religious purposes (Asal, 2009). The data for the level of urbanization is taken from the World Bank (2015, 2016). The data for percent of Muslims in a country comes from the Pew Research Center (2011). The dominant religion variable is taken from the CIA World Factbook (2006) (see Appendix H).

Methods

The method used in order to test the hypotheses is a multivariate regression including various control variables. A bivariate analysis of each hypothesis is conducted in order to clearly display the association between the independent and dependent variables. The first
multivariate analysis will test if higher xenophobic tendencies lead to a lower likelihood of a
country implementing an integrative refugee policy, while controlling for alternate causal
mechanisms. The second analyses will test whether a higher percent change in refugee
acceptance rates leads to higher crime rates, lower safety rates, more incidents of terrorism
and economic downturns while also controlling for the appropriate variables. The years
chosen for this work were limited based on data available.

The regression analysis was complemented by other methods. These include a
correlation analysis in order to see whether or not certain variables set out to control for are
correlated closely with the variable of xenophobia. This will indicate whether the variables
are worth controlling for, or are accounted for in construction of the variable of xenophobia.
All regressions are conducted in the research software R (R version 3.3.2 and RStudio
1.0.136).
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

Hypothesis 1

While attempting to analyze the first hypothesis, several adjustments had to be made. Several control variables were similar in concept to the variables used in the makeup of independent variable, xenophobia. The control variables too similarly related to the variables that went into construction the variable of xenophobia would be obsolete in that they are already covered. Table (1) shows the variable descriptions for the affected variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table (1): Variable Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV: Important child qualities: Tolerance and respect for other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophobic Would not like to have as neighbors: People of a different race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendencies Would not like to have as neighbors: Immigrants/foreign workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not like to have as neighbors: People of a different religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much you trust: People of another religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much you trust: People of another nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to understand different people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow many/few immigrants of different race/ethnic group from majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country’s cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants make country worse or better place to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV2 How proud of nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV3 I see myself as part of ____ nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV4 The only acceptable religion is my religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV5 People who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to investigate this, a Pearson’s correlation was used in R to test the correlation between the independent variable and each of the control variables in question. The results of this are shown in Table (2) below (see Appendix (H) for R commands). For these variables, strongly agree is coded as 1 and strongly disagree is coded as 4. For pride in nationality, the higher the number, the less pride. For seeing oneself as part of the country of residence, the
higher the number, the less one agrees with this statement. For the perception that one’s only acceptable religion is his/her religion, the higher the number, the less one agrees with this statement. Finally, the notion that people who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to the religion of the respondent, the higher the number, the less likely one is to agree with this statement. The coding of the variables justifies the correlations being negative or positive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table (2): Correlation Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xenophobia and ‘How proud of nationality’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophobia and ‘I see myself as part of ____ nation’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophobia and ‘The only acceptable religion is my religion’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophobia and ‘People who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of the correlation output, the variable CV4, ‘The only acceptable religion is my religion’, has been omitted. This variable is adequately covered in the formulation of xenophobic tendencies through the variable, ‘Would not like to have as neighbors: People of a different religion’. The correlation between these two variables specifically is -0.742.

StatPrimer (Version 7.0) B. Burt Gerstman 2003, 2006, 2016 defines a weak correlation as $0 < |r| < .3$, a moderate correlation as $.3 < |r| < .7$ and a strong correlation as $r > 0.7$. Therefore, CV4, ‘The only acceptable religion is my religion’, is strongly correlated with both the independent variable as a whole, as well as the component within the independent variable of ‘Would not like to have as neighbors: People of a different religion’.

Firstly, the bivariate linear regression of the independent variable of xenophobia on the dependent variable of refugee integration policy is shown below in Table (3) (see Appendix (I) for R commands). The independent variable of xenophobia is
significant (p=2.78e-08). The bivariate regression is used to show that the empirical relationship between xenophobia and integration policies is significant in testing the association and direction of the correlation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table (3): Hypothesis 1 – Bivariate Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher levels of xenophobia lead to lower likelihood of implementing an integrative policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xenophobia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the multivariate linear regression can be seen below in Table 4 (for corresponding R commands, see Appendix (J)). This regression investigates the independent variable of xenophobia, and the significance of its effect on the dependent variable of refugee integration policy while controlling for Confidence in humanitarian organizations, How proud of nationality, I see myself as part of ____ nation, People who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine, Worries of a terrorist attack, Population density, Whether a country is in the European Union, Region of the world, and Economic Health. The results show that the independent variable is significant (p=0.046), validating that higher levels of xenophobia lead to a lower likelihood of that country implementing an integrative refugee policy. The substantive effect size of xenophobia on integration policies is -0.171. This means that for every one step that xenophobia increases, the dependent variable goes down at a rate of -0.171. This score of the least xenophobic country is 1.203. The score of the most xenophobic country is 2.723. This means that the range is 1.520. This signifies that the predicted difference between most-xenophobic and least-xenophobic country is about 0.26.
In Table 4, as well as in all of the regression results, the asterisks signify that the p-value is significant and the asterisk codes are: ‘***’ = 0.001, ‘**’ = 0.01, and ‘*’ = 0.05. The results also show that if a country is in the European Union, it is more likely to implement integrative refugee policies (p=0.007). Also, if the country is in South America, it is more likely to have an integrative refugee policy (p=0.010). South America has experiences many civil wars in the past century. Because of the refugee flow to neighboring countries, it is likely that South American governments set up various integration policies a formerly. We can infer from this analysis that higher xenophobic tendencies do in fact lead to lower likelihood of countries implementing integrative refugee policies, with EU membership and the country being in the region of South America playing a causal role as well. If the country is in either Asia or the Middle East, it is less likely to have an integrative refugee policy (p=0.019, p=0.009). The reason that Asian countries may be less likely to have integrative refugee policies may be because some countries in this region, such as China, have very low refugee acceptance rates and therefore do not have refugee policy high on the agenda. There are several reasons why Middle Eastern countries are less likely to have integration policies. It could be the case that Middle Eastern governments have less capacity to implement policies that will truly be implemented in action due to corruption or less power of the governing bodies. It also could be that there is much overflow of refugees into these countries and because the countries are not making particular refugee acceptance policies because of the inflow, then the countries may not be making policy concerning refugees at all, including integration policies.
**Table (4): Hypothesis 1 – Multivariate Analysis**

Higher levels of xenophobia lead to a lower likelihood of integration policy integration controlling for confidence in humanitarian organizations, how proud one is of nationality, seeing oneself as part of the country of residence, the belief that people who belong to other religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine, worries of a terrorist attack, population density, whether a country is in the European Union region of the world and economic health.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>0.000 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophobia</td>
<td>0.035 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in charitable or humanitarian organizations</td>
<td>0.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How proud of nationality</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see myself as part of ____ nation</td>
<td>0.048 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine</td>
<td>0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worries of a terrorist attack</td>
<td>0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>0.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union membership</td>
<td>0.005 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Asia</td>
<td>0.015 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: The Caribbean</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Central America</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Europe</td>
<td>0.005 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Middle East</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: North America</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Oceania</td>
<td>0.008 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: South America</td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Health (GDP, PPP)</td>
<td>0.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Parties (number of parties present or dominant party)</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Rules: Endorsement of candidate</td>
<td>0.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Rules: FPTP</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Rules: Parallel</td>
<td>0.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Rules: Party list PR</td>
<td>0.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Rules: Single non-transferable vote</td>
<td>0.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Rules: Two-round system</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Rules: Two-tier Party list PR</td>
<td>0.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Acceptance (percent change)</td>
<td>0.216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It should be noted that for the second hypothesis through analysis of the data by means of histograms, there were several prominent outliers (see Appendix (K) for histograms). For example, Hong Kong’s population density (people per sq. km of land area) was 6958 when the next highest value was Bahrain at 1779 and the average was approximately 261. In order to accommodate this, a dataset was created that eliminated the extreme values. Extreme values were determined by the histograms. Two analyses are subsequently conducted, one using data including the outliers. The results of the data analyses will be shown side by side with H2_1 being referred to as “version 1” and H2_2 being referred to as “version 2”. Version 1 includes the extreme variables and version 2 omits them.

When analyzing if an increase refugee percent change over time leads to a rise in percent change of crime rate in a country while controlling for Population density, Region of the world, Economic Health, Level of Urbanization, and Percent of Muslims in a country, predicted effects of increasing refugee intake are not statistically significant. Not surprisingly, though, there is a statistically significant relationship between higher population density and higher crime rates. The bivariate analysis is shown in Table 5 and the multivariate analysis is shown in Table 6 (for corresponding R commands, see Appendices (L and M)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table (5): Hypothesis 2 – Bivariate Analysis (Crime Rates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An increase in refugee acceptance will lead an increase in crime rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent change of Refugee intake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When testing whether percent change of refugee intake leads to percent change in safety rate, the results are insignificant using both a bivariate and a multivariate method; corresponding results are show below (see Tables (7) and (8)) (for corresponding R commands, see Appendices (N and O)). For the multivariate regression, the variables controlled for include Population density, Whether a country is in the European Union, Region of the world, Level of Urbanization, and Percent of Muslims in a country.

### Table (6): Hypothesis 2 – Multivariate Analysis (Crime Rates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p-value (version 1)</th>
<th>p-value (version 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Muslim</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Health (GDP, PPP)</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanization</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.005 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Asia</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: The Caribbean</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Central America</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>0.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Europe</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Middle East</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: North America</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Oceana</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: South America</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table (7): Hypothesis 2 – Bivariate Analysis (Safety Rates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p-value (version 1)</th>
<th>p-value (version 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent change of Refugee intake</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another component of the second hypothesis was that percent change of refugee intake may lead to higher likelihood of that country experiencing a higher percent change of incidents of terrorism. As can be inferred by the bivariate and multivariate outputs in the Tables (9) and (10), the results are insignificant. That is, a higher percent change of refugee intake does not appear to lead to a higher percent increase in incidents of terrorism (for corresponding R commands, see Appendices (P and Q)).
Table (10): Hypothesis 2 – Multivariate Analysis (Incidents of Terrorism)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p-value (version 1)</th>
<th>p-value (version 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Religion: Hinduism or Buddhism</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Religion: Islam</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Religion: Orthodox</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Religion: Roman Catholic</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Muslim</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Health (GDP, PPP)</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanization</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Asia</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Central America</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Europe</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Middle East</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: North America</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Oceana</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: South America</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth component of the second hypothesis investigates whether a higher percent change of refugee intake leads to an increase or decrease in economic health nation while controlling for Population density, Region of the world, Whether a nation is in the European Union, Level of Urbanization, and Percent of Muslims in a country. In the bivariate analysis (see Table (11); for corresponding R commands, see Appendix R), the results lack statistical significance. In the multivariate analysis (Table 12 and Appendix S), though, while controlling for the appropriate variables, it is significant that higher intake of refugees by nation in terms of percent change leads to an increase in economic health (p = 0.027). It is also found that a higher percent change of the level of urbanization in a nation leads to an increase in economic health (p = 0.043).
Table (11): Hypothesis 2 – Bivariate Analysis (Economic Health)

An increase in refugee acceptance rates will lead to a decline in economic health.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p-value (version 1)</th>
<th>p-value (version 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>3.38e-10 ***</td>
<td>2.09E-12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent change of Refugee intake</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (12): Hypothesis 2 – Multivariate Analysis (Economic Health)

Higher percent change of refugee intake leads to an increase in economic health controlling for population density, region of the world, level of urbanization, membership in the European Union and Muslim population in a country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p-value (version 1)</th>
<th>p-value (version 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.027*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Muslim</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanization</td>
<td>0.036 *</td>
<td>0.043*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Membership</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Asia</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: The Caribbean</td>
<td>0.038 *</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Central America</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Europe</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Middle East</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: North America</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Oceana</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: South America</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall what can be gathered from the results is that higher levels of xenophobia in a country lead to a lower likelihood of that country implementing an integrative refugee policy. In simple terms, the more fear individuals in a country have regarding foreigners, the less likely that country is to have policies which integrate refugees into society. The Pew Research Center Spring (2016) Global Attitudes Survey Data shows that many of these fears are tied to economic concerns of what will happen with the intake of refugees. From the literature review, fears that refugees will bring crime, decrease safety, bring incidents of
terrorism and harm the economy are the main fears associated with refugee policy. The statistical analysis shows that the realities of each of these fears lack significance in that the percent change of refugee intake does not lead to increased crime rates and incidents of terrorism nor decreased safety rates. Importantly, this was found when controlling for the percent of the Muslim population in a country. This means that even though many refugees are fleeing from predominantly Muslim countries, regardless of the religious makeup of the population, the results still lead to a positive increase in economic health. Instead, the results here suggest that an increase in refugee intake leads if anything to an increase in a country’s economic health.
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Overall, it is inferred that xenophobic tendencies do in fact lead to a lower likelihood of a host-nation implementing an integrative refugee policy. With the knowledge of this, it would be ideal to investigate the implications of a lack of an integrative refugee policy on outcomes of the fears associated with xenophobia such as that refugees will bring economic burden, increase terrorism and heighten crime rates. These conclusions add to the literature surrounding refugees and refugee policy.

Additionally, a higher percent change in increase of refugees is not statistically significant in leading to percent change of crime rates, safety rates, incidents of terrorism and economic health. This is an important revelation in the scheme of refugee policy debate today. Since there is no evidence that refugees will cause harm regarding crime rates, safety rates, threats of terrorism and the economy, the associated xenophobia is unwarranted. Conceptually, this knowledge should lower levels of xenophobia, subsequently resulting in higher levels of integration policy among countries. In future research, the potential benefits of properly integrated refugees in the workforce could be investigated. The xenophobic levels in a country’s government could also be explored in regard to integration policy as there may be cases where a nation’s policy implementations do not reflect attitudes expressed by its citizens.
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APPENDIX A. NATIONS

Below is a list of nations in the sample:

Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil,
Colombia, Cyprus, Chile, China, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia,
Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Hong Kong, Hungary, India, Iraq, Ireland, Israel,
Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libya, Lithuania, Malaysia,
Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland,
Portugal, Romania, Russia, Rwanda, Slovenia, South Korea, South Africa, Spain, Sweden,
Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom,
United States, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Yemen.
APPENDIX B. WVS DATA AND CODES

The nations included in the accumulation of the independent variable of xenophobia from the World Values Survey include: Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Brazil, Colombia, Cyprus, Chile, China, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Hong Kong, India, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Russia, Rwanda, Slovenia, South Korea, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United States, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Yemen.

V16
Important child qualities: Tolerance and respect for other people

“Here is a list of qualities that children can be encouraged to learn at home. Which, if any, do you consider to be especially important?: Tolerance and respect for other people”

1 = Not Mentioned
2 = Mentioned

V37
Would not like to have as neighbors: People of a different race

“On this list are various groups of people. Could you please mention any that you would not like to have as neighbors?: People of a different race”

1 = Not Mentioned
2 = Mentioned

V39
Would not like to have as neighbors: Immigrants/foreign workers
“On this list are various groups of people. Could you please mention any that you would not like to have as neighbors?: Immigrants/Foreign workers”

1 = Not Mentioned

2 = Mentioned

V41

Would not like to have as neighbors: People of a different religion

“On this list are various groups of people. Could you please mention any that you would not like to have as neighbors?: People of a different religion”

1 = Not Mentioned

2 = Mentioned

V106

How much you trust: People of another religion

“I’d like to ask you how much you trust people from various groups. Could you tell me for each whether you trust people from this group completely, somewhat, not very much or not at all? : People of another religion”

1 = Trust Completely

2 = Trust Somewhat

3 = Do not trust very much

4 = Do not trust at all

V107

How much you trust: People of another nationality

“I’d like to ask you how much you trust people from various groups. Could you tell me for each whether you trust people from this group completely, somewhat, not very much
or not at all? People of another nationality”

1 = Trust Completely
2 = Trust Somewhat
3 = Do not trust very much
4 = Do not trust at all
APPENDIX C. ESS DATA AND CODES

The nations included in the accumulation of the independent variable of xenophobia from the European Social Survey include: Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Lithuania, Norway, Portugal, Switzerland, the United Kingdom.

Ipudrst

Important to understand different people

0 = “Very much like me”
.8 = “Like me”
1.6 = “Somewhat like me”
2.4 = “A little like me”
3.2 = “Not like me”
4 = “Not like me at all”
* = “Refusal”
* = “Don’t know”
* = “No answer”

imdfetn

Allow many/few immigrants of different race/ethnic group from majority

1 = “Allow many to come and live here”
2 = “Allow some”
3 = “Allow a few”
4 = “Allow none”
* = “Refusal”
Country’s cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants

4 = “Cultural life undermined”
3.6 = “3.6”
3.2 = “3.2”
2.8 = “2.8”
2.4 = “2.4”
2.0 = “2.0”
1.6 = “1.6”
1.2 = “1.2”
.8 = “.8”
.4 = “.4”
0 = “Cultural life enriched”

Immigrants make country worse or better place to live

4 = “Worse place to live”
3.6 = “3.6”
3.2 = “3.2”
2.8 = “2.8”
2.4 = “2.4”
2.0 = “2.0”
1.6 = “1.6”
1.2 = “1.2”
.8 = “.8”
.4 = “.4”
0 = “Better place to live”
* = “Refusal”
* = “Don’t know”
* = “No answer”
APPENDIX D. INDEPENDENT VARIABLE MAKEUP

The independent variable of xenophobia was created and accumulated using both the World Values Survey (2014) and the European Social Survey (2014). 54 of the nations in the sample were combined using the World Values Survey (2014), and 13 of them were combined using the European Social Survey (2014). The following variables from the World Value Survey (2014) were compressed to a 0-4 scale and averaged per country: V16, V37, V39, V41, V106 and V107 (see Appendix A). The variables were properly scaled in order to have the lower values signifying low levels of xenophobia and the higher values signifying higher levels of xenophobia. When adding the values of the dependent variable indicators, the highest possible sum was 52 (i.e. 100% integrative policies). For example, Algeria was missing DV12, DV16-19 and DV22-23. The sum of the highest scores able to receive out of these variables was 12. Therefore, Algeria’s average was only out of 40 rather than 52, because of omitted variables. Once there was a value for each indicator, these were averaged to yield a single value of xenophobia per nation. For the remaining 13 nations, the following variables from the European Social Survey (2014) were compressed to a 0-4 scale and averaged per country: ipudrst, imdfetn, imueclt and imwbcent (see Appendix C). These variables were also properly scaled in order to have lower values signifying low levels of xenophobia and the higher values signifying higher levels of xenophobia. Again, once there was a value for each indicator, these were averaged to yield a single value of xenophobia per nation. It is inferred that the indicators utilized in accumulation are all what makes up the singular variable of xenophobia, since there is no such accumulated dataset on such tendencies on a large scale.
APPENDIX E. DEPENDENT VARIABLE MAKEUP

Health

**DV1**
Access to healthcare
1. Yes
0. No

**Labor market mobility**

**DV2**
Immediate access to labor market

“Immediate access to labor market: What categories of foreign residents have equal access to employment as nationals? a. Permanent residents b. Residents on temporary work permits (excluding seasonal) within period of ≤ 1 year c. Residents on family reunification permits (same as sponsor)”

2. All of them
1. A and (C or certain categories of B)
0. Only A or None

**DV3**
Equal treatment by taxing authorities
1. Yes
0. No

**DV4**
The right to belong to trade unions

   Membership of and participation in trade unions associations and work-related
negotiation bodies

1. Equal access with nationals
0. Unequal access with nationals

**DV5**

Access to self-employment

“Are foreign residents able to take up self-employed activity under equal conditions as nationals?”

3. Yes. There are no additional restrictions than those based on type of permit

2. Other limiting conditions that apply to foreign residents, e.g. linguistic testing (please specify)

1. Certain sectors and activities solely for nationals (please specify)

**Family reunification for foreign citizens**

**DV6**

Minor children

“Eligibility for minor children (<18 years) a. Minor children b. Adopted children c. Children for whom custody is shared”

3. All three

2. Only a and b

1. Limitations on A or B limitations e.g. age limits <18 years (please specify)

**DV7**

Dependent parents/grandparents

Eligibility for dependent relatives in the ascending line

2. Allowed for all dependent ascendants
1. Restrictive definition of dependency (e.g. only one ground e.g. poor health or income or no access to social benefits)
0. Not allowed or by discretion/exception

**Education**

**DV8**
The adoption of multiculturalism in school curriculum
1. Yes
0. No

**DV9**
The funding of bilingual education or mother-tongue instruction
1. Yes
0. No

**DV10**
Affirmative action for disadvantaged immigrant groups
1. Yes
0. No

**DV11**
Access to elementary education
1. Yes
0. No

**DV12**
Access to higher education
1. Yes
0. No

**Political participation**

**DV13**

Right to vote in national elections

3. Equal rights as nationals after certain period of residence

2. Reciprocity or other special conditions for certain nationalities

1. No right

**DV14**

Membership in political parties

   Membership of and participation to political parties

3. Equal access with nationals (no restrictions imposed by government)

2. Restricted access to internal elected positions

1. Other official/legal restrictions apply

**Permanent residence**

**DV15**

Pre-departure and pre-arrival measures, including actions to prepare migrants and the local communities for the integration process

2. Many measures

1. Some measures

0. No measures

**DV16**

The right to choose their place of residence

1. Yes
The right to move freely within the country
1. Yes
0. No

Access to housing
1. Yes
0. No

The right to own property
1. Yes
0. No

Access to nationality

Allows dual citizenship
1. Yes
0. No

Residence period

“Residence requirement for ordinary legal residents

Note: “Residence” is defined as the whole period of lawful and habitual stay since entry. For instance, if the requirement is 5 years as a permanent resident, which itself can
only be obtained after 5 years’ residence, please select “After ≥ 10 years”

3. After ≤ 5 years of total residence (please specify)

2. After > 5 < 10 years of total residence (please specify)

1. After ≥ 10 years of total residence (please specify)

**Anti-discrimination**

**DV22**

Active participation and social inclusion, including actions to support exchanges with the receiving society, migrants' participation to cultural life and fighting discrimination

1. Many measures

2. Some measures

3. No measures

**DV23**

Free exercise of religion and religious education

1. Yes

0. No

**DV24**

Protection provided by social security

1. Yes

0. No

**DV25**

Exemptions from dress codes (either by statute or court cases)

1. Yes

0. No
DV26

Constitutional, legislative or parliamentary affirmation of multiculturalism at the central and/or regional and municipal levels and the existence of a government ministry, secretariat or advisory board to implement this policy in consultation with ethnic communities

1. Yes

0. No
APPENDIX F. COMPLETE LIST OF SOURCES FOR THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE OF REFUGEE INTEGRATION POLICIES

Algeria

- DV1
- DV2
- DV3
- DV4
- DV5
- DV6
- DV7
- DV8
- DV9
- DV10
- DV13
- DV14
- DV15
- DV20
  
  • **DV21**

  **Argentina**

  • **DV1**
  
  • **DV2**
  
  • **DV4**
  
  • **DV7**
  
  • **DV8**
  
  • **DV9**
  
  • **DV10**
  
  • **DV11**
  
  • **DV14**
  
  • **DV15**
  
  • **DV17**
  
  • **DV18**

- **DV19**

- **DV20**

- **DV21**

- **DV23**

**Armenia**

- **DV1**

- **DV2**

- **DV3**

- **DV4**
  - Support Refugees Self Employment Grant Competition Announcement. *Support Refugees Self Employment Grant Competition Announcement | Armenia | Save the Children.*

- **DV6**
  - Support Refugees Self Employment Grant Competition Announcement. *Support Refugees Self Employment Grant Competition Announcement | Armenia | Save the Children.*

- **DV7**

- **DV8**

• DV9

• DV10

• DV11

• DV12
  o Ghazaryan, Yulia. Obstacles to the Integration and Naturalization of Refugees A Case Study of Ethnic Armenian Refugees in Armenia. Unpan.

• DV13
  o Ghazaryan, Yulia. Obstacles to the Integration and Naturalization of Refugees A Case Study of Ethnic Armenian Refugees in Armenia. Unpan.

• DV15
  o For Persons Displaced from Syria to Armenia (2014). UNHCR.

• DV16
  o For Persons Displaced from Syria to Armenia (2014). UNHCR.

• DV17
  o For Persons Displaced from Syria to Armenia (2014). UNHCR.

• DV19

• DV20

• DV21
  o For Persons Displaced from Syria to Armenia (2014). UNHCR.

Australia

• DV1
• DV2
  o OECD; UNHCR (2016). Migration Policy Debates.
• DV3
• DV4
• DV5
• DV6
• DV7
• DV8
• DV9
• DV10
• DV11
• DV12
• DV13
• DV14
• DV15
• DV16
• DV17

DV18
   o Refugee and Humanitarian Entrants - Eligibility. Department of Immigration and Border Protection.

DV19

DV20

DV21

DV22

DV23

Azerbaijan

DV1

DV2

DV4

DV5
   o Embassy of Hungary Baku (2018). LONG TERM VISA (VISA TYPE D) - PURPOSE OF FAMILY REUNIFICATION.

DV6
   o Embassy of Hungary Baku (2018). LONG TERM VISA (VISA TYPE D) - PURPOSE OF FAMILY REUNIFICATION.

DV7
   o Study on Teacher Education in Six EaP Countries: Azerbaijan (2013). EUROPA. Education and Culture DG.

DV8
   o International Schools in Azerbaijan. Expat-Quotes.

DV9

- **DV10**

- **DV12**

- **DV13**

- **DV14**
  - Parliamentary Assembly (2002). Situation of Refugees and Displaced Persons in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia. *Committee on Migration, Refugees and Demography.*

- **DV15**
  - Parliamentary Assembly (2002). Situation of Refugees and Displaced Persons in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia. *Committee on Migration, Refugees and Demography.*

- **DV16**
  - Parliamentary Assembly (2002). Situation of Refugees and Displaced Persons in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia. *Committee on Migration, Refugees and Demography.*

- **DV17**

- **DV18**

- **DV19**

- **DV20**

- **DV21**

- **DV22**

- **DV23**
Bahrain

- DV1

- DV3

- DV7

- DV8

- DV9

- DV12

- DV14
• DV17
• DV20
• DV21
• DV22
• DV23
  o Karolak, Magdalena and Irena C. Veljanova. Preserving Arab Culture in the Kingdom of Bahrain.

**Belarus**

• DV1
• DV2
  o Belarus (June 2013).] MPC – MIGRATION POLICY CENTRE. *MPC Migration Profile: BELARUS Migration Policy Centre.*
• DV3
  o Belarus (June 2013).] MPC – MIGRATION POLICY CENTRE. *MPC Migration Profile: BELARUS Migration Policy Centre.*
• DV4
  o Belarus (June 2013).] MPC – MIGRATION POLICY CENTRE. *MPC Migration Profile: BELARUS Migration Policy Centre.*
• DV5
• DV6
• DV7
• DV8
• DV9

DV10

DV11

DV12

DV14
- Belarus (June 2013). MPC – MIGRATION POLICY CENTRE. MPC Migration Profile: BELARUS Migration Policy Centre.

DV15
- Belarus (June 2013). MPC – MIGRATION POLICY CENTRE. MPC Migration Profile: BELARUS Migration Policy Centre.

DV16

DV17

DV19
- EU Agenda Team (2016). Leaving No One behind: the Imperative of Inclusive Development. EU Agenda, United Nations.

DV20

DV21
- Belarus (June 2013). MPC – MIGRATION POLICY CENTRE. MPC Migration Profile: BELARUS Migration Policy Centre.

DV23

Belgium

DV1
- LEGAL REPORT ON ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE IN 17 COUNTRIES (2016). European Network to Reduce Vulnerabilities in Health.

DV2
• DV3
• DV4
• DV5
• DV6
• DV7
• DV8
• DV9
• DV10
• DV11
• DV12
  o Voting in Belgium (2018). ANGLOINFO Belguim. ANGLOINFO LTD.
• DV13
• DV14
• DV15
• DV16
• DV17

- **DV18**

- **DV19**

- **DV20**

- **DV21**

- **DV22**

- **DV23**

**Brazil**

- **DV1**

- **DV2**

- **DV5**

- **DV6**

- **DV7**

- **DV8**

- **DV9**
  - Stanek, Christina (2013). The Educational System of Brazil. *IEM Spotlight, Kent State University.*

- **DV10**
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Education Eases the Integration of Refugees in North-East Brazil. *UNHCR*.
- **DV11**
  - United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Education Eases the Integration of Refugees in North-East Brazil. *UNHCR*.
- **DV12**
- **DV14**
- **DV15**
- **DV16**
- **DV17**
- **DV18**
  - LEGAL FRAMEWORK GOVERNING INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION (Brazil) (2014). *OAS, SICREMI*.
- **DV19**
  - Forced Migration Review (2010). Local Integration of Refugees in Brazil | *Forced Migration Review*.
- **DV20**
- **DV21**
- **DV22**
- **DV23**

**Colombia**

- **DV1**
- **DV5**
- **DV6**
- **DV7**
Immerstein, Silje (2015). Education in Colombia. *WENR.*

**DV8**

**DV9**

**DV10**

**DV11**

**DV12**
- Congreso Visible - Toda La Información Sobre El Congreso Colombiano En Un Solo Lugar. Por Medio De La Cual Se Reglamenta El Voto De Extranjeros ... | Proyectos De Ley | Congreso Visible.

**DV14**

**DV15**

**DV17**

**DV18**

**DV20**
- Colombian Constitution of 1991 (Title II – Concerning rights, guarantees, and duties – Chapter I – Concerning fundamental rights – Article 19)

**DV21**

**DV23**

**Cyprus**

**DV1**

**DV2**
• DV3
• DV4
• DV5
• DV6
• DV7
• DV8
• DV9
  o Department of Secondary General Education, Ministry of Education and Culture.
• DV10
• DV11
• DV12
  o Voting in Cyprus - Cyprus (n.d.). *Angloinfo.*
• DV14
• DV16
• DV17
• DV18
• DV19

• DV20

• DV21

• DV22

• DV23

Chile

• DV1
  o BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CHILE (n.d.). Chile. COUNTRY CHAPTERS, Refworld.

• DV2
  o OECD/UNHCR (2016). Hiring Refugees - What Are the Opportunities and Challenges for Employers. OECD. Migration Policy Debates.

• DV3
  o OECD/UNHCR (2016). Hiring Refugees - What Are the Opportunities and Challenges for Employers. OECD. Migration Policy Debates.

• DV4
  o OECD/UNHCR (2016). Hiring Refugees - What Are the Opportunities and Challenges for Employers. OECD. Migration Policy Debates.

• DV7

• DV8
  o Paterito, José Tonko (n.d.). Impact of an Intercultural Education. Bilingual Intercultural Education in Chile, Languages of the Pacific Rim Project.

• DV9

• DV10
  o BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CHILE (n.d.). Chile. COUNTRY CHAPTERS, Refworld.

• DV11
  o BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CHILE (n.d.). Chile. COUNTRY CHAPTERS, Refworld.

• DV12

• DV13

• DV14

• DV15

• DV17

• DV18

• DV20

• DV21

• DV23

China

• DV3

• DV5

• DV6

• DV7

• DV8


LegCo Panel on Home Affairs, Hong Kong SAR (2005). Refugee Children No Right to Education. HONG KONG HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION.

LegCo Panel on Home Affairs, Hong Kong SAR (2005). Refugee Children No Right to Education. HONG KONG HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION.


Czech Republic


• **DV3**

• **DV4**

• **DV5**
o Global Legal Research Directorate Staff (2014). *Family Reunification Laws.*

• **DV6**
o Global Legal Research Directorate Staff (2014). *Family Reunification Laws.*

• **DV7**

• **DV8**

• **DV9**
o QCM, (2013). The Framework Educational Programme for Basic Education. MŠMT ČR, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION YOUTH AND SPORTS.

• **DV10**

• **DV11**

• **DV12**

• **DV13**

• **DV14**

• **DV15**
o European Parliament (1999). MIGRATION AND ASYLUM IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE LIBE 104 EN. *Migration and Asylum in Central and Eastern Europe: Czech Republic.*

• **DV17**

- DV18

- DV19

- DV20

- DV21

- DV23

**Denmark**

- DV1

- DV2

- DV3

- DV5

- DV6

- DV7

- DV8

• DV10 OECD/UNHCR (2016). Hiring Refugees - What Are the Opportunities and Challenges for Employers. OECD. Migration Policy Debates.

• DV11 OECD/UNHCR (2016). Hiring Refugees - What Are the Opportunities and Challenges for Employers. OECD. Migration Policy Debates.

• DV12 Voting in Denmark - Denmark (2018). Angloinfo Denmark. ANGLOINFO LTD.


• DV15 Information on Refugees in Denmark (2018). ASYLUM CENTERS IN DENMARK. REFUGEES.DK.


• DV18 Information on Refugees in Denmark (2018). ASYLUM CENTERS IN DENMARK. REFUGEES.DK.


**Ecuador**

- DV1

- DV2

- DV3

- DV4

- DV5

- DV6

- DV7

- DV8

- DV9

- DV10

- DV11

- DV12
  - DV13
  - DV14
  - DV15
  - DV16
  - DV17
  - DV18
  - DV19
  - DV20
  - DV21
  - DV23

**Egypt**

- DV1
- DV2
- DV4
- DV5

- DV6

- DV7

- DV8

- DV9

- DV10

- DV11

- DV14

- DV15

- DV16

- DV17

- DV18
  - Cairo International Airport (n.d.). *Cairo-Airport*.

- DV19

- DV20

- DV21
  - Notes and Brief Reports Egyptian Social Security Law (n.d.). *Ssa*.

- DV22

- DV23

Estonia

- **DV1**

- **DV2**

- **DV3**

- **DV4**

- **DV5**

- **DV6**

- **DV7**

- **DV8**

- **DV9**

- **DV10**

- **DV11**

- **DV12**

- **DV13**

- **DV14**

- **DV15**

- **DV17**

- **DV18**
  - Right of Permanent Residence and Long-Term Residence Permit in Estonia. Work in Estonia.

- **DV19**

- **DV20**

- **DV21**

- **DV22**

- **DV23**

**Finland**

- **DV1**

- **DV2**
  - Sarvimäki, Matti (2017). Labor Market Integration of Refugees in Finland. VATT Research Reports. *VALTION TALOUDELLINEN TUTKIMUSKESKUS VATT INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMIC RESEARCH.*

- **DV3**
- DV5
- DV6
- DV7
- DV8
- DV9
- DV10
- DV11
- DV12
- DV13
- DV14
- DV15
- DV16
  - Turvapaikanhakijana Suomeen (2017). Asylum in Finland. *Infopankki, Moving to Finland*.
- DV17
- DV18
• DV19  

• DV20  
  o Church and state (2011). Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland.

• DV21  

• DV22  

• DV23  

**France**

• DV1  
  o LEGAL REPORT ON ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE IN 17 COUNTRIES (2016). European Network to Reduce Vulnerabilities in Health. Mdmeuroblog.

• DV2  

• DV3  

• DV4  

• DV5  

• DV6  

• DV7  

• DV8  

• DV9  

• DV10

• DV11

• DV12
  • Voting in France, for Foreigners (2018). Angloinfo France. *ANGLOINFO LTD.*

• DV13

• DV14

• DV15

• DV16
  • Mandal, Ruma (2003). LEGAL AND PROTECTION POLICY RESEARCH SERIES Political Rights of Refugees. UNHCR. *Refworld - DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION.*

• DV17

• DV18

• DV19

• DV20
  • Religious freedom in France: according to the Protestants the USA is poorly informed - News about religious cults and sects (2016).

• DV21

• DV22

• DV23
Georgia

- DV1
- DV2
- DV3
- DV4
- DV5
- DV6
- DV7
- DV8
- DV9
- DV10
- DV11
- DV14
- DV15
- DV16
- DV17
• DV18

• DV19

• DV20

• DV21

• DV23

\textbf{Germany}

• DV1
  o \textit{LEGAL REPORT ON ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE IN 17 COUNTRIES} (2016). European Network to Reduce Vulnerabilities in Health.

• DV2

• DV3

• DV4

• DV5

• DV6

• DV7
  o Treppte, Carmen (n.d.). Multicultural Approaches in Education: A German Experience Multiculturalism in Early Childhood Programs. ERIC/EECE Book Archive. \textit{Multiculturalism in Early Childhood Programs, Turkish Children and Mothers Project}.

• DV8

- **DV9**
  - Multiculturalism Policies in Contemporary Democracies (2010). Germany | Multiculturalism Policies in Contemporary Democracies. *Queen's University.*

- **DV10**

- **DV11**

- **DV12**

- **DV13**

- **DV14**

- **DV15**

- **DV16**

- **DV17**

- **DV18**

- **DV19**

- **DV20**

- **DV21**

- **DV22**

- **DV23**
Ghana

- DV1
  o GHANA REFUGEE BOARD - FUNCTION OF THE BOARD (2016).
- DV2
- DV4
- DV5
- DV6
- DV7
- DV8
- DV9
- DV10
- DV11
- DV12
- DV14
- DV15
• DV16

• DV17

• DV19
  o Acheampong, Anthony (2015). Local Integration of Refugees: Reflections from Liberian Refugees in Ghana. *UIT, Faculty of Humanities, Social Science and Education Centre for Peace Studies.*

• DV20

• DV21

• DV22

• DV23

**Hong Kong**

• DV1

• DV2

• DV3

• DV4

• DV5

• DV6

• DV7

**DV8**

**DV9**
- Education Bureau (2013). The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

**DV10**

**DV11**

**DV12**
- Sonia Lin (2007). Non-Citizen Voting in Hong Kong. *immigrantvoting.org*.

**DV14**

**DV17**

**DV18**

**DV19**

**DV20**

**DV21**

**DV22**

**DV23**
Hungary

- DV1
- DV2
- DV3
- DV5
- DV6
- DV7
- DV8
- DV9
- DV10
- DV11
- DV12
- DV13
- DV14
- DV15
- DV16
- DV17

• DV18
  o Wall, David (2004). Residence Permit for the Purpose of Family Reunification. *Multi-Tier Application Programming with PHP.*

• DV19

• DV21

• DV22

• DV23

**India**

• DV1

• DV2

• DV3

• DV4

• DV5

• DV6

• DV7
• Mehta, Venu (2013). Literature-Oriented Multicultural Education in India Children’s Experiences with a Task-Based Folklore Lesson. *MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION, Promising Practices.*

• DV8

• DV9

• DV10
  o UNHCR (2014). UNHCR - UNHCR in India.

• DV11
  o UNHCR (2014). UNHCR - UNHCR in India.

• DV12

• DV14

• DV15

• DV16

• DV17

• DV19
  o McGregor, Elaine, and Nora Ragab (2016). The Role of Culture and the Arts in the Integration of Refugees and Migrants. *European Expert Network on Culture and Audiovisual (EENCA).*

• DV20

• DV21

• DV22

• DV23
  o There's no national language in India: Gujarat High Court - Times of India (2017). *indiatimes.com.*
Iraq

- **DV1**
- **DV7**
- **DV8**
- **DV9**
- **DV10**
- **DV11**
- **DV12**
- **DV14**
- **DV17**
- **DV19**
- **DV20**
- **DV21**
- **DV22**
- **DV23**

Ireland

- **DV1**
  - LEGAL REPORT ON ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE IN 17 COUNTRIES (2016). *European Network to Reduce Vulnerabilities in Health*.

• DV3

• DV4

• DV5

• DV6

• DV7

• DV8

• DV9

• DV10

• DV11

• DV12

• DV13

• DV14

• DV15

• DV16

• DV17

• DV18

• DV19

• DV20

• DV21

• DV22

• DV23

Israel

• DV1

• DV3

• DV4

• DV5

• DV6

• DV7

• DV8

• DV9

• DV10

• DV11

• DV12

• DV13

• DV14

• DV16

• DV17

• DV19

• DV20

• DV21

• DV22

• DV23
Japan

- DV1

- DV2

- DV5

- DV6

- DV7

- DV8

- DV9

- DV10

- DV11

- DV12

- DV14

- DV17

- DV18
  - Residence Status of Long-Term Resident (2007). REFUGEE ASSISTANCE HEADQUARTERS.

- DV19

- DV20

• DV21

• DV22

• DV23

**Jordan**

• DV1

• DV2

• DV3
  o The ITUC Global Rights Index (2012). Global Rights Index. *ITUC Survey of Violations of Trade Union Rights, ITUC-CSI-IGB.*

• DV4

• DV5

• DV6

• DV7

• DV8

• DV9

• DV10

DV11

DV12


DV14


DV16


DV17


DV20


DV21


DV22


DV23


Kazakhstan

DV1


DV2


DV5

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2017). Family Reunification. MFA.

DV6

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2017). Family Reunification. MFA.

DV7


- **DV9**

- **DV10**

- **DV11**

- **DV14**

- **DV15**

- **DV16**

- **DV17**

- **DV18**

- **DV19**

- **DV20**

- **DV21**

- **DV22**

- **DV23**
Kazakhstan's unique Assembly of People maintains ethnic harmony (n.d.). *UPI.*

**Kuwait**

- DV1
- DV3
  - The ITUC Global Rights Index (2011). Global Rights Index. *ITUC Survey of Violations of Trade Union Rights, ITUC-CSI-IGB.*
- DV8
- DV9
- DV10
- DV11
- DV12
- DV14
- DV15
- DV17
- DV18
- DV20
- DV21
- DV22
- DV23

**Kyrgyzstan**

- DV1

- DV4
  - Jakupova, Cholpon (2014). KYRGYZSTAN’S EXPERIENCE IN RESOLVING THE REFUGEE PROBLEM. *CA&CC Press AB.*

- DV5

- DV6

- DV7

- DV9

- DV10

- DV11

- DV13

- DV14

- DV15

- DV17

- DV19

- DV20

- DV21

- DV22
• DV23  
  
**Lebanon**

• DV1  

• DV2  

• DV3  

• DV4  

• DV5  

• DV6  

• DV7  

• DV8  

• DV9  

• DV10  

• DV11  
• DV13

• DV14

• DV15
  • How We Help Refugees in Lebanon: Housing for the Crisis (2017). Habitat for Humanity GB.

• DV16
  • United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (2017). Lebanon. *UNHCR.*

• DV17

• DV19

• DV20

• DV21

• DV22
  • Saifi Institute for Arabic Language (2014). Do’s and Don’Ts in Lebanon.

• DV23

• DV1

• DV2
  • MPC Team (2013). MPC - MIGRATION PROFILE Libya. MPC – MIGRATION POLICY CENTRE. *Co-Fi Nanced by the European Union.*

• DV3
  • MPC Team (2013). MPC - MIGRATION PROFILE Libya. MPC – MIGRATION POLICY CENTRE. *Co-Fi Nanced by the European Union.*

• DV4
  • MPC Team (2013). MPC - MIGRATION PROFILE Libya. MPC – MIGRATION POLICY CENTRE. *Co-Fi Nanced by the European Union.*

• DV7

• DV8

- **DV9**

- **DV10**

- **DV11**

- **DV14**

- **DV15**

- **DV16**

- **DV17**

- **DV19**

- **DV20**

- **DV21**

- **DV22**

- **DV23**

**Lithuania**

- **DV1**

- **DV2**
  - EUROFOUND (2016). EurWORK European Observatory of Working Life. Approaches towards the Labour Market Integration of Refugees in the EU. *Eurofound, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions*.

- **DV3**

• DV5 o Global Legal Research Directorate Staff (2014). Family Reunification Laws.

• DV6 o Global Legal Research Directorate Staff (2014). Family Reunification Laws.


• DV9 o Kryptis, Dizaino (2016). Education. Pre-Primary Education. Ministry of Education and Science.


• DV15 o UNHCR (2013). Integration of Refugees in Lithuania Participation and Empowerment - Understanding Integration in Lithuania through an Age, Gender and Diversity Based Participatory Approach. The UN Refugee Agency.

• DV16 o UNHCR (2013). Integration of Refugees in Lithuania Participation and Empowerment - Understanding Integration in Lithuania through an Age, Gender and Diversity Based Participatory Approach. The UN Refugee Agency.


• DV18
• Vilnius (2012). ORGANISATION OF ASYLUM AND MIGRATION POLICY IN LITHUANIA. EUROPEAN MIGRATION NETWORK NATIONAL CONTACT POINT FOR THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA.

• DV19

• DV20

• DV21

• DV23

Malaysia

• DV1

• DV2

• DV3

• DV5

• DV6

• DV7

• DV8

• DV9

• DV10

• DV11
• DV12  
  o Constitution of Malaysia Archived 2017 at the Wayback Machine.
• DV14  
• DV15  
• DV16  
• DV17  
• DV18  
• DV19  
• DV20  
• DV21  
• DV22  
• DV23  

Mexico
• DV1  
• DV2  
  o OECD (2013). EDUCATION POLICY OUTLOOK MEXICO.
• DV3  
  o OECD (2013). EDUCATION POLICY OUTLOOK MEXICO.
• DV4  
  o OECD (2013). EDUCATION POLICY OUTLOOK MEXICO.
• DV5  
• DV6
• DV8
• DV9
  o OECD (2013). EDUCATION POLICY OUTLOOK MEXICO.
• DV10
• DV11
• DV12
• DV13
• DV14
• DV16
• DV17
• DV18
• DV19
  o ASAMBLEA LEGISLATIVA DEL DISTRITO FEDERAL, V LEGISLATURA (2011). LEY DE INTERCULTURALIDAD, ATENCIÓN A MIGRANTES Y MOVILIDAD HUMANA EN EL DISTRITO FEDERAL.
• DV20
• DV21
• DV22
  o Constitución Política de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos (n.d.). Congress of the Union of the United Mexican States.
• DV23
Morocco

- **DV1**

- **DV2**

- **DV3**

- **DV4**

- **DV8**

- **DV9**

- **DV10**

- **DV11**

- **DV12**

- **DV14**

- **DV17**

- **DV20**

- **DV21**

- **DV22**

- **DV23**
Netherlands

- DV1
  - LEGAL REPORT ON ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE IN 17 COUNTRIES (2016). European Network to Reduce Vulnerabilities in Health.
- DV2
  - United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (2013). Netherlands. UNHCR.
- DV3
- DV4
  - Fóti, Klára, and Andrea Fromm (2016). Approaches to the Labour Market Integration of Refugees and Asylum Seekers. EUROFOUND.
- DV5
- DV6
- DV7
- DV8
- DV9
- DV10
- DV11
- DV12
- DV13
- DV14
- DV15
DV1
- AIDA (2016). Education. TYPES OF ACCOMMODATION- Netherlands. Asylum Information Database.

DV17

DV18

DV19

DV20

DV21
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (2013). Netherlands. UNHCR.

DV22

DV23

New Zealand

DV1

DV4

DV5

DV6

DV7

DV8
• DV9

• DV10

• DV11

• DV12

• DV13

• DV14

• DV15

• DV17

• DV18
  o Ministry Of Business, Innovation, and Employment (2017). All Visa Options for Living Permanently We Have a Range of Visas That Allow You to Live in New Zealand Permanently.

• DV19

• DV20

• DV21

• DV22
Norway


• DV13  

• DV14  

• DV15  
  o OECD/UNHCR (2016). Hiring Refugees - What Are the Opportunities and Challenges for Employers. OECD. *Migration Policy Debates*.

• DV17  

• DV18  

• DV19  

• DV20  

• DV21  

• DV22  

• DV23  

**Pakistan**

• DV1  
  o United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Project in Pakistan Ensures Health Services for Both Refugees and Locals. *UNHCR*.

• DV2  

• DV3  

• DV4

• DV7

• DV8

• DV9

• DV12

• DV14

• DV16

• DV17

• DV20
  o Trespasses of the State, Ministering to Theological Dilemmas through the Copyright/Trademark (2005). Naveeda Khan, Sarai Reader; Bare Acts, 178.

• DV21

• DV22
  o Clothing in Pakistan and other Local Customs Reviews (n.d.). VirtualTourist.

• DV23
Peru

- DV1

- DV2

- DV5

- DV6

- DV7

- DV8

- DV9
  - The Peru K-12 Education System (2017). Peru Education.

- DV10

- DV11

- DV12

- DV14

- DV16

- DV17

- DV20

- DV21
• DV22
• DV23

**Philippines**

• DV1
• DV3
• DV5
  o EMBASSY OF ROMANIA in the Republic of the Philippines. *Family Reunification Visa (D/VF).*
• DV6
  o EMBASSY OF ROMANIA in the Republic of the Philippines. *Family Reunification Visa (D/VF).*
• DV7
  o Phil.multicultural Educ. Scribd.
• DV8
  o DepED Order No. 74 s. 2009. Multilingual Philippines.
• DV9
• DV10
• DV11
• DV12
• DV14
• DV17
• DV20

• DV23
  o YEOH Kok Kheng, Towards an Index of Ethnic Fractionalization, Table 1.

Poland

• DV1

• DV2

• DV3

• DV4

• DV5
  o IOM. Migrant EN. Temporary Residence Permit for Family Members of a Foreigner Residing in Poland - Migrant EN, Migrant Info.

• DV6
  o IOM. Migrant EN. Temporary Residence Permit for Family Members of a Foreigner Residing in Poland - Migrant EN, Migrant Info.

• DV7
  o Leek, Joanna (2015). Ethics Education in Polish Schools - a Multicultural Approach with a Global View. University of Lodz, Poland, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Research on Steiner Education.

• DV8

• DV9

• DV10
  o AIDA (2016). Education. Access to Education – Poland. Asylum Information Database.

• DV11
  o AIDA (2016). Education. Access to Education – Poland. Asylum Information Database.

• DV14

• DV15

• DV17

• DV18

• DV19

• DV20

• DV21

• DV22

• DV23

Portugal

• DV1

• DV2

• DV3

• DV4

• DV5

• DV6

• DV7

- DV8

- DV9

- DV10

- DV11

- DV12

- DV13

- DV14

- DV15

- DV17

- DV18

- DV19

- DV20

- DV21

- DV22

- DV23

Romania

- DV1
  o LEGAL REPORT ON ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE IN 17 COUNTRIES (2016). European Network to Reduce Vulnerabilities in Health.

- DV2

- DV3

- DV4

- DV5
  o The Romanian Long-Stay Visa for Family Reunification (Identified through the Letters D/VF. CONSULATE GENERAL OF ROMANIA. Newyork.mae.

- DV6
  o The Romanian Long-Stay Visa for Family Reunification (Identified through the Letters D/VF. CONSULATE GENERAL OF ROMANIA. Newyork.mae.

- DV7

- DV8

- DV9

- DV10

- DV11

• DV13

• DV14

• DV15

• DV17

• DV18

• DV19

• DV20

• DV21

• DV23

• DV1

• DV2

• DV3

- DV5

- DV6

- DV7
  - Logvinova, O, and G Ivanova (2016). Pre-Service Teacher Multicultural Education in Russia: Problems and Responses. *Department of Psychology and Pedagogy, Philological Faculty, RUDN University, Moscow, Russia, Indian Journal of Science and Technology, 9*(29).

- DV8
  - AZBUKA Russian-English Bilingual School Opening. *Azbuka School.*

- DV9

- DV10

- DV11

- DV14

- DV15

- DV16

- DV17

- DV18

- DV20

- DV21
  - Social Security Administration (2016). Russia, Social Security Programs Throughout the World: Europe.

- DV22

- DV23

**Rwanda**

- DV1
- DV2
  - UNHCR (2016). Economic Inclusion of Refugees in Rwanda.
- DV3
  - UNHCR (2016). Economic Inclusion of Refugees in Rwanda.
- DV4
  - UNHCR (2016). Economic Inclusion of Refugees in Rwanda.
- DV9
- DV10
- DV11
- DV13
- DV14
- DV16
- DV19
  - UNHCR (2016). Economic Inclusion of Refugees in Rwanda.
- DV20
- DV21
- DV23

**Slovenia**

- DV1
  - LEGAL REPORT ON ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE IN 17 COUNTRIES (2016). European Network to Reduce Vulnerabilities in Health.
- DV2
- DV3

- DV4

- DV5

- DV6

- DV7

- DV8
  - Your Gateway to Information on Slovenia (2017). Elementary Education. Slovenia.si.

- DV9

- DV10

- DV11

- DV12

- DV13

- DV14

- DV15

- DV16
  - President of the National Assembly (2001). REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA LAW ON ASYLUM (LoA). Legislationline.

- DV17

- DV18
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- DV19

- DV20

- DV21

- DV23
  - REFLECTIONS OF MULTICULTURALISM AND PATRIOTISM IN SLOVENE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CURRICULA Vladimir PREBILIČ, Irena BAČLIJA.

  **South Korea**

- DV1

- DV2

- DV3

- DV4

- DV5

- DV6

- DV7

- DV8

- DV9
  - MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (2016). Simplifying Procedures for Processing Documents for Returnees. 교육부, Elementary, Middle, and High Education.

- DV10

• DV11

• DV12

• DV13

• DV14

• DV17

• DV19

• DV20

• DV21
  o Social Security Administration (2010). South Korea, Social Security Programs Throughout the World: Asia and the Pacific.

• DV23

**South Africa**

• DV1
  o United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. South Africa. *UNHCR.*

• DV2

• DV4
• DV5  

• DV6  

• DV7  

• DV8  
  o Olivier, Jako (2009). SOUTH AFRICA: LANGUAGE & EDUCATION. South African Languages | Language and Education.

• DV9  
  o National Department of Basic Education > Home (2017).

• DV10  
  o United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. South Africa. UNHCR.

• DV12  

• DV14  

• DV15  

• DV16  

• DV17  

• DV18  

• DV20  

• DV21  

• DV22  

• DV23  
Spain

- **DV1**
  - LEGAL REPORT ON ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE IN 17 COUNTRIES (2016). European Network to Reduce Vulnerabilities in Health.

- **DV2**

- **DV3**

- **DV4**

- **DV5**

- **DV6**

- **DV7**

- **DV8**

- **DV9**

- **DV10**

- **DV11**

- **DV12**

- **DV13**

- **DV14**
• DV15

• DV16

• DV17

• DV18

• DV19

• DV20

• DV21
  o LEGAL REPORT ON ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE IN 17 COUNTRIES (2016). European Network to Reduce Vulnerabilities in Health.

• DV22

• DV23

**Sweden**

• DV1
  o LEGAL REPORT ON ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE IN 17 COUNTRIES (2016). European Network to Reduce Vulnerabilities in Health.

• DV2
  o OECD/UNHCR (2016). Hiring Refugees - What Are the Opportunities and Challenges for Employers. OECD. *Migration Policy Debates*.

• DV3

• DV4
  o OECD/UNHCR (2016). Hiring Refugees - What Are the Opportunities and Challenges for Employers. OECD. *Migration Policy Debates*.

• DV5

• DV6
  - DV7
  - DV8
  - DV9
  - DV10
  - DV11
  - DV12
  - DV13
  - DV14
  - DV15
  - DV16
  - DV17
  - DV18
  - DV19
  - DV20

- DV21

- DV22

- DV23

**Switzerland**

- DV1

- DV2

- DV5

- DV6

- DV7

- DV8

- DV9

- DV10

- DV11

- DV12
• DV14  

• DV15  

• DV16  

• DV17  

• DV18  

• DV19  

• DV20  
  o FREEDOM HOUSE (2013). Switzerland. *FREEDOM IN THE WORLD.*

• DV21  

• DV22  

• DV23  

  **Thailand**

• DV1  

• DV2  

• DV3  

• DV4  

• DV7

- **DV8**

- **DV9**

- **DV10**
  - Advancing the Rights of Refugees in the Asia Pacific Region - THAILAND (2017). APRRN.

- **DV11**
  - Advancing the Rights of Refugees in the Asia Pacific Region - THAILAND (2017). APRRN.

- **DV12**

- **DV14**

- **DV15**

- **DV16**

- **DV17**

- **DV20**

- **DV22**

- **DV23**
  - Horstmann, Alexander (2012). Multiculturalism in Thailand: Concept, Policy and Practice. *รายงานการประชุม Trinidad and Tobago*

- **DV1**

- **DV5**
• DV6
• DV7
• DV8
• DV9
• DV10
• DV11
• DV12
  o Immigrant Voting Rights in Trinidad and Tobago (2013). Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago.
• DV13
• DV14
• DV15
• DV17
• DV18
• DV19
• DV20
• DV21
• DV22

• DV23

**Tunisia**

• DV1

• DV3
  o Global Rights Index (2013). *ITUC Survey of Violations of Trade Union Rights, Tunisia*.

• DV4

• DV8

• DV9

• DV10

• DV14

• DV17

• DV20

• DV21

• DV22

• DV23
  o MULTICULTURALISM AND DEMOCRACY IN NORTH AFRICA: Aftermath of the Arab Spring (2016). TAYLOR & FRANCIS.

**Turkey**

• DV1
  o LEGAL REPORT ON ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE IN 17 COUNTRIES (2016). European Network to Reduce Vulnerabilities in Health.

• DV2

DV3

DV4

DV5

DV6

DV7

DV8

DV9
Tüm Hakları Saklıdır (2017). REPUBLIC OF TURKEY MINISTRY OF NATIONAL EDUCATION. MEB.

DV10

DV11

DV12

DV14

DV15

DV16

- **DV17**

- **DV18**
  o YellAli (2015). Long Term Residence Permit (Permanent) - Turkey in Visas / Permits / Passports. *Long Term Residence Permit (Permanent) - Turkey in Visas / Permits / Passports.*

- **DV19**

- **DV20**

- **DV21**
  o LEGAL REPORT ON ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE IN 17 COUNTRIES (2016). European Network to Reduce Vulnerabilities in Health.

- **DV22**

- **DV23**

**Ukraine**

- **DV1**

- **DV2**

- **DV5**
  o Expatro Law Firm. How to Get a Temporary or Permanent Residence Permit for Ukraine.

- **DV6**
  o Expatro Law Firm. How to Get a Temporary or Permanent Residence Permit for Ukraine.

- **DV7**

- **DV8**

- **DV9**
• DV10  

• DV12  

• DV14  

• DV15  

• DV16  
  o LAW OF UKRAINE ON THE LEGAL STATUS OF ALIENS.

• DV17  

• DV18  

• DV19  

• DV20  

• DV21  

• DV23  

**United Kingdom**

• DV1  
  o LEGAL REPORT ON ACCESS TO HEALTHCARE IN 17 COUNTRIES (2016). European Network to Reduce Vulnerabilities in Health.

• DV2  

• DV3

• DV4

• DV5

• DV6

• DV7

• DV8

• DV9

• DV10

• DV11

• DV12

• DV13

• DV14

• DV15

• DV17

• DV19

• DV20

• DV21

• DV22

• DV23

United States

• DV1

• DV2

• DV3

• DV4

• DV5

• DV6

• DV7
- DV8
- DV9
- DV10
- DV11
- DV12
- DV13
- DV14
- DV15
- DV16
- DV17
- DV18
- DV19
- DV20
- DV21
- DV22

• DV23

**Uruguay**

• DV1

• DV2

• DV9
  o The Uruguayan K-12 Education System (2017). Uruguay Education.

• DV10

• DV11

• DV14

• DV15

• DV17

• DV19

• DV20

• DV21

• DV23

Uzbekistan

• DV1
  o Hays, Jeffrey (2017). HEALTH CARE IN UZBEKISTAN. Facts and Details.

• DV2
  o UNHCR. Background Information on the Situation in the Republic of Uzbekistan in the Context of the Return of Asylum Seekers.

• DV8
  o Hays, Jeffrey (2017). HEALTH CARE IN UZBEKISTAN. Facts and Details.

• DV9

• DV10

• DV11

• DV14

• DV15

• DV16

• DV17

• DV20

• DV21

• DV22

• DV23
Yemen

- **DV1**

- **DV2**

- **DV3**

- **DV8**

- **DV9**

- **DV10**

- **DV11**

- **DV14**

- **DV16**

- **DV17**

- **DV19**

- **DV20**

- **DV21**

- **DV22**
• U.S. Department of State. BUREAU OF DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND LABOR, YEMEN INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM REPORT.

• DV23
APPENDIX G. CONTROL VARIABLES

CV1

Confidence: Charitable or humanitarian organizations

“I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? Charitable or humanitarian organizations”

1 A great deal
2 Quite a lot
3 Not very much
4 None at all

-5 Missing; RU,DE: Inappropriate response SG: Refused{Inappropriate}
-4 Not asked in survey
-3 Not applicable
-2 No answer
-1 Don´t know

CV2

How proud of nationality

How proud are you to be [Nationality]*?: * [Substitute your own nationality]

1 Very proud
2 Quite proud
3 Not very proud
4 Not at all proud
5 I am not [nationality]
People have different views about themselves and how they relate to the world. Using this card, would you tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how you see yourself? I see myself as part of the [French]* country *

[Substitute your country’s nationality for “French”]

1 Strongly agree
2 Agree
3 Disagree
4 Strongly disagree

Please tell us if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the
following statements: “The only acceptable religion is my religion”

1 Strongly agree

2 Agree

3 Disagree

4 Strongly disagree

-5 DE,SE:Inapplicable ; RU:Inappropriate response; Missing{Inappropriate}

-4 Not asked in survey

-3 Not applicable

-2 No answer

-1 Don’t know

CV5

People who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine

Please tell us if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements: People who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine

1 Strongly agree

2 Agree

3 Disagree

4 Strongly disagree

-5 DE,SE:Inapplicable ; RU:Inappropriate response; Missing{Inappropriate}

-4 Not asked in survey

-3 Not applicable
CV6

Worries: A terrorist attack

To what degree are you worried about the following situations? A terrorist attack

1 Very much
2 A great deal
3 Not much
4 Not at all
-5 DE: Inapplicable; Missing; Unknown {Inappropriate}
-4 Not asked in survey
-3 Not applicable
-2 No answer
-1 Don’t know

CV7

population density

(people per sq. km of land area)
CV10
Region of the world

CV11
Economic health
GDP, PPP (current international $)

CV12
Urbanization
Urban population growth (annual %)

CV13
Percent of Muslim population by country (%)

CV14
Dominant religion in a country
Hinduism/Buddhism
Muslim
Orthodox
Roman Catholic

CV15
Political Parties
1 = Any sort of democratic, 2+ party system
0 = Non-democratic, de facto/military/dominant party

CV16
Voting Rules
Voting Rules
Party list PR
Two-tier Party list PR
single transferable vote
FPTP
Two-round system
Endorsement of candidate
Two-round system
Parallel
Indirect election
Single non-transferable vote
Bloc voting
**RPC**
Refugee admittance population by country
Percent change from 2012-2016 (%)
## APPENDIX H. CORRELATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>CV2</th>
<th>CV3</th>
<th>CV4</th>
<th>CV5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>-0.191</td>
<td>-0.712</td>
<td>0.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV2</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV3</td>
<td>-0.191</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV4</td>
<td>-0.712</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV5</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>-0.425</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I. BIVARIATE HYPOTHESIS 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bivariate Hypothesis 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lm(formula = DV ~ IV, data = H1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residuals:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.280802</td>
<td>-0.075773</td>
<td>-0.001252</td>
<td>0.110867</td>
<td>0.303226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 1

Residual standard error: 0.1413 on 65 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.3801, Adjusted R-squared: 0.3706

F-statistic: 39.86 on 1 and 65 DF, p-value: 2.781e-08
APPENDIX J. MULTIVARIATE HYPOTHESIS 1

Multivariate Hypothesis 1

Call:
\[ \text{lm(formula = DV ~ IV + CV1 + CV2 + CV3 + CV5 + CV6 + CV7 + CV9 + CV10 + CV11 + CV15 + CV16 + RPC, data = H1)} \]

Residuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>-0.17379</td>
<td>-0.02944</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03546</td>
<td>0.16423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients: (1 not defined because of singularities)

|                  | Estimate  | Std. Error | t value | Pr(>|t|)   |
|------------------|-----------|------------|---------|-----------|
| (Intercept)      | 1.88E+00  | 3.58E-01   | 5.24    | 0.0000258 *** |
| IV               | -1.82E-01 | 8.15E-02   | -2.234  | 0.03549 *  |
| CV1              | 1.86E-03  | 7.94E-02   | 0.023   | 0.98149   |
| CV2              | 9.59E-02  | 7.96E-02   | 1.204   | 0.24076   |
| CV3              | -2.88E-01 | 1.38E-01   | -2.091  | 0.04774 *  |
| CV5              | -1.16E-01 | 8.71E-02   | -1.336  | 0.19456   |
| CV6              | -6.57E-02 | 4.20E-02   | -1.563  | 0.13178   |
| CV7              | -1.16E-05 | 1.82E-05   | -0.636  | 0.53097   |
| CV9              | 3.05E-01  | 9.80E-02   | 3.109   | 0.00494 ** |
| CV10ASIA         | -1.55E-01 | 5.90E-02   | -2.623  | 0.0152 *  |
| CV10Central America | 2.31E-02 | 1.17E-01   | 0.198   | 0.84475   |
| CV10EUROPE       | -1.46E-01 | 9.61E-02   | -1.515  | 0.14349   |
| CV10MIDDLE EAST  | -2.18E-01 | 7.01E-02   | -3.104  | 0.005 **  |
| CV10Northern America | 3.55E-02 | 1.26E-01   | 0.281   | 0.7809    |
| CV10OCEANIA      | -9.29E-02 | 1.69E-01   | -0.549  | 0.58832   |
| CV10South America| 1.95E-01  | 6.66E-02   | 2.921   | 0.00769 **|
| CV10The Caribbean| -1.86E-01 | 1.35E-01   | -1.372  | 0.18321   |
| CV11             | -1.15E-01 | 1.33E-01   | -0.861  | 0.398     |
| CV15             | -8.59E-02 | 4.63E-02   | -1.857  | 0.07618   |
| CV16Endorsement of candidate | -1.21E-01 | 2.12E-01   | -0.569  | 0.5752    |
| CV16FPTP         | -1.76E-01 | 1.41E-01   | -1.248  | 0.22456   |
| CV16Parallel     | -4.67E-02 | 1.38E-01   | -0.338  | 0.73852   |
| CV16Party list PR | -1.86E-01 | 1.34E-01   | -1.388  | 0.17858   |
| CV16Single non-transfer | -1.81E-01 | 1.73E-01   | -1.046  | 0.30661   |
| CV16Two-round system | -2.53E-01 | 1.67E-01   | -1.517  | 0.14278   |
| CV16Two-tier Party list | 7.34E-02  | 1.76E-01   | 0.416   | 0.68119   |
| RPC              | -2.26E-05 | 1.77E-05   | -1.274  | 0.21552   |
Signif. codes:  0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

Residual standard error: 0.09227 on 23 degrees of freedom
(17 observations deleted due to missingness)

Multiple R-squared:  0.8657, Adjusted R-squared:  0.7139
F-statistic: 5.703 on 26 and 23 DF,  p-value: 3.738e-05
APPENDIX K. HISTOGRAMS

Histogram of $H_{2,1}PCCR$

Histogram of $H_{2,1}PCSР$
### APPENDIX L. BIVARIATE HYPOTHESIS 2 – CRIME

#### Bivariate Hypothesis 2 Version 1 - Crime

**Call:**
\[
\text{lm(formula = PCCR \sim RPC, data = H2_1)}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residuals:</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-34.494</td>
<td>-15.891</td>
<td>-5.735</td>
<td>5.725</td>
<td>101.965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Coefficients: | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr(>|t|) |
|---------------|----------|------------|---------|---------|
| (Intercept)   | 4.560206 | 3.574923   | 1.276   | 0.207   |
| RPC           | -0.002295| 0.003839   | -0.598  | 0.552   |

Residual standard error: 27.15 on 59 degrees of freedom
(6 observations deleted due to missingness)
Multiple R-squared: 0.00602, Adjusted R-squared: -0.01083
F-statistic: 0.3573 on 1 and 59 DF, p-value: 0.5523

#### Bivariate Hypothesis 2 Version 2 - Crime

**Call:**
\[
\text{lm(formula = PCCR \sim REFUGEES, data = H2_2)}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residuals:</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-37.887</td>
<td>-16.176</td>
<td>-5.739</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100.772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Coefficients: | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr(>|t|) |
|---------------|----------|------------|---------|---------|
| (Intercept)   | 3.538127 | 4.177393   | 0.847   | 0.401   |
| REFUGEES      | 0.006094 | 0.020612   | 0.296   | 0.769   |

Residual standard error: 27.55 on 57 degrees of freedom
(8 observations deleted due to missingness)
Multiple R-squared: 0.001531, Adjusted R-squared: -0.01599
F-statistic: 0.08741 on 1 and 57 DF, p-value: 0.7686
### APPENDIX M. MULTIVARIATE HYPOTHESIS 2 – CRIME

#### Call:

```
Call:
lm(formula = PCCR ~ RPC + CV7 + CV10 + CV11 + CV12 + CV13, data = H2_1)
```

#### Residuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residuals</td>
<td>-40.099</td>
<td>-14.165</td>
<td>-2.223</td>
<td>5.577</td>
<td>89.526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Coefficients:

|                  | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr(>|t|) |
|------------------|----------|------------|---------|---------|
| (Intercept)      | 2.78E+01 | 2.36E+01   | 1.177   | 0.245   |
| RPC              | -2.28E-03| 4.12E-03   | -0.555  | 0.582   |
| CV7              | 3.60E-03 | 4.50E-03   | 0.8     | 0.428   |
| CV10ASIA         | -1.64E+00| 1.59E+01   | -0.103  | 0.918   |
| CV10Central America | -2.39E+01| 3.14E+01   | -0.76   | 0.451   |
| CV10EUROPE       | -9.00E+00| 1.44E+01   | -0.625  | 0.535   |
| CV10MIDDLE EAST  | -3.87E+00| 1.85E+01   | -0.209  | 0.835   |
| CV10North America | -2.07E+01| 3.14E+01   | -0.658  | 0.514   |
| CV10OCEANIA      | -2.08E+01| 2.46E+01   | -0.846  | 0.402   |
| CV10South America| -1.07E+01| 1.76E+01   | -0.608  | 0.546   |
| CV10The Caribbean| 1.19E+02 | 1.16E+02   | 1.031   | 0.308   |
| CV11             | 3.44E+01 | 3.49E+01   | 0.985   | 0.33    |
| CV12             | -1.47E+01| 1.18E+01   | -1.247  | 0.219   |
| CV13             | -7.73E-04| 6.88E-04   | -1.123  | 0.267   |

---

Signif. codes:  0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

Residual standard error: 28.21 on 47 degrees of freedom
(6 observations deleted due to missingness)
Multiple R-squared: 0.1455, F-statistic: 0.6158 on 13 and 47 DF, p-value: 0.8286
### Multivariate Hypothesis 2 Version 2 - Crime

**Call:**
```
lm(formula = PCCR ~ RPC + CV7 + CV10 + CV11 + CV12 + CV13, data = H2_2)
```

**Residuals:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-42.604</td>
<td>-13.605</td>
<td>-3.042</td>
<td>9.515</td>
<td>72.462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coefficients:**

|                      | Estimate  | Std. Error  | t value | Pr(>|t|) |
|----------------------|-----------|-------------|---------|----------|
| (Intercept)          | 27.166426 | 23.859536   | 1.139   | 0.26117  |
| RPC                  | 0.008745  | 0.023928    | 0.365   | 0.71654  |
| CV7                  | 0.049127  | 0.016497    | 2.978   | 0.00475 ** |
| CV10ASIA             | -12.899856| 16.828544   | -0.767  | 0.44754  |
| CV10Central America  | -33.36687 | 31.870741   | -1.047  | 0.30098  |
| CV10EUROPE           | -15.986257| 16.558532   | -0.965  | 0.33972  |
| CV10MIDDLE EAST      | -27.559413| 19.500513   | -1.413  | 0.16478  |
| CV10North America    | -23.354019| 31.281471   | -0.747  | 0.45938  |
| CV10OCEANIA          | -23.22902 | 25.294894   | -0.918  | 0.36357  |
| CV10South America    | -21.525263| 20.923103   | -1.029  | 0.30934  |
| CV11                 | 64.932197 | 42.859418   | 1.515   | 0.13709  |
| CV12                 | -15.970155| 11.489366   | -1.39   | 0.17168  |
| CV13                 | -0.077122 | 0.146067    | -0.528  | 0.60022  |

---

Signif. codes:  0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

Residual standard error: 26.54 on 43 degrees of freedom

(11 observations deleted due to missingness)

Multiple R-squared:  0.271, Adjusted R-squared:  0.06753

F-statistic: 1.332 on 12 and 43 DF, p-value: 0.2365
# APPENDIX N. BIVARIATE HYPOTHESIS 2 – SAFETY

## Bivariate Hypothesis 2 Version 1 - Safety

**Call:**

\[ \text{lm(formula = PCSR ~ RPC, data = H2}_1) \]

**Residuals:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-27.433</td>
<td>-7.671</td>
<td>-0.399</td>
<td>6.737</td>
<td>67.568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coefficients:**

|        | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr(>|t|) |
|--------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| (Intercept) | 1.545286 | 2.088427 | 0.74 | 0.462 |
| RPC        | 0.002016 | 0.002243 | 0.899 | 0.372 |

Residual standard error: 16.05 on 57 degrees of freedom

(8 observations deleted due to missingness)

Multiple R-squared: 0.002271,

F-statistic: 0.1297 on 1 and 57 DF, p-value: 0.7201

## Bivariate Hypothesis 2 Version 2 - Safety

**Call:**

\[ \text{lm(formula = PCSR ~ REFUGEES, data = H2}_2) \]

**Residuals:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-27.75</td>
<td>-7.112</td>
<td>-0.548</td>
<td>7.348</td>
<td>66.681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coefficients:**

|        | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr(>|t|) |
|--------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| (Intercept) | 1.520277 | 2.434555 | 0.624 | 0.535 |
| REFUGEES | 0.004326 | 0.012012 | 0.36 | 0.72 |

Residual standard error: 16.05 on 57 degrees of freedom

(8 observations deleted due to missingness)

Multiple R-squared: 0.002271, Adjusted R-squared: -0.01523

F-statistic: 0.1297 on 1 and 57 DF, p-value: 0.7201
### APPENDIX O. MULTIVARIATE HYPOTHESIS 2 – SAFETY

Call:
```
lm(formula = PCSR ~ RPC + CV7 + CV10 + CV11 + CV12 + CV13, data = H2_1)
```

Residuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residual standard error: 13.31 on 47 degrees of freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6 observations deleted due to missingness)

Multiple R-squared: 0.4463,

F-statistic: 2.915 on 13 and 47 DF, p-value: 0.003605

| Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr(>|t|) |
|----------|------------|---------|---------|
| (Intercept) | -9.99E+00  | 1.12E+01 | -0.896  | 0.3747 |
| RPC      | 1.98E-03   | 1.94E-03 | 1.02    | 0.3127 |
| CV7      | -1.25E-03  | 2.13E-03 | -0.588  | 0.5592 |
| CV10ASIA | 6.75E+00   | 7.49E+00 | 0.902   | 0.3717 |
| CV10Central America | 1.74E+01 | 1.48E+01 | 1.171   | 0.2476 |
| CV10EUROPE | 4.33E+00 | 6.80E+00 | 0.638   | 0.5267 |
| CV10MIDDLE EAST | 7.11E+00 | 8.74E+00 | 0.813   | 0.4202 |
| CV10North America | 1.36E+01 | 1.48E+01 | 0.916   | 0.3646 |
| CV10OCEANIA | 1.00E+01 | 1.16E+01 | 0.863   | 0.3924 |
| CV10South America | 1.78E+00 | 8.31E+00 | 0.214   | 0.8311 |
| CV10The Caribbean | 2.40E+01 | 5.46E+01 | 0.438   | 0.6632 |
| CV11     | -1.44E+01  | 1.65E+01 | -0.871  | 0.3881 |
| CV12     | 5.09E+00   | 5.57E+00 | 0.914   | 0.3655 |
| CV13     | 6.93E-04   | 3.25E-04 | 2.134   | 0.0381 * |

---

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

Residual standard error: 13.31 on 47 degrees of freedom

(6 observations deleted due to missingness)
Call: lm(formula = PCSR ~ RPC + CV7 + CV10 + CV11 + CV12 + CV13, data = H2_2)

Residuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-25.8321</td>
<td>-6.0886</td>
<td>-0.0293</td>
<td>8.2304</td>
<td>29.0592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients:

|                | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr(>|t|) |
|----------------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| (Intercept)    | -9.86057 | 11.836175  | -0.833  | 0.409   |
| RPC            | -0.009573| 0.01187    | -0.807  | 0.424   |
| CV7            | -0.013554| 0.008184   | -1.656  | 0.105   |
| CV10ASIA       | 11.494279| 8.348259   | 1.377   | 0.176   |
| CV10Central America | 23.824776 | 15.810352 | 1.507   | 0.139   |
| CV10EUROPE     | 8.246364 | 8.214312   | 1.004   | 0.321   |
| CV10MIDDLE EAST| 12.86001 | 9.673762   | 1.329   | 0.191   |
| CV10North America | 15.486199 | 15.518028 | 0.998   | 0.324   |
| CV10OCEANIA    | 11.862043| 12.548223  | 0.945   | 0.35    |
| CV10South America | 7.144781 | 10.379477  | 0.688   | 0.495   |
| CV11           | -23.722781 | 21.261586 | -1.116  | 0.271   |
| CV12           | 4.608147  | 5.699614   | 0.809   | 0.423   |
| CV13           | 0.055866  | 0.072461   | 0.771   | 0.445   |

---

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

Residual standard error: 13.16 on 43 degrees of freedom
(11 observations deleted due to missingness)

Multiple R-squared: 0.1676,

F-statistic: 0.7213 on 12 and 43 DF, p-value: 0.7227
### APPENDIX P. BIVARIATE HYPOTHESIS 2 – INCIDENTS OF TERRORISM

#### Bivariate Hypothesis 2 Version 1 – Incidents of Terrorism

Call:  
\texttt{lm(formula = PCNI ~ RPC, data = H2_1)}

Residuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-287.47</td>
<td>-213.8</td>
<td>-143.51</td>
<td>-3.59</td>
<td>2419.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients:

|            | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr(>|t|) |
|------------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| (Intercept)| 188.39698 | 59.37907  | 3.173   | 0.00249 ** |
| RPC        | -0.02925 | 0.06128  | -0.477  | 0.63508  |

---

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

Residual standard error: 433.1 on 54 degrees of freedom
(11 observations deleted due to missingness)

Multiple R-squared: 0.004201, Adjusted R-squared: -0.01424
F-statistic: 0.2278 on 1 and 54 DF, p-value: 0.6351

#### Bivariate Hypothesis 2 Version 2 – Incidents of Terrorism

Call:  
\texttt{lm(formula = PCNI ~ RPC, data = H2_2)}

Residuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-360.04</td>
<td>-196.66</td>
<td>-150.74</td>
<td>36.29</td>
<td>2386.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients:

|            | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr(>|t|) |
|------------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| (Intercept)| 168.1854 | 69.3948    | 2.424   | 0.019*   |
| RPC        | 0.1712   | 0.344      | 0.498   | 0.621    |

---

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

Residual standard error: 438.8 on 50 degrees of freedom
(15 observations deleted due to missingness)

Multiple R-squared: 0.004201, Adjusted R-squared: -0.01424
F-statistic: 0.2278 on 1 and 54 DF, p-value: 0.6351
# APPENDIX Q. MULTIVARIATE HYPOTHESIS 2 – INCIDENTS OF TERRORISM

## Multivariate Hypothesis 2 Version 1 – Incidents of Terrorism

Call:
```
lm(formula = PCNI ~ REFUGEES + CV7 + CV10 + CV11 + CV12 + CV13 + CV14, data = H2_1)
```

Residuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-528.8</td>
<td>-242.69</td>
<td>-65.28</td>
<td>113.82</td>
<td>1874.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients:

|               | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr(>|t|) |
|---------------|----------|------------|---------|---------|
| (Intercept)   | 5.52E+02 | 3.30E+02   | 1.673   | 0.102   |
| REFUGEES      | -1.32E-02| 7.55E-02   | -0.175  | 0.862   |
| CV7           | 2.79E-01 | 2.80E-01   | 0.996   | 0.325   |
| CV10ASIA      | 2.35E+02 | 2.51E+02   | 0.937   | 0.355   |
| CV10Central America | -8.06E+01 | 5.57E+02  | -0.145  | 0.886   |
| CV10EUROPE    | -1.03E+02| 2.64E+02   | -0.39   | 0.698   |
| CV10MIDDLE EAST | -2.13E+02 | 2.78E+02  | -0.769  | 0.447   |
| CV10North America | -1.24E+02 | 5.24E+02  | -0.235  | 0.815   |
| CV10OCEANIA   | 8.55E+01 | 4.18E+02   | 0.205   | 0.839   |
| CV10South America | -1.05E+02 | 3.57E+02  | -0.293  | 0.771   |
| CV11          | -2.85E+02| 4.15E+02   | -0.687  | 0.496   |
| CV12          | -1.20E+02| 1.34E+02   | -0.894  | 0.377   |
| CV13          | -5.21E-03| 1.26E-02   | -0.414  | 0.681   |
| CV14hinduism/buddhism | -5.10E+02 | 3.27E+02  | -1.56   | 0.127   |
| CV14Muslim    | -1.97E+02| 2.17E+02   | -0.91   | 0.368   |
| CV14Orthodox  | -1.75E+02| 2.87E+02   | -0.61   | 0.545   |
| CV14Roman Catholic | -1.31E+02 | 2.25E+02  | -0.58   | 0.565   |

---

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

Residual standard error: 468 on 39 degrees of freedom

(11 observations deleted due to missingness)

Multiple R-squared: 0.16, Adjusted R-squared: -0.1846

F-statistic: 0.4643 on 16 and 39 DF, p-value: 0.95
### Multivariate Hypothesis 2 Version 2 – Incidents of Terrorism

Call:
\[
\text{lm(formula = PCNI ~ RPC + CV7 + CV10 + CV11 + CV12 + CV13 + CV14, data = H2_2)}
\]

Residuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-515.04</td>
<td>-246.47</td>
<td>-45.12</td>
<td>153.8</td>
<td>1801.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients:

|                        | Estimate   | Std. Error | t value | Pr(>|t|) |
|------------------------|------------|------------|---------|---------|
| (Intercept)            | 684.33058  | 376.14665  | 1.819   | 0.0777 .|
| RPC                    | 0.05978    | 0.46241    | 0.129   | 0.8979  |
| CV7                    | 0.33882    | 0.29621    | 1.144   | 0.2607  |
| CV10ASIA               | 213.11649  | 289.22352  | 0.737   | 0.4663  |
| CV10Central America    | -177.40697 | 587.6603   | -0.302  | 0.7646  |
| CV10EUROPE             | -221.56206 | 295.62188  | -0.749  | 0.4587  |
| CV10MIDDLE EAST        | -311.84791 | 301.04579  | -1.036  | 0.3076  |
| CV10North America      | -184.97711 | 556.0406   | -0.333  | 0.7414  |
| CV10OCEANIA            | 0.63051    | 445.92247  | 0.001   | 0.9989  |
| CV10South America      | -274.24196 | 397.94707  | -0.689  | 0.4954  |
| CV11                   | -388.14494 | 764.69258  | -0.508  | 0.615   |
| CV12                   | -175.80684 | 147.58015  | -1.191  | 0.2418  |
| CV13                   | 8.25015    | 9.24045    | 0.893   | 0.3782  |
| CV14Hinduism/Buddhism  | -531.12747 | 353.43308  | -1.503  | 0.1421  |
| CV14Muslim             | -862.29887 | 782.43886  | -1.102  | 0.2782  |
| CV14Orthodox           | -194.15073 | 292.39137  | -0.664  | 0.5112  |
| CV14Roman Catholic     | -102.77827 | 234.16533  | -0.439  | 0.6635  |

---

Signif. codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 . ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

Residual standard error: 475.2 on 34 degrees of freedom

(16 observations deleted due to missingness)

Multiple R-squared:  0.2063, Adjusted R-squared:  -0.1672

F-statistic: 0.5524 on 16 and 34 DF, p-value: 0.8968
### Bivariate Hypothesis 2 Version 1 – Economic Health

**Call:**

```r
lm(formula = ED ~ RPC, data = H2_1)
```

**Residuals:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.76043</td>
<td>-0.08264</td>
<td>-0.00367</td>
<td>0.05303</td>
<td>0.35273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coefficients:**

|            | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr(>|t|)  |
|------------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| (Intercept)| 1.59E-01 | 2.14E-02   | 7.401   | 3.38e-10 *** |
| RPC        | 6.13E-06 | 2.41E-05   | 0.254   | 0.8      |

---

Signif. codes:  0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

Residual standard error: 0.1709 on 65 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.0009926, Adjusted R-squared: -0.01438

F-statistic: 0.06459 on 1 and 65 DF, p-value: 0.8002

---

### Bivariate Hypothesis 2 Version 2 – Economic Health

**Call:**

```r
lm(formula = ED ~ RPC, data = H2_2)
```

**Residuals:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.26253</td>
<td>-0.08611</td>
<td>-0.01331</td>
<td>0.05065</td>
<td>0.34795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coefficients:**

|            | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr(>|t|)  |
|------------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| (Intercept)| 1.63E-01 | 1.86E-02   | 8.772   | 2.09E-12 *** |
| RPC        | 1.03E-04 | 9.38E-05   | 1.099   | 0.276    |

---

Signif. codes:  0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

Residual standard error: 0.1282 on 61 degrees of freedom

(4 observations deleted due to missingness)

Multiple R-squared: 0.01942, Adjusted R-squared: 0.003343

F-statistic: 1.208 on 1 and 61 DF, p-value: 0.2761
### APPENDIX S. MULTIVARIATE HYPOTHESIS 2 – ECONOMIC HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call:</th>
<th>lm(formula = ED ~ REFUGEES + CV7 + CV9 + CV10 + CV12 + CV13, data = H2_1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residuals:</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.67214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficients:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFUGEES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV10ASIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV10Central America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV10EUROPE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV10MIDDLE EAST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV10North America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV10OCEANIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV10South America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV10The Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Signif. codes:  0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

Residual standard error: 0.1622 on 53 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.2669, Adjusted R-squared: 0.08714

F-statistic: 1.485 on 13 and 53 DF, p-value: 0.1543
Multivariate Hypothesis 2 Version 2 – Economic Health

Call:
\( \text{lm(formula = ED } \sim \text{ RPC + CV7 + CV9 + CV10 + CV12 + CV13, data = H2_2)} \)

Residuals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>3Q</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.253333</td>
<td>-0.061474</td>
<td>-0.001426</td>
<td>0.05921</td>
<td>0.255654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients:

|                     | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr(>|t|) |
|---------------------|----------|------------|---------|---------|
| (Intercept)         | 4.17E-02 | 7.89E-02   | 0.528   | 0.6     |
| RPC                 | 1.93E-04 | 8.41E-05   | 2.288   | 0.0267* |
| CV7                 | 3.66E-05 | 6.17E-05   | 0.593   | 0.5561  |
| CV9                 | -6.20E-02 | 5.03E-02  | -1.232  | 0.2239  |
| CV10ASIA            | 9.56E-02 | 5.28E-02   | 1.813   | 0.0763  |
| CV10Central America | 4.96E-03 | 1.20E-01   | 0.041   | 0.9672  |
| CV10EUROPE          | -1.31E-02 | 6.72E-02  | -0.195  | 0.8461  |
| CV10MIDDLE EAST     | 3.06E-02 | 6.47E-02   | 0.472   | 0.6389  |
| CV10North America   | -4.38E-03 | 1.20E-01  | -0.037  | 0.971   |
| CV10OCEANIA         | 2.32E-02 | 9.52E-02   | 0.243   | 0.8089  |
| CV10South America   | 1.23E-01 | 7.26E-02   | 1.699   | 0.0959  |
| CV12                | 5.57E-02 | 2.68E-02   | 2.079   | 0.0431* |
| CV13                | 9.03E-05 | 4.96E-04   | 0.182   | 0.8563  |

---

Signif. codes:  0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘ ’ 1

Residual standard error: 0.1041 on 47 degrees of freedom

(7 observations deleted due to missingness)

Multiple R-squared: 0.4791, Adjusted R-squared: 0.3461

F-statistic: 3.602 on 12 and 47 DF, p-value: 0.0007617