

Defining indicators of immigrants' quality of life in Italy

O. Dessy (University of Venice Cà Foscari)

F. Maggino (University of Florence)

Motivation

- Immigrants are a relevant presence in Italy, about 5 million to date
- Italy has been one of the leading emigration countries in Europe, only since the second half of the 1970s has started to attract immigration flows
- The history of the regularization programmes is quite recent: 1990, 1995, 1998, 2002, 2006, 2009 by governments of different orientation

Motivation

- There are reasons for devoting efforts in measuring, explaining and monitoring immigrants' *QoL* in Italy:
 - 1) immigrants are growing in Italy
 - 2) inequalities can generate *social cohesion trouble*
- CRUCIAL to this purpose is to study the characteristics of the *integration process in Italy*

Motivation

- 1) policies should take into account the characteristics of the process of integration
- 2) an official system for monitoring migrant integration does not exist in Italy
- 3) the implementation of integration policies proposed at the EU-level has been contradictory in Italy, as sometimes policy directives have been quite repressive, *especially at the local level*

Problems

- How to measure immigrants' *integration*?
⇒ both objective and subjective measures
- How to measure the relationship between *integration* and *QoL* of immigrants?
⇒ need both variables about integration and quality of life/life satisfaction
⇒ need both data on natives and immigrants

Data available for objective measures

- CNEL-CARITAS since 2002 publish annually synthetic indexes based on 3 aspects (polarisation, social stability, inclusion in employment) at the regional level. Sources are generally administrative data.
- Survey: LFS and ISTAT IT-silc 2004-2010 microdata, do not oversample immigrants. Detailed information for objective measures only for cross-sections.
- ISTAT IT-silc 2009 special survey for families with at least 1 foreign person, comparable with the former
- ISTAT 'Condition and social integration of foreign citizens' (May-July 2011) 12,000 households with at least one foreign member, both subjective and objective measures

Focus of our 2012 study: subjective measures

- ISMU (Observatory for Integration and Multi-ethnicity of Lombardy) October 2008-February 2009 is a rare collection of data
- Oversamples immigrants: 12.000 foreigners aged over 18 years
- Data collected in 20 local units for 32 provinces chosen with representativity purposes in 13 Italian regions: Piemonte, Lombardia, Trentino Alto Adige, Veneto, Emilia Romagna, Toscana, Marche, Abruzzo, Lazio, Campania, Molise, Puglia e Sicilia.

Focus of our study: subjective measures

- Centre sampling technique of sampling => weights available
- Detailed country of origin (65)
- Sociological approach: extensive questions on personal perceptions of integration on 4 dimensions: cultural, social, political, economic

Previous index of integration

- Blangiardo and Cesareo (2009) have used ISMU data for constructing a composite index
- First they aggregate *ALL* the available variables for each dimension => construct 4 partial indexes respectively of cultural, social, political and economic integration
- Then they aggregate the 4 partial indexes in 1 final index of integration called '*integrometro*'.

Our approach

- First we carry out an extensive, *critical* analysis of the questions asked for deciding the opportunity of keeping them separate within the same dimension
- Then we carry out a rigorous set of statistical tests (correlation between variables) and checks (analysis of distributions' characteristics) for selecting and aggregating the available information
- The aggregation methods (average or sum) are chosen according to the characteristics of the variables involved

Results: our indexes

- 4 indexes of *cultural integration*: 1) knowledge of Italian language (understanding, speaking, reading, writing); 2) use of Italian language; 3) feeling of belonging to Italy; 4) appreciation of the Italian style of life (education, work, family relationships, food, dressing, free time)
- 1 index of *social integration*: ethnicity of friends (host/home country or both)
- 1 index of *political integration* (citizenship, civic status)
- 1 index of *socio-economic integration* (housing, access to bank account)

Results: descriptive statistics

c1a = conoscenza lingua italiana		c1b = uso lingua italiana		c2 = indice di gradimento dello stile vita italiano		s1 = indice di interazione con la popolazione locale		p1 = indice di integrazione politica	
Valori	%	Valori	%	Valori	%	Valori	%	Valori	%
1	1.14	0.6	1.58	0	0.51	1	17.12	1	1.33
1.25	0.68	1	2.82	0.25	0.03	2	33.32	2	11.15
1.5	3.17	1.3	3.58	0.5	0.07	3	31.91	3	3.05
1.75	2.74	1.6	4.31	0.75	0.12	4	17.65	4	6.69
2	5.34	2	5.31	1	0.37			5	28.07
2.25	4.37	2.3	8.72	1.25	0.45			6	41.97
2.5	7.41	2.6	8.54	1.5	0.55			7	7.72
2.75	6.57	3	15.29	1.75	0.86				
3	9.62	3.3	9.88	2	1.44				
3.25	6.31	3.6	12.09	2.25	1.74				
3.5	8.75	4	7.26	2.5	3.53				
3.75	7.06	4.3	8.4	2.75	4.22				
4	9.68	4.6	4.03	3	6.06				
4.25	5	5	8.19	3.25	6.43				
4.5	5.63			3.5	9.84				
4.75	4.11			3.75	10.16				
5	12.44			4	11.7				
				4.25	10.43				
				4.5	10.9				
				4.75	9.08				
				5	11.51				
	<i>11,958</i>		<i>11,381</i>		<i>11,329</i>		<i>11,911</i>		<i>11,924</i>

Results: explanatory variables

- We try to explain the various degrees of immigrants' integration with a number of characteristics:
- Sex, age, years of permanence in Italy, education, civil status, children, religion, region of residence.
- Carry out ANalysis Of VAriance

	c1 knowledge of Italian language	c2 use of Italian language	c3 appreciation of Italian style of life	c4 feeling of belonging to host country	s1 relationship with Italian people	p1 political integration
Variance explained by:						
Ethnic origin	12.42*	9.03*	3.19*	2.83*	6.42*	11.42*
Region	7.83*	14.48*	10.34*	20.65*	17.40*	57.40*
Sex	32.10*	28.32*	8.59*	14.21*	27.88*	124.22*
Age	5.32*	1.90*	1.08*	1.42*	2.63*	3.99*
Years in Italy	46.97*	24.26*	4.34*	12.75*	17.43*	76.85*
Children	8.82*	11.51*	1.02	0.63	2.94*	5.62*
Civil Status	3.51*	15.71*	0.63	1.31	3.28*	79.88*
Education	268.59*	116.47*	14.15*	22.63*	107.27*	63.89*
Religion	5.40*	12.22*	1.90*	2.86*	8.42*	8.38*
<i>Residual</i>	<i>0.64</i>	<i>0.82</i>	<i>0.73</i>	<i>0.72</i>	<i>0.74</i>	<i>1.38</i>

Source: our elaboration of ISMU data; * Level of significance 5%

Stime ordered logit sugli indici di identità e degli aspetti particolari del processo di acculturazione.

	c1a conoscenza lingua italiana	c1b uso lingua italiana	c2 gradimento stile vita italiano	s1 interazione con la popolazione locale	p1 integrazione politica
Maschi	-0.311*	-0.289*	0.099*	-0.264*	-0.455*
Età	-0.045*	-0.015*	-0.010*	-0.027*	-0.015*
Permanenza	0.173*	0.104*	0.040*	0.104*	0.198*
Figli	-0.165*	-0.171*	-0.045	-0.093	-0.105*
Centro	-0.372*	-0.015	-0.415*	0.108*	-0.239*
Sud	-0.412*	0.204*	-0.389*	0.441*	-0.486*
Coniugato	-0.170*	-0.192*	-0.012	-0.086	0.704*
Vedovo	-0.118	0.166	-0.160	-0.216	0.183
Separato/Divorziato	0.015	0.276*	0.100	0.200*	0.252*
Scuola obbligo	0.937*	0.630*	0.310*	0.552*	0.407*
Scuola secondaria	1.675*	1.074*	0.467*	1.064*	0.682*
Diploma/Laurea	2.319*	1.381*	0.384*	1.381*	0.815*
Musulmani	-0.291*	-0.471*	-0.203*	-0.308*	-0.034
Buddisti	0.049	-0.162	-0.052	0.129	0.181
Induisti	-0.436*	-0.718*	0.051	-0.713*	-0.235
Altre religioni	-0.113	-0.190	-0.338*	-0.210	-0.318*
Nessuna religione	0.305*	0.200*	-0.106	0.364*	0.503*
<i>LR-chi² (81)</i>	<i>5209.3*</i>	<i>3085.46*</i>	<i>708.3*</i>	<i>2349.44*</i>	<i>4452.25*</i>
<i>Pseudo-R²</i>	<i>0.089</i>	<i>0.059</i>	<i>0.013</i>	<i>0.080</i>	<i>0.137</i>
<i>N. osservazioni</i>	<i>10920</i>	<i>10397</i>	<i>10403</i>	<i>10872</i>	<i>10902</i>

Fonte: nostra elaborazione dati ISMU; * significatività 5%.

Conclusions

- Relevant role of education for all indexes
- Women always more integrated than men
- Ethnic origin explains only knowledge of language and NOT the other dimensions of integration
- Important explanatory power of region of arrival (always higher than ethnicity): Sud has higher levels of integration wrt North and Centre but for *social relationships* aspect more than *style of life*
- Children explain only c1 and c2 (language knowledge and use)
- Religion: muslims integrate less than people of other religions.

Further research

- Move to objective measures with other data
- Promote the collection of data where both subjective and objective indexes can be constructed, possibly:
 - 1) with longitudinal design
 - 2) Informative also on the commitment of immigrants to their home country for clarifying the model of integration to be implemented (e.g. assimilation, integration, separation, marginalisation, Dessy 2012)