

META-ANALYSIS

Q1-4 Marie

Q6-9 Sofia

Q10-12 Lea

Q13-16 Maja

Q1 Age

Mostly people of school age were interviewed.

The next larger group is apparently the parent generation

This sample is not very representative because the age structure of the respondents is too one-dimensional.

Q2 Gender

There are mostly respondents of the female gender.

That's probably because there are more female participants in the Erasmus+ project.

Q3 Nationality / Ethnicity

A big part of the respondents are ethnic.

In Germany, almost no one has a different origin except the German one.

Q4 Migratory Background

In Germany, Italy and Spain, there is a significantly lower proportion of respondents with a migration background than those without a migration background.

In Bulgaria it is the other way around → There is a significantly larger proportion of respondents with a migratory background.

It is noticeable that Germany also shows the lowest share here.

Bulgaria is a special case because the question of immigration policy in recent years/decades is interesting.

Q5

Q6 Highest School Qualification

The A-levels are most frequently represented in Germany.

In Italy and Bulgaria, A-levels as well as middle school are represented.

In Germany there is only such a high number of potential high school graduates because there are no longer any admission restrictions for the high school.

In Italy, middle school was mostly indicated because the school system there does not separate the school types until later.

The middle school is more an intermediate step than an actual end.

Because of the different handling of the questionnaire and evaluation, statements to the link between level of education and the attitude to the migratory question / refugee question could not be made.

Q7 Intake Limit

Germany, Italy and Bulgaria want an intake limit; Spain is more against it.

One third voted for "It depends on" → This erases the clarity of the yes-no tendency.

It is noticeable – with regard to the migratory background: Bulgaria wants an intake limit the most.

There is an indecision despite county-specific tendencies towards yes or no. So why is there

an indecision? Bulgaria shows the strongest tendency to yes, despite or because there is already a strong migration background among the respondents.

Q8 More Financial Support

Half of the respondents from Italy and Bulgaria are against further financial support.

It is noticeable, that half of the respondents from Spain and Norway want more money for the integration of refugees and people with a migratory background.

The German respondents answered rather unsure.

The respondents who tended to an intake limit in question 7, did not tend to a larger financial support of the refugees here.

In Spain it is the other way around.

Q9 Money Linked To The Acquisition Of Language

A large proportion of respondents from Germany, Italy and Spain, but above all Germany, think that the financial support should be linked to the acquisition of language.

The respondents from Bulgaria don't want to combine the money to the acquisition of the language, which is due to the fact that they don't want any financial support for refugees.

Q10 Return As Soon As Classified As Safe

Germany, Italy and Bulgaria rather want refugees to be forced to leave as soon as their home countries are considered to be safe again.

In Norway, most are against it; Spain is relatively undecided.

The respondents from the respective countries, who tended to an intake limit in question 7, tended that refugees should return to their home countries as soon as they are safe again. In Spain and Norway it is the other way around.

Q11 Enrichment For Society

Many respondents from Spain and Norway think that refugees are an enrichment for the society.

A big part voted for "It depends on" in Bulgaria, Italy and Germany

→ some are an enrichment, some aren't

Respondents who tended to an intake limit in question 7 and that they should return as soon as the countries are classified as safe again in question 10, think that refugees aren't an enrichment for the society.

In Spain and Norway it is the other way around.

It could be said that when refugees are seen as an enrichment, neither the intake limit nor their emigration should be forced.

So, on the basis of which information channels is the assessment of social enrichment made?

Q12 Informational Events Visited

In principle, none of the respondents visited informational events.

In Spain, half of the respondents visited those

On the basis of information events that have been instructed to take place, it is not always possible to assess the enrichment of society. The exception are the respondents from Spain.

Q13 Contact In Neighborhood

Half of the respondents from Germany and Bulgaria don't have contact with refugees or people with migratory background.

In comparison, half of the respondents from Spain and Italy have contact with them.

Q14 Contact At School/Work

A large proportion of respondents from Germany don't have contact with refugees at school or at work.

In Italy and Spain most of them have contact with them.

In Bulgaria they have more contact with them than no contact.

Q13 & 14

Direct contact tends to be less common than at school/ at work.

The school and the working world consciously create points of contact.

Q15 Friendships With Refugees

In Bulgaria and Germany it is distributed relatively equally.

Most respondents from Spain and Italy are friends with or in a relationship with refugees or people with migratory background.

It's not like that in Norway; the majority has no closer friendships with refugees or people with migratory background.

Respondents that reported stronger personal contact with refugees in question 13 and question 14 are more likely to have friendship with them.

Interpretation: personal contact (especially in organized and on learning or productivity framework) and making friends condition each other. Join work connects!

Interesting is, in combination of question 11 and question 15 there is no clear connection between the assessment of refugees as enrichment of the society and the recognize the frequency of closed friendship with them.

Provocative interpretation: the contact and friendship alone do not make one social added value. You do not have to be connected in to create something together!

Q16 How often informing themselves

A large part voted for "It depends on" → Almost half of all respondents inform themselves about the topic integration and refugees, admittedly not very often but not too little