

Summary Report on the MIPEX Health Strand and Country Reports

No. 52

**IOM
MIGRATION
RESEARCH
SERIES**



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

The opinions expressed in the report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout the report do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IOM concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

IOM is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. As an intergovernmental organization, IOM acts with its partners in the international community to: assist in meeting the operational challenges of migration; advance understanding of migration issues; encourage social and economic development through migration; and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants.

Publisher: International Organization for Migration
17 route des Morillons
P.O. Box 17
1211 Geneva 19
Switzerland
Tel.: +41 22 717 91 11
Fax: +41 22 798 61 50
E-mail: hq@iom.int
Website: www.iom.int

ISSN 1607-338X
ISBN 978-92-9068-731-3
© 2016 International Organization for Migration (IOM)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Summary Report on the MIPEx Health Strand and Country Reports

International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Regional Office Brussels
Migration Health Division (MHD)



International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Acknowledgements

This document is based on work carried out by the International Organization for Migration (IOM), Migration Health Division, within the framework of the project EQUI-HEALTH (Fostering health provision for migrants, the Roma, and other vulnerable groups) in collaboration with COST Action IS1103, Adapting European Health Systems to Diversity (ADAPT), and the Migration Policy Group (MPG).

The EQUI-HEALTH project is co-financed under the European Union 2012 workplan, within the second programme of community action in the field of health (2008–2013), by a direct grant awarded to IOM by the European Commission’s Directorate General for Health and Food Safety (SANTE) through the Consumers, Health, Agriculture and Food Executive Agency (CHAFEA). Additional co-financing was provided by IOM and several additional donors. The EQUI-HEALTH project is designed and managed by the IOM Regional Office Brussels, Migration Health Division (MHD).

COST Action IS1103 (ADAPT) is an interdisciplinary scientific network comprising 130 experts in 30 countries, which ran from December 2011 to July 2016. The COST Association is funded from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 Framework Programme for Research and Innovation.

The current (2015) edition of the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) was developed by the MPG within the project Integration Policies: Who Benefits, co-funded by the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals, DG HOME.

This report was produced by the ADAPT network under the coordination of Prof. David Ingleby (University of Amsterdam), who also acted as lead author. The project could never have been completed without the valuable contributions of more than a hundred collaborating experts.

The following invited experts and members of ADAPT participated in the international meetings held between 2013 and 2016 to design and pilot the questionnaire and discuss the results:

Sonja Novak-Zezula, Ursula Trummer, Ine Wilczewska (Austria); Marie Dauvrin (Belgium); Panagiotis Petrou (Cyprus); Karolína Dobiášová, Helena Hnilicová, Jitka Vacková (Czech Republic); Natasja Koitzsch Jensen, Allan Krasnik, Marie Louise Nørredam (Denmark); Maili Malin (Finland); Brankica Mladenovic, Fimka Tozija (former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); Paul Dourgnon, Julia Puebla Fortier (France); Zviad Kirtava (Georgia); Eva Berens, Veta Lazarashvili, Oliver Razum (Germany); Ioanna Kotsioni, Angelo Tramountanis (Greece); Attila Dobos (Hungary); Bjarney Friðriksdóttir (Iceland); Nadav Davidovitch, Yonina Fleischman, Ora Nakash (Israel); Antonio Chiarenza, Gianfranco Costanzo, Margherita Giannoni, Caterina Guidi, Roberta Perna, Aldo Rosano (Italy); Linas Šumskas (Lithuania); Sandra C. Buttigieg (Malta); David Ingleby (Netherlands); Arild Aambø, Bernadette Kumar (Norway); Ela Czapka (Poland); Luis Bernardo, Cláudia De Freitas, Sonia Dias, Gustavo Malafaya Sá, Beatriz Padilla, José Peixoto Caldas (Portugal); Manuel García Ramírez, Lluís Granero, Tona Lizana, Javier Moreno, Victoria Porthé, Elena Sánchez, María Luisa Vázquez (Spain); Kvetoslava Rimárová (Slovakia); Slobodan Zdravkovic (Sweden); Milena Chimienti, Ina Gudumac, Paulo Hartmann, Bülent Kaya, Paolo Ruspini (Switzerland); Seval Akgün (Turkey); Raj Bhopal, Bernd Rechel (United Kingdom).

From the Migration Policy Group, Brussels, Jan Niessen and Thomas Huddleston participated in the ADAPT meetings, while Özge Bilgili and Zvezda Vankova provided additional help. From the IOM, inputs on the initial questionnaire were provided by the Migration Health Division (MHD), Barbara Rijks and Poonam Dhavan (HQ) and Roumyana Petrova-Benedict (MHD Regional Office Brussels). Among the IOM MHD RO Brussels team, Roumyana Petrova-Benedict, Mariya Samuilova and Isabelle Beauclercq participated in the ADAPT meetings, while Naja Kofeod, Jordi Noguera, Milen Petrov, Annie Raykov, Marina Rota and Federica Viello also contributed to the MIPEX development process. The data were collected by the 103 researchers and peer reviewers listed in the Appendix, 48 of whom were members of ADAPT.

The opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission, IOM, the COST Association or MPG. The sole responsibility for this publication therefore lies with the authors. The European Commission, IOM, COST Association and MPG are not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

Correspondence should be addressed to ROBrusselsMHUnit@iom.int.


Contents

| | |
|---|------------|
| Acknowledgements | iii |
| List of acronyms..... | ix |
| Executive summary..... | xi |
| 1. Introduction to the project..... | 1 |
| 1.1. The project partnership..... | 2 |
| 1.2. Aims and background | 3 |
| 1.3. Countries and migrant groups studied | 4 |
| 1.4. Policy issues studied | 8 |
| 1.5. The questionnaire..... | 16 |
| 2. Content of the MIPEX health strand questionnaire | 23 |
| 2.1. Entitlement to health services..... | 23 |
| 2.2. Policies to facilitate access..... | 28 |
| 2.3. Responsive health services..... | 30 |
| 2.4. Measures to achieve change | 32 |
| 3. Questionnaire scores | 35 |
| 3.1. Entitlement to health services..... | 35 |
| 3.2. Policies to facilitate access..... | 61 |
| 3.3. Responsive health services..... | 68 |
| 3.4. Measures to achieve change | 74 |
| 4. Statistical analyses..... | 81 |
| 4.1. Reliability, validity and structure of the scales..... | 81 |
| 4.2. Relation of MIPEX Health strand scores to other variables | 87 |
| Appendix: Names of researchers and peer reviewers..... | 93 |
| Bibliography | 95 |
| Endnotes | 101 |

List of acronyms

| | |
|-------|--|
| ADAPT | Adapting European Health Systems to Diversity |
| CSO | Civil Society Organization |
| EC | European Commission |
| EFTA | European Free Trade Association |
| EHCI | Euro Health Consumer Index |
| EU | European Union |
| EU15 | EU countries prior to 2004 (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom) |
| EU28 | EU15 plus Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia. |
| EUR | Euro |
| GDP | Gross Domestic Product |
| HIV | Human immunodeficiency virus |
| IOM | International Organization for Migration |
| MIPEX | Migrant Integration Policy Index |
| MPG | Migration Policy Group |
| NGO | Non-governmental organization |
| NHS | National health service |
| OECD | Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development |
| OOP | Out of pocket |
| SHI | Social (or statutory) health insurance |
| TB | Tuberculosis |
| UDM | Undocumented migrant |
| UN | United Nations |
| VPI | Voluntary private (health) insurance |
| WHO | World Health Organization |

Map showing total scores on the MIPEX Health strand (divided according to rank order into five groups of roughly equal size)



Note: Following MIPEX methodology, data in Italy, Spain, Switzerland and Austria were collected from regions with a higher concentration of migrants, which may lead to higher scores. The same was true to some extent in other countries (see section 1.4.1).

Executive summary

The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) Health strand is a questionnaire designed to supplement the existing seven strands of MIPEX, which in its latest edition (2015) monitors policies affecting migrant integration in 38 different countries. The Health strand questionnaire is based on the *Recommendations on Mobility, migration and access to health care* adopted by the Council of Europe in 2011, which were based in turn on a consultation process that lasted two years and involved researchers, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations and a wide range of specialists in health care for migrants. The questionnaire measures the equitability of policies relating to four issues: (A) migrants' entitlements to health services; (B) accessibility of health services for migrants; (C) responsiveness to migrants' needs; and (D) measures to achieve change. The work described in this report formed part of the EQUI-HEALTH project carried out by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) from 2013 to 2016, in collaboration with the Migration Policy Group (MPG) and COST Action IS1103, Adapting European Health Services to Diversity (ADAPT).

Part I of this report shows that many studies have already been carried out on migrant health policies, but because they tend to select different countries, concepts, categories and methods of measurement, it is difficult to integrate and synthesize all these findings. The MIPEX Health strand set out to surmount this obstacle by collecting information on carefully defined and standardized indicators in all 38 MIPEX countries, as well as Bosnia and Herzegovina and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Indicators were scored on a three-point Likert scale and added up to form scales relating to the four issues listed above, as well as summary scales for "Access" (sections A and B), "Quality" (C and D) and the total score. Where separate policies apply to migrant workers, asylum seekers and UDMs, data are disaggregated for each group. Migration within the European Union/European Free Trade Association region is not studied because special measures exist to harmonize access to health care within this region.

In keeping with the fact that policies in the health sector are influenced by multiple actors, a multilevel concept of policy is used. Development and piloting of the questionnaire were undertaken by the ADAPT network, while the data were collected by independent experts working in each country. The methodological issues involved in transforming qualitative data into qualitative scales in this way are also discussed in Part I. Computer simulations showed that varying the assumptions used to make these transformations had little effect on the results obtained.

Part II describes the conceptual framework underlying the questionnaire and the way in which aspects of policy were operationalized and scored in the 38 indicators. This is followed in **Part III** by a detailed description of the pattern of results found in 34 European countries on each item in the questionnaire.

- Section A covered legal entitlements to health-care coverage for migrants, also taking into account the administrative barriers that often make it difficult for migrants to actually obtain this coverage. A score of 100 on this section would represent complete parity with nationals. Migrant workers score 71 on this scale, asylum seekers 60, and undocumented migrants only 35. For migrant workers, requirements related to employment or length of stay often obliged them to take out private insurance or pay their own medical bills. Asylum seekers were seldom entitled to the complete basket of health-care services, while coverage for undocumented migrants ranged from practically non-existent to almost the same as for nationals (subject to a means test).
- Scores on section B (Accessibility) also showed that countries differed greatly in the efforts that were made to inform migrants about their rights to health care and how to exercise them, as well as other measures to help them find their way into care. Often, health workers appeared to be as badly informed about entitlements as migrants themselves. For undocumented migrants, the threat – real or perceived – of being reported to the authorities was a significant barrier to access in a number of countries.
- Section C (Responsiveness) shows the widest variations between countries: eight countries take no measures whatsoever to meet the special needs of migrants, while six have scores above 70.
- Section D showed that the data collection, research, planning, consultation and coordination that are needed to develop good policies existed in few countries.

Part IV reports the results of statistical analyses of these data. First, the reliability, validity and structure of the scales are examined. Scores on all the individual questions are quite highly intercorrelated (Cronbach's alpha = .86), but factor analysis shows that the four sections to some extent measure different dimensions of policy – as indeed they are supposed to. Overall scores on sections C and D (together measuring “Quality”) are strongly correlated ($r = .67, p < .01$), but sections A and B (“Access”) are only weakly related to them. In keeping with this, countries such as France and Iceland give very good access to migrants but make almost no adaptations, while the United Kingdom appears to have the opposite priorities. Despite these inconsistencies, the average score on all sections of the Health strand gives a reasonable indication of the overall “migrant-friendliness” of a country's health system. Remarkably, section A on “Entitlements” shows no correlation with section D on “Achieving change”. Clearly, the “change” that the latter relates to has much more to do with what goes on *inside* health services than with migrants' ability to access them.

Second, the relations between Health strand scores and background variables are examined. Here, it is often difficult to disentangle the effects of different variables, because the latter tend to be strongly intercorrelated. Health strand scores are related to GDP, health expenditure, the percentage of migrants in a country, scores on the other strands of MIPEX, and the date of accession of countries to the European Union (EU) – that is, before or after 2000. Strikingly, the strongest predictor among these highly intercorrelated variables turns out to be the last one: the policy environment for migrant integration, especially regarding health, is much more negative in the 13 countries that joined the EU after 2000 than in the EU15. Further research is needed to shed light on this difference, which can be seen clearly in the scores on each section.

Two other interesting findings are that the type of health financing used in each country (tax-based or insurance-based) makes a difference to quality but not to access. It is widely assumed that tax-based systems are more inclusive, but this does not appear to be the case for migrants. On the other hand, such systems do seem better at introducing measures to adapt services to the needs of migrants. Again, further research is called for. Finally, the results show that the “traditional countries of immigration” (Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States), which are often assumed to have better developed policies on migrant health than European countries, tend to have higher scores but also show the effects of recent political shifts. While the Affordable Care Act in the United States has improved access for migrants, governments in Canada and Australia have – as in some parts of Europe – rolled back earlier measures to make their health systems “migrant-friendly”. These results are only the first of many that are expected to result from the availability of the comprehensive, standardized data in the MIPEX Health strand.

List of country codes used in tables and figures

| | | | |
|----|------------------------|----|---------------------------------------|
| AT | Austria | IS | Iceland |
| AU | Australia | IT | Italy |
| BE | Belgium | LT | Lithuania |
| BG | Bulgaria | LU | Luxembourg |
| BH | Bosnia and Herzegovina | LV | Latvia |
| CA | Canada | MK | former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia |
| CH | Switzerland | MT | Malta |
| CY | Cyprus | NL | Netherlands |
| CZ | Czech Republic | NO | Norway |
| DE | Germany | NZ | New Zealand |
| DK | Denmark | PL | Poland |
| EE | Estonia | PT | Portugal |
| ES | Spain | RO | Romania |
| FI | Finland | SE | Sweden |
| FR | France | SI | Slovenia |
| GR | Greece | SK | Slovakia |
| HR | Croatia | TR | Turkey |
| HU | Hungary | UK | United Kingdom |
| IE | Ireland | US | United States of America |

I. Introduction to the project

The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) Health strand is an instrument for measuring the equitability of a country's policies relating to the health of migrants. Many studies of migrant health policy have been carried out in the last two decades, but it is hard for research in this area to move forward because these studies have made different selections of countries, policy issues and categories of migrant. It has not been possible to combine the results of studies using such different concepts and methods. This has prevented researchers from making systematic comparisons and carrying out quantitative analyses.

This new instrument combines the methodology of MIPEX with the normative framework adopted by the Council of Europe in its *Recommendations on Mobility, migration and access to health care* (Council of Europe, 2011). Developing the questionnaire, as well as collecting and analysing the data from 34 countries and producing Country Reports based on this information, was the third component of the International Organization for Migration's (IOM) EQUI-HEALTH action (<http://equi-health.eea.iom.int/>).

The 2015 round of MIPEX covers the following eight “strands” of integration policy:

- Labour market mobility
- Political participation
- Family reunion
- Permanent residence
- Education
- Access to nationality
- Health
- Anti-discrimination

Each strand is measured by a questionnaire containing four “dimensions”, with four to six questions providing the indicators for each dimension. Each indicator classifies the country’s policies on a given topic on a three-point scale. The three scores correspond to:

- 0 the worst case (no policies exist to further migrant integration);
- 50 a specific intermediate level of policy development; and
- 100 the best case (policies give migrants the same rights as national citizens).

The method of scoring will be described in section E below. The quantitative results have been uploaded to the MIPEX website (www.mipex.eu).¹

In addition, Country Reports are being produced for EQUI-HEALTH, which will be available online on the project’s website later in 2016. These are separate from the MIPEX project but make use of the same questionnaire data. They are written in narrative form and provide more detail, as well as background information. The MIPEX scores are based on the situation at the beginning of 2015, but more recent information has also been included in some Country Reports.

1.1. The project partnership

The MIPEX Health strand was created in the framework of a collaboration between three organizations:

IOM (Regional Office Brussels, Migrant Health Department)

The project is part of the action EQUI-HEALTH, which started in February 2013. EQUI-HEALTH is co-financed under the 2012 workplan of the second programme of community action in the field of health (2008–2013), by direct grant awarded to IOM from the European Commission’s Directorate General for Health and Food Safety (DG SANTE) through the Consumers, Health, Agriculture and Food Executive Agency (CHAFEA).

Migration Policy Group

The Migration Policy Group (MPG) is responsible for MIPEX, a longitudinal project that evaluates and compares what governments are doing to promote the integration of migrants in EU Member States and several non-EU countries.² The first version of MIPEX was published in 2004; subsequent rounds have been carried out in 2007, 2011 and 2015. During this period, the number of countries

studied and the range of indicators used has steadily increased. Together with its partner Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB), MPG carried out the 2015 round of MIPEX with co-financing from the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals in the project “Integration policies: Who benefits? The development and use of indicators in integration debates”. This project ran from December 2013 to June 2015.

COST Action IS1103 (ADAPT)

Adapting European Health Systems to Diversity (ADAPT)³ is an interdisciplinary scientific network involving 130 experts in 30 countries, financed by the European Commission through the COST Association⁴ and running from December 2011 to July 2016. It extends and builds on the work of COST Action Health and Social Care for Migrants and Ethnic Minorities in Europe (HOME).⁵ While HOME (2007–2011) focused on inequities in health and health care for migrants, identifying both the problems and the proposed solutions, ADAPT is concerned with implementing this knowledge through policy measures. The cornerstone of the workplan is the mapping of policies on migrant health through the joint work with IOM and MPG, which started in May 2013. Using the results, recommendations for improving policies are being formulated and the “levers for change” identified.

1.2. Aims and background

Studies of policies relating to migrant health have been carried out since the 1990s (for example, Bollini, 1992; Bollini and Siem, 1995; Huismann, Weilandt and Geiger, 1997; Carballo, Divino and Zeric, 1998; Vulpiani, Comelles and van Dongen, 2000; Watters, 2002; Ingleby et al., 2005; Mladovsky, 2007, 2009; Huber et al., 2008; Rechel et al., 2011). In addition, a number of reports on policies for separate categories such as undocumented migrants (UDMs)⁶ or asylum seekers have been published. Landmark studies of this kind were the article by Romero-Ortuño (2004) and the 2007 Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants (PICUM) report on UDMs, as well as the study by Norredam, Mygind and Krasnik (2005) on asylum seekers. These have subsequently been complemented by many others.

Bollini’s 1992 study showed that out of seven advanced industrial countries, only three (Canada, the United Kingdom and Sweden) had taken steps to promote equity of access and quality for migrants in their health services. The rest maintained a passive attitude, expecting migrants to adapt themselves to the demands of the services. Almost a quarter of a century later, we can say on

the basis of the MIPEX results that attention to health equity for migrants has become more widespread, but many countries remain passive in their approach. There are even countries (such as the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Spain and Portugal) where policies to promote equity have been withdrawn, under the influence of austerity policies and/or political opposition to migration and multiculturalism.

A major drawback of previous studies is that they make different selections of countries, policy issues and categories of migrant. In addition, the separate indicators are not combined into dimensions or scales, making it hard to get an overview of tendencies in different countries. The MIPEX Health strand sets out to overcome these limitations by collecting comparable data on migrant health policies in 40 countries, using a standard list of 38 indicators. Not only can countries be compared with each other, but the results on Health can also be compared with those from other MIPEX strands. Moreover, since the MIPEX measurements are repeated every four years, it will later be possible to study changes over time.

1.3. Countries and migrant groups studied

1.3.1. Countries

There are slight differences in the sample of countries used in the main MIPEX study and EQUI-HEALTH. For the latter project, data were collected and Country Reports written for the EU28, the three European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries Norway, Switzerland and Iceland, as well as Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey. In addition to these 34 countries, questionnaire data alone were collected for the MIPEX website on four “traditional countries of immigration” (Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States). The scores of these four countries are mentioned in this report from time to time for purposes of comparison, but the statistical analyses have been carried out using only the 33 European countries and Turkey.

Because the main MIPEX study did not include the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia or Bosnia and Herzegovina, data on other strands of MIPEX are not available for those countries. Two additional Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries in the main MIPEX study (Japan and Republic of Korea) are not mentioned in this report because the policy context in these countries differed too widely from the main sample.

Table 1: Countries studied

| MIPEX | EQUI-HEALTH |
|---|---|
| EU28, Norway, Iceland, Turkey, Switzerland | EU28, Norway, Iceland, Turkey, Switzerland (with Country Reports) |
| Australia, Canada, New Zealand, United States | Australia, Canada, New Zealand, United States |
| | Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia |
| Japan, Republic of Korea | |

1.3.2. Migrant groups

The Health strand defines the target groups for policies in the same way as the rest of the MIPEX study. In EU/EFTA countries, the focus is on migrants who are third-country nationals, i.e. not citizens of another EU/EFTA country. This is because in the latter countries, health policies grant virtually the same entitlements to migrants from other EU/EFTA countries as to national citizens, as a result of the European Union’s Cross-border Directive of 2011 and bilateral agreements with EFTA countries.⁷ By contrast, the entitlements of third-country nationals vary greatly from country to country. (In non-EU/EFTA countries the concept of third-country national is of course inapplicable.)

Some countries have reciprocal agreements with other countries, exempting migrants originating in those countries from restrictions on health coverage normally applying to migrants. These agreements are usually based on historical, political or economic ties and vary greatly from country to country. They have not been systematically listed in this project, but their existence should always be borne in mind. The neighbouring countries outside the EU/EFTA studied here (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Turkey) have each signed such agreements with about half of all EU/EFTA countries.

The basic definition of “migrant” adopted in this report is that used by the UN, World Bank, OECD and EU, that is, “a person who changes his or her country of usual residence” (United Nations, 1998). The minimum length of time a person must have resided in a country in order to be regarded as a resident rather than a visitor (that is, the lower boundary) varies according to national legislation; generally, it is three months. According to UN terminology (UN, op. cit.), migrants staying for less than a year are classified as “short-term” and those staying (or having permission to stay) for a longer period are “long-term”. Since the implementation in 2008 of new EU regulations on the reporting of statistics,⁸

short-term migrants have been excluded from Eurostat data on migration. As a result, an important type of intra-EU mobility – seasonal or brief migration – is not visible in EU statistics. Nevertheless, short-term migrants still count as migrants in national policies.

Regarding the upper boundary (the period after which migrants cease to be regarded as such), no limits are adopted in Eurostat and UN data on migrant stock; migrant status is determined on the basis of country of birth or country of origin. Even after a migrant has acquired citizenship of the receiving country, they are still classified as a migrant. However, entitlements to health-care coverage are usually based not on country of birth or origin but on nationality. Migrants who become naturalized will acquire the same entitlements as other nationals.

Unlike policies determining entitlements to health care, policies designed to adapt health services to the special needs of migrants may continue to be relevant to migrants after naturalization; these needs are more likely to depend on country of birth than nationality. Naturalization in itself will make little difference to problems such as linguistic or cultural barriers, social disadvantage and discrimination, so naturalized migrants may have as much need for health services that are adapted to their needs as those who remain foreign citizens. Some researchers on health also argue that newcomers and recent migrants should form a separate target group, but such a distinction is not often made in policies or research, except in relation to information or consultations for newly arrived migrants.

Policies that affect migrants are not always targeted at migrants as such. First, the target group may be defined as “migrants and ethnic minorities”, or even just “ethnic minorities”. This mainly applies to measures to adapt health services to accommodate varying needs, rather than entitlement to use the services. Policies adapting services to differences between ethnic groups may at the same time improve the matching of services to the needs of migrants, so they are also considered in this survey. (This is particularly important in the United Kingdom, where most such policies are targeted at minority ethnic groups rather than migrants.) However, a drawback of policies formulated in such terms is that they often overlook important issues that are specific to migrants, such as their different legal situation and their initial unfamiliarity with the receiving country’s health system.

The term *ethnic minorities* is often used to refer both to migrants and their descendants (particularly the so-called second generation). This double focus can be very useful, since many problems affecting the first generation (such as linguistic or cultural barriers, social disadvantage and discrimination) may also affect later ones. How useful this focus is depends on the context; when policies

exist to improve access and quality of health care for indigenous minorities such as the Roma, it is possible that they will encourage sensitivity to other forms of diversity. However, if the provisions for Roma are specially labelled as such (such as “Roma health mediators”), migrants may not benefit from them.

Second, some policies affecting service provision do not refer either to migrants or ethnic minorities but to diversity in general, including differences in socioeconomic position, education, language, gender, religion, age and others. Indeed, there is a tendency in many countries to promote health system responsiveness to a whole range of differences, often under the label of patient-centred care or intersectionality.⁹ Such measures can benefit migrants and ethnic minorities, but only if they encourage attention to the specific problems of these groups. A general exhortation to take account of differences between individuals, families and their social situation is usually not specific enough to tackle inequities affecting migrants.

Policies relating to three groups of migrants are studied. Here too, this report uses MIPEX terminology:

Legal migrants

This category refers to legally residing migrants. To reduce the complexity of the data, this study focuses on the rules that apply to *migrant workers*. These may differ from those for family members, students, pensioners and beneficiaries of the various types of international protection (refugee status, subsidiary protection, a humanitarian permit or “tolerated residence”). No account is taken of the different rules that may apply to migrants in the latter categories. Asylum seekers, who are also legally present in a country, are studied as a separate category (see next page).

Some legal migrants may have been “regularized” after a period of illegal residence. However, this is not a permanent status; in some countries (such as Spain), they can be “deregularized” again if they lose their jobs.

Legislation concerning legal migrants is mainly based on foreign nationality and therefore does not apply to foreign-born persons who have acquired national citizenship through naturalization. Acquiring citizenship confers on such migrants the same rights as nationals.

Asylum seekers

An asylum seeker is a person who has applied for international protection and has not yet received a final decision on the claim. Persons still involved in appeal procedures but denied permission to await the outcome in the receiving country count as UDMs.

In some countries, entitlements and health services for asylum seekers differ according to where they live. Provisions for those living in State-run reception centres may be different than for asylum seekers living in the community. In such cases, scores are based on the provisions that apply to most asylum seekers. The same applies when health service entitlements differ according to the length of time an asylum seeker has been in the country, as in Germany.


Undocumented migrants

This refers to migrants who lack authorization to reside in the country where they are living. Unauthorized residence can result either from unauthorized entry, or (more frequently) from infringement of the conditions on which residence was authorized (such as overstaying a visitor's visa or violating conditions regarding work). The term has the same meaning as "migrant in an irregular situation" (often abbreviated to "irregular migrant" or IM). It is used here because it is standard terminology in MIPEX. As with asylum seekers, there may be differences in the provisions for UDMs living independently and in the care of the State (which usually means in detention). In the Country Reports, conditions in detention are described separately; the MIPEX scores apply to UDMs not in detention.

1.4. Policy issues studied

Sometimes equity can be achieved by simply having the same policies for both groups, but equality does not always mean equity. Figure 1 sums up the difference:

Figure 1: Difference between equality and equity



Source: Interaction Institute for Social Change | Artist: Angus Maguire. Available from <http://interactioninstitute.org/illustrating-equality-vs-equity/>

An instrument such as the MIPEX, which investigates the degree to which policies promote equity between migrants and native citizens, must obviously be based on some assumptions about the policies that are important and desirable to this end.

Equity in legal entitlements to care can usually be achieved simply by making no distinction between migrants and native citizens. In other cases, however, achieving equity requires creating differences, as the right-hand picture on Figure 1 shows; then, “one size fits all” is not an equitable policy.¹⁰

What are the most important policy changes required to make service delivery equitable? This issue has been intensively debated during the last three to four decades. The question cannot be decided purely on the basis of which policies give better clinical outcomes; priorities for change cannot be established purely on an empirical basis. If a policy is based on normative principles, it does not need to be backed up by evidence of better clinical outcomes. For example, the principle that no group should suffer unfair disadvantage in terms of reduced access to health services, inferior service quality or other forms of discrimination, does not need any empirical justification, even though improved outcomes would provide an additional argument. The principle of non-discrimination

does not have to be defended on pragmatic grounds. At a more detailed level, however, there is room for disagreement about the particular measures likely to have the most impact on reducing inequities (for example, the way language barriers should be tackled). Unfortunately, research on the relationship between policies and outcomes is expensive and fraught with difficulties, and there are relatively few findings in the area of migrant health.

Another issue concerns the level at which policies should be changed. Since the 1980s, the emphasis has shifted in the direction of more multilevel approaches. Initially, the remedy for inequities was thought to lie in the acquisition of “cultural competence” by individual health workers. However, by the end of the 1990s in the United States, a “whole organization approach” came to prevail; individual competence was still regarded as necessary, but it had to be promoted and backed up by organizational policies. Progress would be made by implementing good practices in service provider organizations. Later still came the realization that not all problems can be solved at the level of provider organizations. Entitlements to health services are usually not determined by these organizations but at the national, state or regional level, while flanking measures such as data collection, research or consultation between stakeholders and policymakers are also essential and have to be organized at higher levels. A public health approach is necessary, which by definition involves more than the sum of individual organizational initiatives. This shift was signalled in a phrase used at the Portuguese EU Presidency conference on migrant health in 2007: “Good practices are not enough”.¹¹

This means that not only service providers, but the health system itself must respond to diversity; moreover, some issues even fall outside the remit of health ministries. Following the principle of “health in all policies”, some of the increased health risks to which migrants are exposed can only be tackled from other sectors, such as industrial safety or immigration policy.

Several relevant sets of recommendations or standards have been published in recent years. A study carried out by members of ADAPT (Seeleman et al., 2015) compared six widely known approaches to “responsiveness to diversity” in Europe, the United States and Australia. The authors concluded that “despite differences in labelling, there is a broad consensus about what health-care organizations need to do in order to be responsive to patient diversity”. Most of the recommendations studied were aimed at service provider organizations:

- The National CLAS Standards – National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services in Health and Health Care (Government of United States, Office of Minority Health), 2001.

- Cultural Responsiveness Framework. Guidelines for Victorian health services (Government of Victoria, Department of Health, Australia), 2009.
- Joint Commission Roadmap for Hospitals (US Joint Commission), 2010.
- Standards for Equity in Health Care for Migrants and Other Vulnerable Groups (World Health Organization (WHO) – Health Promoting Hospitals Task Force on Migrant-Friendly and Culturally Competent Health Care), 2013.

Two approaches, however, consider the whole health system:

- Recommendation of the Council of Ministers to member states on Mobility, migration and access to health care (Council of Europe), 2011.
- Equality Delivery System for the National Health Service (United Kingdom Department of Health), 2012.

Approaches at health system (rather than organizational) level are more relevant to MIPEX because they also consider national legislation on entitlements to care, as well as the “flanking measures” mentioned above.

A Delphi study based on the opinions of 134 experts in 16 countries was carried out within the European Commission-supported project EUGATE (Deville et al., 2011),¹² concerning principles of good practice in health care for immigrants in Europe. Experts were chosen from academia, the non-governmental sector, policymaking and health-care practice, on the basis of their experience and expertise concerning health care for migrants. The findings were broadly consistent with the approaches listed above, but in this study a considerable amount of disagreement was also noted, both within and between countries. This is hardly surprising considering that views were sought at an individual level.

1.4.1. Basis of the MIPEX Health Strand in the Council of Europe Recommendations

By a fortunate coincidence, the Council of Europe’s *Recommendations on Mobility, migration and access to health care* (2011) was published shortly before the present project began. The background to this document was a series of initiatives at European level, including the following:

- Council of Europe recommendations on Health services in a multicultural society (2006).¹³

- The Bratislava Declaration on health, human rights and migration (2007).¹⁴
- Outcomes of the Portuguese Presidency conference on Health and Migration in the EU – Better health for all in an inclusive society (2007).¹⁵
- The World Health Assembly's (WHA) Resolution WHA 61.17 on the Health of migrants (2008).¹⁶
- Spanish Presidency document, *Moving forward equity in health* (2010).¹⁷
- European Commission communication, *Solidarity in health: Reducing health inequalities in the EU* (2009).¹⁸

The recommendations were drawn up by a Committee of Experts made up of 12 independent specialists. In the course of a two-year consultation process, many different sources were consulted by this committee, including scientific authorities as well as representatives of the IOM, WHO, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), the Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants (PICUM), Doctors of the World (Mdm) and others.

The document that was drawn up on the basis of these consultations contains 14 recommendations, which are explained in 23 guidelines, divided into 6 categories:

1. Improving knowledge about migrants and their situation;
2. Migrants' state of health;
3. Entitlement to health service provision;
4. Accessibility of the health system;
5. Quality of health services;
6. General measures to promote change.

These topics are incorporated in the MIPEX Health Strand, but since a MIPEX strand only has four dimensions, categories 1 and 2 have been combined with category 6. This results in the following dimensions:

- A. Entitlement to health services
- B. Policies to facilitate access
- C. Responsive health services
- D. Measures to achieve change

Each dimension contains six questions, which may have more than one indicator.

1.4.2. Concept of “policy” underlying the Health strand

Multilevel concept of policy

Within the Health strand policies are regarded as regulated practices, i.e. practices that follow rules. To qualify as “policy”, these rules must be explicitly stated.¹⁹ Especially in the health sector, it is important to adopt a multilevel concept of policy, in recognition of the fact that policies in the health system are made at many levels and by many actors. In fact, the concept of “levels” may be misleading: actors cannot always be arranged in a hierarchy.

Since 2000, WHO has adhered to the following definition of health systems (WHO, 2000): “all the activities whose primary purpose is to promote, restore or maintain health”. Although WHO regards governments as ultimately responsible for a country’s health system, tasks and policymaking may be shared out among a wide range of organizations. As well as national governments, these may include regional and municipal authorities, service provider organizations, professional organizations, educational institutions, health insurers, accreditation agencies, civil society organizations (CSOs), private enterprise and advocacy groups (such as migrant or human rights organizations). Over and above the whole system, international organizations such as the UN, WHO, IOM, European Commission or Council of Europe exert influence using instruments ranging from “hard” (treaties and other laws) to “soft” (recommendations, technical advice).

An important concept in relation to health systems is “subsidiarity”. EU treaties make clear that “the organization and delivery of health care services is the responsibility of the Member States and not of the EU” (McKee, Hervey and Gilmore, 2010:232). “Soft” measures such as the “open method of coordination” (European Council, 2000) are required to enable the EU to exert any meaningful degree of influence over policies concerning health care. Most other international bodies listed also have to confine themselves to issuing recommendations and giving technical advice. In spite of this, the influence of such bodies can be considerable.

With so many levels and actors involved, it is very unlikely that policies within a health system will make up a completely harmonious whole. To achieve this would require a degree of top-down control that suggests an almost totalitarian style of governance. Health systems vary greatly in the amount of control that national governments attempt to exert. Control tends to be tighter in tax-based

National Health Systems than in Bismarckian social health insurance based systems, though the connection between financing mechanisms and governance is not as rigid as is often assumed (Kutzin, 2011). Moreover, responsibilities may be devolved or decentralized when a country has a federal structure or strong regional autonomy. For all these reasons, policies at different levels often come into conflict with each other.

This is one reason why simply listing the policies that have been laid down by government may not give an accurate impression of what happens “on the shop floor”. The degree to which government policies are actually implemented is not captured. However, “implementation gaps” seldom arise at random. When a government policy is implemented poorly or not at all, this is often because it conflicts with other policies, rather than because of weak legislation, arbitrary negligence or disobedience. For example, policies requiring the highest standards of care may conflict with other policies requiring cost reduction.

The advantage of applying a many-layered notion of “policy” is that it brings our descriptions closer to the realities that confront migrants. While governments may have national plans (or even laws) that state how migrants should be dealt with, regions and individual service providers may have their own policies that oppose these laws (either in a “migrant-friendly” or “migrant-unfriendly” direction). The MIPEX Health strand tries to capture the policies that are laid down by whatever actor or actors exert effective control. In medical education, this may be the universities, in service provision, the provider organizations, in clinical practice, a professional body, and so on.

Where regional authorities have an important say in policymaking, the standard MIPEX procedure is followed – two regions in the country with a high percentage of migrants are studied, and the description of the country is based on aggregated results from these two areas. This method carries the risk of a bias towards higher scores for such countries, though legal entitlements are usually the same in all regions. However, such a bias is at least partially counteracted by the method used for collecting data on health service delivery.

Legal entitlements and the administrative procedures required to make use of them are more likely to be uniform across a country than policies to make service delivery responsive to the needs of migrants. Such policies are often left to “the field”, i.e. to professional bodies, educators, insurance companies, accreditation agencies and service providers themselves. This can result in wide variations in the “migrant-friendliness” of the services offered. The degree of adaptation across the whole country therefore has to be based on an estimate of the proportion of service providers that adopt “migrant-friendly” policies.

It is logical that more attention will be paid to the needs of migrants in areas where they form a larger proportion of the population, so in this project, more attention has been paid to those areas.

But how friendly must these policies be? It is easy to define “no adaptation”, but how should we define the maximum and intermediate levels of an indicator? To this question, a pragmatic answer has been adopted. For the MIPEX Health strand to be useful, it must enable us to distinguish different stages of progress in a country. The highest stage does not correspond to complete adaptation – simply that the need for adaptation is accepted and efforts to realize it are well under way. To achieve an intermediate score, it is only necessary that the adaptations made are capable of significantly influencing care for migrants. In this respect, the efforts made in “migrant-rich” areas or service providers are regarded as the most important. In this way, the bias produced by the procedure followed in countries with strong regional differences is to some extent counteracted.

Which aspects of policy could not be included?

It is important to note that some relevant issues are not captured by the MIPEX Health strand questionnaire. For example, question 10 concerned policies to reduce practical barriers to access for migrants, such as inconvenient hours of service or problems of transport. This question had to be removed because of low item-total correlations. One problem was that a lack of policies might simply mean that there were few such barriers to be removed. Another problem was the difficulty of distinguishing practical barriers that may be experienced by all users from those that particularly affect migrants.

Another barrier that was impossible to measure was direct, individual discrimination against migrants – for example, hostile or disrespectful behaviour, or unjustifiable denial of treatment to which the migrant was entitled. The questionnaire measures policies, and such behaviour is unlikely to be mandated by an explicit policy (even though it might be a part of “organizational culture”). However, reports of such discrimination were recorded as comments in the questionnaire and in the Country Reports.

The third issue that could not be measured was the extent of out-of-pocket (OOP) payments (co-payments). This problem is discussed in section 2.1.

The role of non-governmental organizations

The questionnaire concerns the mainstream health system in a country. If deficiencies are compensated for by non-governmental organizations (NGOs)

or other CSOs, this is not taken into account in the scoring, except when the activities in question can be regarded as integrated in the mainstream. This will be the case if a health authority decides to outsource certain activities to NGOs that are especially well equipped to carry them out. However, for these activities to count as policy, the government has to cover all or most of the cost.

The role of IOM is different from that of NGOs because it is an intergovernmental organization. Although autonomous, it is financed by government contributions. Activities carried out in a given country by IOM are therefore regarded as part of health system policies, provided they are carried out in collaboration with the relevant authorities.

1.5. The questionnaire

The construction of the questionnaire was carried out in Work Package 1 of COST Action IS1103 ADAPT, in close collaboration with IOM and MPG. Seven international meetings were devoted to this process, each with about 25 participants. The reason why such an intensive investment of time was necessary is that MIPEX is a longitudinal project, with measurements repeated every four years. Making improvements to the questionnaire after the current round would not be permissible, because it would undermine the comparability of the measurements. The questionnaire therefore had to be “right first time”, and every weakness that was discovered had to be remedied.

The first task was to decide on the methodology and draw up a list of indicators based on the Council of Europe Recommendations. Some indicators were combined into a single question averaging them. Following this, several rounds of piloting and fine tuning were carried out in selected countries. After each round, the questions were adjusted in the light of difficulties reported and results found.

Even after the final round of data collection, improvements were made to the method of scoring and structuring the information collected. For example, when a highly skewed distribution of scores was found (i.e. with nearly all countries scoring in one or two categories), category boundaries were redefined to yield a more even distribution. The scoring of section A (Entitlements) was organized so that three separate scores could be extracted for legal migrants, asylum seekers and UDMs. Finally, the item-total correlation for each question was calculated, and one weak item (question 10, which was clearly being interpreted in different ways) was removed.

An important point is that scores are relative: they measure the gap between provisions for migrants and for national citizens, not the absolute levels of quality. In the 34 countries analyzed in detail, there are very wide differences in the overall quality of health services provided. These reflect the extreme differences in wealth among European countries. GDP per capita (adjusted for the cost of living) ranges from 28 in Bosnia and Herzegovina to 263 in Luxembourg (a ratio of 1 to 9), while annual spending on health per capita ranges from EUR 644 in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to EUR 4,392 in Switzerland (1 to 7). Provisions for migrants in some countries may be very inadequate, but if those for national citizens are equally inadequate, then “equity” between the two groups will have been achieved.

Because we are not measuring the absolute level of health services for migrants, but only their relation to those available to nationals, we tend to ignore in this survey the overall quality of health service provisions in each country (although it is reported as a background variable). The UN’s well-known AAAQ framework²⁰ states that “all [health] services, goods and facilities must be available, accessible, acceptable and of good quality.” The MIPEX Health strand, however, does not measure availability; it is assumed that all services that exist are equally available in principle for migrants and nationals, as long as they have access to them. This may not be the case when services for a particular migrant group are delivered using a different system (for example, in asylum seeker centres or in detention). Such exceptions have been noted in the Country Reports, but are not registered by the MIPEX scores.

1.5.1. Administration of the questionnaire

In each country, one or more researchers were appointed with responsibility for completing the questionnaire, as well as one or more peer reviewers who carefully reviewed the results obtained. All were chosen for their expertise on the topic of migrant health policy. In total, 103 researchers were involved; of the 82 working in Europe, 48 were members of COST Action IS1103 ADAPT. A list of their names is given in the Appendix. In accordance with MIPEX rules, all researchers were independent; none were employed by governments or other policymaking authorities.

Researchers used a variety of methods to gather the required data. Most used a network of informants to provide information, especially concerning policies in service provider organizations. Other information was obtained from publications (scientific or grey literature), published legislation and regulations, as well as other official information on the Internet. Key figures and informants were contacted, and some interviews were held. All results were checked by a peer reviewer from the same country.

Submitted questionnaires were checked by the coordinator of the project to make sure the scores given were adequately justified and that standard criteria were used. Staff of MPG carried out a further check to ensure that rules of scoring were carefully followed.

1.5.2. Scoring of the questionnaire

The issue of weighting

MIPEX combines qualitative information to make quantitative scales. As we saw earlier, answers to the questionnaire items are scored on a three-point scale. Average scores are calculated for each of the four sections (A to D) separately; the overall Health strand score is the average of these four scores. Respondents are required to provide detailed information on each question in an extra column to explain the score they have given. This is the standard method used in all strands of the MIPEX.

However, from the point of view of measurement theory, two potential weaknesses are inherent in this method of constructing scales. First, for each indicator, it could be argued that the midpoint should not be scored 50, but a higher or lower number. For example, on the indicator “conditions for entitlement” scores are “unconditional entitlement” = 100, “conditional entitlement” = 50, and “total exclusion” = 0. If it is very difficult for migrants to meet the condition being applied, we might want to score the middle category, conditional entitlement, as (say) 10 rather than 50.

Theoretically, the correct weight for this category is the percentage of migrants that satisfy the condition. However, this percentage can never be known in advance, because it depends on the composition of a particular migrant group in a particular country at a particular time. For example, there will be variations in time and between countries in the percentage of legal migrants who satisfy the condition of being employed. It is therefore not possible to know in advance what value should be assigned to the conditional entitlement category. MIPEX calls it 50, on the assumption that in the long run, overestimations and underestimations will tend to cancel each other out.

Second, in the total score for section A, we average together the entitlement scores for legal (i.e. labour) migrants, asylum seekers and UDMs, despite the fact that the first group is usually more numerous than the other two. This can be justified by arguing that legal migrants are better able to look after themselves, so that the other two groups are more vulnerable to bad policies. A similar problem arises over the weighting of the individual questions in each

section; furthermore, the topics addressed by the four sections (Entitlement, Accessibility, Responsiveness and Measures to Achieve Change) may not all be equally important components of equity. In all these cases, there is again no way to accurately weight the scores in advance, because the relative importance of an indicator will depend on the migrant population in the country being studied. For example, if most of the migrants in a country speak the local language, reduction of language barriers will not be very important for improving service delivery for migrants.

As remarked earlier, such reservations apply to all MIPEX strands, not just health. Despite this, the reliability and validity of MIPEX as a measuring instrument has been shown to be satisfactory (Ruedin, 2011; Ruedin, Alberti and D'Amato, 2015). It is also possible to relate policies as measured by MIPEX to the outcomes they are intended to produce (Bilgili, Huddleston and Joki, 2015). The next section describes tests that have been carried out to discover how stable the results from the Health strand are when different scoring and weighting systems are used.

Ordinal and interval scales

Technically, what MIPEX methodology does is to treat an ordinal scale as if it had interval properties. The benefits and risks of doing this have long been a subject of controversy in psychology and the social sciences, two areas in which ordinal scales are widely used. Knapp (1990) provides a succinct discussion of the conflict between conservatives (who believe it should never be done) and liberals (who regard it as acceptable under certain conditions). Good predictive value is often found for indicators that treat ordinal scales as if they have interval properties; this is why they are so often used.

Purely on mathematical grounds, it can be deduced that there are two conditions that reduce the risk that systematic errors (i.e. biased results) will be produced by adding up scores on a three-point ordinal scale.

- (a) The larger the number of indicators, the better the chance that variations from the hypothetical “true” values approximated by the score of 50 will tend to even out. The Health strand has 38 indicators, a reasonably large number for these purposes.
- (b) Concerning the weighting of different items in a section, or of different sections in the total score, the risk that assigning equal weights will create bias will depend on the statistical homogeneity of the scale in question. To illustrate this, we can consider a topic in which different weightings make a lot of difference, such as the quality of health care

or university education. Over the years, a number of scales have been developed that claim to show which health-care system or university offers the best quality. However, the rankings they yield depend to a large extent on the weight they attach to different dimensions of quality. For example, is health care for children regarded as more important than care for the elderly? Is it more important for a university to teach students to be creative or to reason logically? The different rating scales available reflect different assumptions about such questions.

The important issue here is the degree to which different components of a scale are correlated with each other. Consider the limiting case of a scale with 100 per cent homogeneity: in such a case, it would not matter how the items are weighted, because each item is a perfect predictor of every other item. The lower the degree of homogeneity, the more the overall ranking will depend on the weighting chosen. The homogeneity of the MIPEX health strand is fairly high (Cronbach's $\alpha = .86$), although it varies within different sections (section 4.1 explores issues of reliability, validity and structure in more detail).

To examine the robustness of the MIPEX Health strand, i.e. the degree to which results depend on the scoring system and the weights chosen, three types of computer simulation have been carried out.

- (a) First, the score of 50 for the middle category has been replaced in turn by 20 and 80. We have then examined how this affects the ranking of countries on the total Health strand score. (Ranks are reduced to a three-point scale with six to seven countries in each interval, as on the map at the beginning of this report.) Increasing the score for the middle category from 50 to 80 makes no difference to the rankings; decreasing it to 20 changes the rankings of 9 out of 34 countries, but never by more than one point.

We then examine the correlation between key background variables and the total Health strand scores. With the midpoint scored at 20, 50 and 80, the correlation (r) with GDP becomes .53, .52 and .51 respectively; the correlation with the number of third-country migrants in the country becomes .50, .49 and .47. If this pattern were repeated, it would suggest that a score of 20 would lead to marginally better predictions than a score of 50, but the differences are so minute as to be negligible.

- (b) Next, we have examined the effects on the rank ordering of countries of weighting the four different sections of the Health strand differently. At present, the weights are equal: we have calculated the total score when the weight of sections A, B, C and D in turn is doubled, and finally for A + B (Access) and C + D (Quality). When the rankings are reduced to a five-point scale as described above, some countries change their position but never by more than 1 point. Doubling the weight for section A and for Access makes most difference to the final rank: in both conditions, 10 countries change position.

These simulations show that although MIPEX methodology depends on a number of untested assumptions, scores are not drastically affected when these assumptions are replaced by different ones. A more accurate approach to measuring the “migrant-friendliness” of integration policies will have to await the production of data about the effects of these policies in real life. Even then, some fairly arbitrary assumptions will have to be made about the relative importance of different effects. This is only to say that measuring integration policies, like much else in social science, is not an exact science and never could be.

In the end, the decision to use instruments such as MIPEX is based on pragmatic considerations. If no attempt is made to construct scales, the study of migrant integration will forever remain the study of dozens of different indicators, with little possibility of making general statements about them. Constructing scales makes much more powerful analyses possible, though it is always open to biases that might produce misleading results. However, if scale construction is ruled out a priori, there will be no possibility of systematically comparing countries, categories of migrant, dimensions of integration, and policies at different times.

2. Content of the MIPEX health strand questionnaire

2.1. Entitlement to health services

What is meant by “entitlement”?

Following the Council of Europe Recommendations, the Health strand makes a clear-cut distinction between the “entitlements” that migrants enjoy and the “accessibility” of services. These two issues are usually combined without distinction in the single concept of “access”. However, entitlements are almost always laid down in national legislation, while other aspects of accessibility are regulated at a variety of levels.

The term *entitlement* concerns the affordability of care: it refers to the coverage of health-care costs under a risk-sharing system. The costs of necessary health care can easily exceed an individual’s ability to pay them: in the worst case, these costs can become catastrophic. Individuals or their families can avoid being financially devastated by illness or injury by insuring against these costs.

Voluntary private health insurance (VPI) is the least equitable type of coverage. Premiums usually take no account of financial circumstances and will therefore represent a greater burden for poorer people than for richer ones. Insurance companies may refuse to cover pre-existing medical conditions, or charge higher premiums for people who suffer from them. Third country nationals in the EU/EFTA are often obliged to take out VPI if they wish to safeguard against catastrophic health costs. Without strict government regulation, such policies can be highly disadvantageous.

Statutory (State-regulated) systems of coverage have evolved in order to improve equity and increase the percentage of the population with health-care coverage. They do this either by regulating the terms of insurance policies (Bismarck system) or by financing health costs through taxation (Beveridge system). In this study, the two types of system are labelled as social or statutory health insurance (SHI) or national health service (NHS).²¹ Often the two systems are combined – for example, unemployed and low-income people are covered from tax revenue but others from premiums (Kutzin, 2011). Such mixed systems are becoming increasingly common because “in a globalized economy, as the share of labor decreases relative to that of capital, wage income is increasingly insufficient to cover the rising cost of care” (Liaropoulos and Goranitis, 2015). In Europe, ageing is also reducing the economically active population and increasing the number requiring expensive care, so that the funding generated by the contributions of working people and their employers becomes increasingly inadequate for covering the entire population.

An essential feature of statutory systems is that joining them – in contrast to VPI – is not optional. Whether contributions to a risk-sharing scheme are made through premiums or taxation, they are continuous and do not start only when one is ill: for this reason, they are often called “upfront” contributions. Risk-sharing means that people with many health problems are subsidized by those with fewer problems. To the extent that financing is progressive (i.e. contributions are matched to ability to pay), rich people will also subsidize poor ones. A person with the right to participate in the statutory system of risk-sharing usually also has the obligation to do so – an obligation which, as President Obama discovered when introducing “affordable care” in the United States, may be strongly resented by the healthy and wealthy.


All EU/EFTA countries except Cyprus now have statutory systems of coverage. For migrants, it makes a lot of difference if they are allowed to participate in this system (or can transfer the coverage they have in their home country). As we shall see, this is far from always being the case, so that they either have to use VPI or pay for health costs as they arise.

How is entitlement measured?

The extent of coverage for migrants is measured in the Health strand with the help of the WHO model of coverage (Figure 2). In this model, coverage has three dimensions:

1. Who is covered?
2. Which services are covered?
3. What do people have to pay out-of-pocket?

Figure 2: Three dimensions to consider when moving towards universal coverage



Source: WHO World Health Report, 2010, as cited in Oxfam International, *Universal health coverage: Why health insurance schemes are leaving the poor behind*, Oxfam Briefing Paper 176 (Oxfam International, Oxford, 2013).

The first dimension (left to right) concerns the extent of inclusion in the statutory system of coverage. Is coverage unconditional, or do only certain migrants qualify for it, or none at all? The second dimension (front to back) concerns the basket of services that is covered. Does it contain only emergency care, a few additional services, or all the services that nationals enjoy?

The WHO model's third dimension (vertical) concerns the extent of OOP payments or co-payments, such as charges to the patient for prescriptions or consultations. Such payments undermine the very principle of coverage, because they place certain costs outside the scope of insurance. Although it was originally intended to include OOP charges in the MIPEX Health strand, it soon became obvious that too much research would be required to obtain the necessary information. The total percentage of health expenditure financed by OOP payments is readily available from WHO or OECD databases, but this figure is based on all users. Our interest is in the OOP payments that affect migrants in each of our three categories. Obtaining this information is difficult enough, but we would also have to take into account concessions designed to make OOP payments more equitable (exemptions, ceilings and refunds), which vary enormously between countries.

Therefore, because OOP payments comprise on average only 19 per cent of total health expenditure in the countries we studied, it was decided not to take them into account. The overall percentage of health expenditure covered by these payments is nevertheless an interesting variable, which has been included in the background data and statistical analyses.

Returning to the first two dimensions of the WHO cube (Who is covered? Which services are covered?), we also need to take into account exemptions from restrictions that apply in certain special cases. These cases concern either vulnerable groups or conditions regarded as a threat to public health; for example, care relating to pregnancy and childbirth, children or infectious diseases. Exemptions provide a “back door” into the system for those who are not entitled to enter through the “front door”. Generally, they also apply to national citizens who do not have coverage (for example, those in SHI systems who are uninsured because they have not paid the compulsory contributions).

Section A addresses the following issues for legal migrants, asylum seekers and UDMs. Scores for this section can be extracted separately for each category. (In sections B, C and D, separate scores are not calculated, though information about the different groups is asked for in certain questions.)

Questions in section A

1–3. Inclusion in health system, services covered, special exemptions

1. Legal migrants
2. Asylum seekers
3. Undocumented migrants

Each score for questions 1–3 is the average of the following three indicators:

(a) Conditions for inclusion in a system of health-care coverage

- 100 = Unconditional inclusion
- 50 = Some conditions for inclusion
- 0 = No inclusion

(b) Extent of coverage

- 100 = Same coverage as nationals
- 50 = More than emergency care, but less than for nationals
- 0 = Emergency care only (or none if no inclusion)

(c) Special exemptions

Five grounds for exemption are listed:

- Antenatal and/or perinatal and/or postnatal care
- Infectious disease (such as tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS)
- Care for minors (or for unaccompanied minors if other minors are covered)
- Care for vulnerable groups (e.g. victims of torture, trafficking or traumatization)
- Others (specify)

100 = Three or more exemptions

50 = One or two exemptions

0 = No exemptions

4–6. Administrative barriers to obtaining entitlement

While questions 1–3 describe the legal entitlements that each group of migrants enjoys, questions 4–6 cover the administrative barriers that may prevent them from exercising these entitlements. These barriers are included in section A because they directly negate or undermine the legal entitlements given. For example, not knowing whether one can count on coverage is a powerful disincentive to seeking help, because the patient runs the risk of being forced to pay crippling medical bills.

These barriers are different in kind from the ones described in section B, which have to do with difficulties in reaching service providers. It was decided to include them in the section on entitlements because it is often found that the law provides UDMs (for example) with reasonably good entitlements, but obstacles are put in place at the administrative level that prevent UDMs from exercising them. In such cases, it would be misleading to speak of a high level of entitlement.

Two types of administrative barrier are considered:

- A. Administrative demands for documents that may be difficult for migrants to produce; and
- B. Subjecting entitlements to discretionary decisions with an uncertain outcome.

Scoring:

100 = Neither

50 = A or B

0 = A and B

Note that questions 4–6 in fact measure “freedom from administrative barriers”; a complete absence of barriers gets the highest score.

The score for section A is the average of the questions on legal entitlements and administrative barriers. Depending on requirements, scores can be calculated for a single migrant group or for the average of all three.

2.2. Policies to facilitate access

In this section, access barriers are investigated that have to do with the provision of necessary information, mediators to guide migrants through the health system, and the threat of sanctions against use of health services by UDMs.

Lack of information about entitlements is a serious barrier to exercising them: people who do not know their rights cannot claim them. Unfortunately, this ignorance may not be confined to migrants, because staff are often inadequately informed about entitlements. This situation is made worse when legislation is complex and changes rapidly.

7. Information for service providers about migrants' entitlements

This question examines two issues:

- A. Do service provider organizations receive up-to-date information on migrants' entitlements?
- B. Do organizations pass on up-to-date information about these entitlements to their employees?

Scoring:

100 = A and B

50 = A or B

0 = Neither

8. Information for migrants concerning entitlements and use of health services

Scores for this question are the average of three indicators:

(a) Method of dissemination

Five methods of dissemination are listed:

- Websites
- Brochures in public places
- One-stop shops
- Classes or individual instruction
- Others (specify)

100 = More than one method

50 = One method

0 = No methods

(b) *Number of languages in which information for migrants is available (not including the official languages of the country or English)*

100 = Four or more

50 = One to three

0 = None (NB: This can mean “only in English”.)

(c) *Groups reached by information*

A. Legal migrants

B. Asylum seekers

C. Undocumented migrants

100 = All three

50 = Only two

0 = Only one

(This question is skipped if there is no method of dissemination.)

9. Health education and health promotion for migrants

Scores for this question were calculated in the same way as for question 8.

10. Practical barriers

This question was dropped for the reasons given in section D.

11. Provision of “cultural mediators” or “patient navigators” to facilitate access for migrants

Scores for this question are the average of two indicators:

(a) *Extent of provision*

100 = Guaranteed across the system or in major immigrant areas

50 = On a smaller or ad hoc basis

0 = Not available

(b) *Groups reached by information*

A. Legal migrants

B. Asylum seekers

C. Undocumented migrants

100 = All three

50 = Only two

0 = Only one

(Question b is skipped if there is no provision.)

12. Is there an obligation to report undocumented migrants, and are there any sanctions against helping undocumented migrants?

This question is only relevant to one of the three groups studied, but it nevertheless gives an indication of the level of respect for the rights of migrants in a country. Scores are the average of two indicators:

(a) *Are health-care professionals or organizations required to report undocumented migrants to the police or immigration authorities?*

100 = Explicitly forbidden in law and/or professional codes of conduct

50 = No relevant legislation or professional codes of conduct

0 = Explicitly required in law

(b) *Are there legal or organizational sanctions against health-care professionals or organizations assisting undocumented migrants?*

100 = No legal sanctions or other pressures on professionals to deter them from helping migrants who cannot pay

50 = Only organizational sanctions exist (organizations discourage carers from helping migrants who cannot pay)

0 = Legal sanctions exist against helping undocumented migrants

2.3. Responsive health services

This section concerns steps that are taken to adapt services to migrants' needs. These needs may concern linguistic or cultural barriers or specialized knowledge about health conditions.

13. Interpretation services

Scores for this question are the average of two indicators:

(a) *Availability of qualified interpretation services for patients with inadequate proficiency in the official language(s)*

100 = Interpreters are available and free of charge to patients

50 = Interpreters are available but patients must pay all (or a substantial part) of the costs

0 = No interpretation services available

(b) *Methods used for interpretation*

Six methods of interpretation are listed:

– Face-to-face

– Telephone interpretation

– Interpretation by video link

– Credentialed volunteers

– Employment of “cultural mediators”

– Employment of competent bilingual or multilingual staff

100 = Three or more methods available

50 = One or two

0 = None

14. Availability of “culturally competent” or “diversity-sensitive” services

Indicator: Existence of standards or guidelines requiring that health services take account of individual and family characteristics, experiences and situation, respect for different beliefs, religion, culture and competence in intercultural communication.

- A. Standards or guidelines exist on “culturally competent” or “diversity-sensitive” services.
- B. Compliance with these standards or guidelines is monitored by a relevant authority.

100 = Both of these

50 = One of these

0 = Neither

15. Training and education of health service staff

Indicator: Policies exist to support training of staff in providing services responsive to the needs of migrants. Training may be part of basic professional education and/or in-service professional development.

100 = At national level

50 = At local or organizational level

0 = Neither

16. Involvement of migrants in information provision, service design and delivery

Only forms of migrant involvement that are explicitly encouraged by policy measures (at any level) should be mentioned.

- A. Migrants are involved in service delivery (e.g. through the employment of “cultural mediators”).
- B. Migrants are involved in the development and dissemination of information.
- C. Migrants are involved in research (not only as respondents).
- D. Migrant patients or ex-patients are involved in the evaluation, planning and running of services.
- E. Migrants in the community are involved in the design of services.

100 = Three to five of these

50 = One or two

0 = None

17. Encouraging diversity in the health service workforce

Concerning this issue, there is less consensus (Seeleman et al., 2015). Although American guidelines tend to emphasize the value of a culturally and linguistically diverse workforce, in Europe the idea of allowing ethnicity to play a role in recruitment is more controversial. There is no separate Council of

Europe recommendation on this topic, but the desirability of a workforce that reflects the diversity of the general population is mentioned in the Guidelines and Explanatory Memorandum. Answers to the question give an indication of the extent to which health workers with a migrant background are seen in Europe as having a role to play in responsive care.

Indicator: Existence of recruitment measures (e.g. campaigns, incentives, support) to encourage participation of people with a migrant background in the health service workforce. (This question does not concern policies aimed at recruiting or employing health-care professionals from abroad because of a national shortage of staff.)

- 100 = At national level
- 50 = At local or organizational level
- 0 = Neither

18. Development of capacity and methods

While questions 13–17 were concerned with improving interactions between health workers and migrant patients, question 18 examines the adaptation of clinical procedures (diagnosis, treatment) to the needs of migrant populations.

Indicator: Diagnostic procedures and treatment methods are adapted to take more account of variations in the sociocultural background of patients.

- 100 = Policies exist to encourage the adaptation of diagnostic procedures and treatment methods to sociocultural diversity
- 50 = Adaptation of diagnostic procedures and treatment methods is to a limited extent tolerated, but not encouraged
- 0 = Policies are exclusively focused on standardizing diagnostic procedures and treatment methods

2.4. Measures to achieve change

This section concerns measures that support the process of improving responsiveness (flanking measures) or provide leadership to initiate change processes.

19. Collection of data on migrant health

All approaches stress the importance of data collection and research in order to strengthen the knowledge base concerning migrant health. There is widespread concern about shortcomings in this area.

Indicator: Data on migrant status, country of origin or ethnicity is included in medical databases or clinical records. (Choose Option 1 if linkage between medical databases and national databases containing the above personal information is practically possible.)

- 100 = Inclusion of such information is mandatory
- 50 = Inclusion of such information is optional
- 0 = Such information is never included

20. Support for research on migrant health

Funding bodies have in the past five years supported research on the following topics:

- A. Occurrence of health problems among migrant or ethnic minority groups.
- B. Social determinants of migrant and ethnic minority health.
- C. Issues concerning service provision for migrants or ethnic minorities.
- D. Evaluation of methods for reducing inequalities in health or health care affecting migrants or ethnic minorities.

- 100 = Three or four topics
- 50 = One or two
- 0 = None

21. Health in all policies approach

This refers to attention for the health impact of all policies affecting migrants.

- 100 = Mandatory consideration of the impact on migrant or ethnic minority health of policies in other sectors than health
- 50 = Ad hoc consideration of the impact on migrant or ethnic minority health of policies in other sectors than health
- 0 = No consideration taken of the impact on migrant or ethnic minority health of policies in sectors other than health

22. Whole organization approach

This question concerns the extent to which migrants' health is regarded as a concern throughout the health system, or only for specialized departments of organizations.

Indicator: Migrant or ethnic minority health is a priority throughout service provider organizations and health agencies (integrated versus categorical approach).

- 100 = Commitment to providing equitable health care for migrants or ethnic minorities is present in all departments of service provider organizations and health agencies
- 50 = Concern for migrant or ethnic minority health is regarded as a priority only for specialized departments or organizations

- 0 = No systematic attention is paid to migrant or ethnic minority health in any part of the health system. Measures are left to individual initiative

23. Leadership by government

- A. Government publishes an explicit plan for action on migrant health.
 - B. Policies are implemented to support these measures.
- 100 = A and B
 - 50 = Only ad hoc policies introduced on migrant health
 - 0 = No policy measures introduced on migrant health

24. Involvement of stakeholders / migrants' contribution to health policymaking

The final topics concern governance. Does the national government take the lead in changing the health system to improve migrants' health? Are there mechanisms for bringing together all the stakeholders who need to be involved in such an enterprise? Are migrants and their organizations represented in policymaking? (NB: Participation at service provider level is covered by question 16.) Scores for this question are the average of two indicators:

- (a) What is the policy to involve stakeholders in the design of (national or regional) migrant health policies? Is there an advisory body or centre of expertise promoting cooperation among stakeholders on migrant health policy? (This can be led by government, service providers, or NGOs/institutes. Stakeholders include administrative and health authorities at various levels of governance, service providers, health insurers, professional bodies, universities, accreditation agencies, NGOs and commercial organizations.)
 - 100 = Through structural cooperation (e.g. via advisory body or centre of expertise)
 - 50 = Through ad hoc cooperation (e.g. during consultations on new health strategy or law or through projects)
 - 0 = None
- (b) Migrants' contribution to health policymaking at national or regional levels. How do migrant stakeholders (e.g. NGOs and CSOs) participate in national policymaking affecting their health?
 - 100 = Through structural cooperation (e.g. involvement in advisory body or regular review of health legislation, services and outcomes)
 - 50 = Through ad hoc cooperation (e.g. during consultations on new health strategy or law or through projects)
 - 0 = None

3. Questionnaire scores

3.1. Entitlement to health services

Legal migrants

Policies analysed are those applying to migrant workers. Entitlements for family members, students, pensioners and beneficiaries of international protection may differ.

Countries excluded from the analysis

Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States are not included in the totals below, because the main aim is to provide an overview of the EQUI-HEALTH sample. Malta cannot be scored on questions 1a, 1b and 1c, because no clear rules are laid down concerning the entitlements of legal third-country nationals.

Inclusion in health system and services covered

| | A | B | C |
|---|---|---|----------|
| Legal migrants: conditions for inclusion in a system of health-care coverage | | | |
| A. Inclusion is unconditional. | 10 | 22 | 1 |
| B. Some conditions for inclusion. | BE, DK, FR, MK, DE, IT, LU, NL, SE, CH | AT, BH, BG, HR, CZ, EE, FI, GR, HU, IS, IE, LV, LT, NO, PL, PT, RO, SK, SI, ES, TR, UK | CY |
| C. No inclusion (costs must be paid in full by the user or by a commercial insurance policy). | | | |
| 1a Please specify any conditions for obtaining health-care coverage, such as length of stay, residing in a State facility, etc. (Ignore the conditions which have to be satisfied in order to be classed as a "migrant" rather than a "visitor".) | | | |

| | Legal migrants: extent of coverage | A | B | C |
|----|---|---------------------------------|---|----|
| 1b | A. Same coverage as nationals. | | | |
| | B. More than emergency care, but less than for nationals. | 32 | 0 | 1 |
| | C. Emergency care only (or none if no inclusion). | All countries (excluding Malta) | | CY |

Question 1a: Conditions of coverage

Unconditional inclusion in the national system of coverage is granted to legal migrants by 10 countries. They are covered for the same basket of services as nationals. At the other end of the scale, Cyprus has four separate systems of health-care coverage and legal migrants qualify for none of them. Only emergency care is provided by the State.

Conditional inclusion is granted by 22 countries. If the conditions are satisfied, the same services are covered as for nationals. If not, legal migrants must pay health costs (other than for emergency care) out of pocket or through VPI. The most important conditions concern **duration of residence permit** and **employment**. In the guidelines accompanying the Council of Europe Recommendations, particular concern is expressed about these two conditions:

8. Special attention should be paid to the entitlement of migrants to health service provision in the following cases:
- migrants who have not stayed long enough in a country to qualify for health-care coverage;
 - migrants whose insurance premiums are not paid by an employer.

Table 2 shows the main conditions for inclusion in a system of health-care coverage, listed separately for the two types of health system (NHS and SHI). Countries that acceded to the EU since 2000 are set in italics.

Five countries apply two conditions: in the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovenia entitlement is granted if **one** of these conditions is satisfied, while in Lithuania and Canada, both conditions must be satisfied.

Table 2: Conditions for inclusion in the national system of health-care coverage

| | NHS (14) | SHI (19) |
|--|---|---|
| Unconditional inclusion | DK, IT, SE | BE, CH, FR, DE, LU, NL, MK |
| Miscellaneous conditions | ES ^{a,b} , IS ^c , PT ^{b,d} | |
| Inclusion if employed or self-employed | | AT, CZ, HR, HU, LT, PL ^e , SI, GR, BH ^e |
| Inclusion with “temporary” residence permit (usually 1–5 years) | IE, NO | HU, LT, TR |
| Inclusion only with “permanent” residence permit (usually ≥ 5 years) | UK, FI ^b , LV | BG, CZ, EE, RO, SK, SI |
| No inclusion | CY | |

- a. In Spain, inclusion is granted if a legal migrant is affiliated to the social security system and paying all necessary contributions, or earning less than EUR 100,000 a year.
- b. In Spain, Portugal and Finland registration of residence is required.
- c. In Iceland, entitlements cannot be exercised during the first six months.
- d. In Portugal, entitlements cannot be exercised during the first three months.
- e. In Bosnia and Herzegovina and Poland, a legal migrant may join the SHI system by paying contributions voluntarily.

NHS systems never impose conditions related to employment, but only three offer unconditional inclusion. We will now examine each of the types of inclusion in turn.

Unconditional inclusion

This is granted by three countries with an NHS system and seven with SHI. Apart from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, all are EU15 countries that have received migrants on a large scale since the 1950s.

Miscellaneous conditions

In Portugal and Iceland (both countries with NHS systems), legal migrants are not allowed to exercise their entitlements during the first three or six months of residence. Presumably this policy is intended to discourage “health tourism” – coming to a country primarily in order to get treatment for a pre-existing health problem. However, just as when inclusion depends on the duration of the residence permit (see below), such measures are unjust because they oblige migrants to pay taxes for services they are not allowed to use during a certain period. In Spain, entitlement is dependent on being affiliated to the social security system and paying all necessary contributions, as well as not having too high an income.

Inclusion dependent on employment

SHI systems have evolved from the stage in which coverage was limited to those in employment and their dependents. In most such systems, coverage is now virtually universal. When only economically active migrants are covered, this has more to do with immigration policy than with the way the health system is financed.

How fair is it to base entitlement on employment? A work visa is by definition tied to employment; migrant workers can only obtain a residence permit if they have a guarantee of work. In the countries that link coverage to employment, we may surmise that being unemployed is seen as a breach of the conditions under which the migrant was admitted.

From this narrow viewpoint, it is logical that migrants cannot make use of the safety net (including health-care benefits) which is provided to national citizens in case of unemployment or low income. The threat of losing entitlement to health care encourages the migrant to work hard, hold on to their job, and get a new one quickly if they lose it. This suggests that the migrant is primarily regarded as a productive unit. Moreover, such a policy can only be deemed fair on the assumption that it is up to the individual whether he/she has a job. In reality, employment rates are strongly influenced by macroeconomic conditions, while third-country nationals are overwhelmingly more vulnerable to unemployment than national citizens or EU migrants (WHO, 2013:xxx). Finally, denying health-care coverage to unemployed migrants is particularly inequitable because they are in a worse position to pay extra costs than employed migrants.

In countries that deny full coverage to unemployed migrant workers, the discrimination is often indirect rather than direct. Coverage may be available for persons receiving State benefits, but migrants often do not qualify for unemployment benefit, in particular because of conditions that apply in relation to previous payment of social security contributions. When assessing health-care entitlements, it is therefore important to note whether the criterion applied is “being unemployed” or “receiving unemployment benefit”.

Inclusion dependent on length of permit

As can be seen from Table 2, two categories of countries can be distinguished depending on whether they require a temporary or a permanent residence permit. However, the boundaries of these categories are somewhat blurred: the concepts used, and their exact meanings, vary between countries. For example, the criterion may concern either the actual or the permitted length

of residence, and it may not always be necessary to wait five years in order to get a permanent residence permit.

What is clear is that in most countries imposing such conditions, entitlement is granted only to migrants whose stay is (or is intended to be) very long – so long, in fact, that in many countries they would become eligible to apply for national citizenship. Denying entitlements for such a long period is grossly inequitable, because in a tax-based system, there is no possibility of exemption from the portion of taxes that goes to financing the health system. Legal migrants excluded from a SHI system suffer less from this form of discrimination; they may have to cover their own health costs, but at least they are exempt from paying SHI contributions. As we noted earlier, however, all SHI systems are nowadays subsidized to a certain extent by government financing, so part of the taxes paid by the migrant will still go to financing a system from which they are excluded.

Differences between EU15 and post-2000 accession countries

Table 2 shows that the 13 post-2000 accession countries impose more exclusive conditions on entitlement for legal migrants than EU15 countries. This difference is highly significant ($p < .0001$ by Fisher's Exact Test, two-tailed). Analysis of the background data collected for this study shows that EU15 Member States have higher GDPs, percentages of foreign-born and foreign national residents, and scores for tolerance of migrants. Health systems in the EU15 are much more generously financed than in the post-2000 accession countries, especially in terms of health expenditure per capita, and as a result, the Euro Health Consumer Index (EHCI), which measures health-care quality, is also higher.

Each of these factors, and probably others too, might be related to the poorer entitlements for legal migrants in these countries. The serious underfinancing of health services is likely to encourage policymakers to adopt exclusive rather than inclusive policies for migrant workers. However, further analysis is necessary to unravel the influence of different factors.

Another factor that may undermine equitable policies for migrant workers is the political influence of the commercial health insurance sector. In Malta, the Government issues inconsistent information about legal health entitlements (see Country Report). Access to the NHS is said to be available to all who pay social security contributions – but to obtain an Employment Licence for a third-country national, employers are required to show proof of private health insurance to cover the full duration of employment. In the Czech Republic, reforms of the system that have been strenuously advocated by human rights groups and migrant organizations – and even by some government departments – have

been successfully resisted by the commercial health insurance lobby, supported by the Ministry of Health (see Country Report).

Question 1b: Limitations on the basket of services provided

As can be seen in the results from this question, for legal migrants only two levels of coverage were found: complete coverage or none at all. Emergency care is provided in all countries, though the obligation to pay for it afterwards varies: this issue is not dealt with here.


Question 1c: Special exemptions from restrictions

These exemptions provide a mechanism through which health systems can mitigate some effects of exclusion from the statutory system of coverage. They are designed to protect vulnerable groups and/or reduce public health risks.

| | Legal migrants: special exemptions | Three or more exemptions | One or two exemptions | No exemptions |
|----|---|--|--|---------------|
| 1c | A. Antenatal and/or perinatal and/or postnatal care. | 11 | 10 | 2 |
| | B. Infectious disease (e.g. TB, HIV/AIDS). | | | |
| | C. Care for minors (or for unaccompanied minors if other minors are covered). | BG, EE, GR, RO, SI, CY, HR, NO, PT, ES, UK | AT, CZ, HU, LT, PL, TR, FI, IS, IE, LV | BH, SK |
| | D. Care for vulnerable groups (e.g. victims of torture, trafficking or traumatization). | | | |
| | E. Other (specify). | | | |
| | Score Option 1 if full coverage for this group is granted anyway (Option 1 in 1a and 1b). | | | |

The issue of exemptions does not arise for the 10 countries granting complete unconditional inclusion to legal migrants, because none are necessary. In the remaining 23 countries analysed (i.e. excluding the traditional countries of immigration and Malta, which has no clear legislation), the distribution of these exemptions was as follows. This information should not be regarded as precise: it was difficult to count exemptions because of wide variations in the definitions used.

Figure 3: Probability of exemption existing




Question 4: Administrative barriers

| | Neither | A or B | A and B |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p>Administrative discretion and documentation for legal migrants</p> <p>A. Administrative demands for documents which may be difficult for migrants to produce.</p> <p>B. Coverage for migrants may depend on decisions with uncertain outcome.</p> | <p>15</p> <p>AT, BE, HR, FI, FR, DE, IS, NL, NO, PL, SK, SE, CH, TR, BH</p> | <p>12</p> <p>Only A (8): BG, CZ, GR, HU, IT, LT, LU, RO</p> <p>Only B (4): DK, IE, LV, MT</p> | <p>7</p> <p>CY, EE, PT, SI, ES, UK, MK</p> |
| <p>4</p> <p><i>Examples of A:</i> proof of low income on the basis of tax returns; identity documents available only from the police; proof of address from local authority records.</p> <p><i>Examples of B:</i> Decisions made by administrators (receptionists, managers or committees), health workers making clinical judgements about criteria for entitlement such as "urgency", financial departments deciding how rigorously to pursue unpaid bills, etc.</p> | | | |

Figure 4 shows the score for each country that results from aggregating legal entitlements and [absence of] administrative barriers to obtaining entitlement (negative). The coloured part of the line shows the portion of the score that is due to legal entitlements (Question 1); the grey part shows the portion due to the absence of barriers (Question 4). A country can only score 100 per cent if there are full entitlements and no administrative barriers.

Figure 4: Entitlement score for legal migrants



Key to colours:

- Blue: EU15 countries
- Purple: EFTA countries
- Green: Post-2000 accession countries
- Yellow: EU neighbour countries
- Red: Non-European countries

The four traditional countries of immigration have been included in this graph for purposes of comparison. We may note first the contrast between most EU15 countries (blue) and most post-2000 accession countries (green). Outliers in a downward direction are the United Kingdom, Spain and Portugal. The latter two countries previously had universal coverage, but introduced new conditions and barriers in 2011 and 2012 in the context of “austerity” measures. The United Kingdom had an even longer tradition of universal coverage, but severe restrictions were imposed on third-country nationals in the 2014 Immigration Act. Outliers in an upward direction are Poland and Croatia, which have the best coverage of all the recent accession countries.

Second, we can observe that three of the four traditional countries of immigration – Australia, Canada and New Zealand – offer levels of entitlement to legal migrants that are comparable with those in most EU15 countries. The United States, on the other hand, offers less – and prior to the 2010 Affordable

Care Act, coverage for migrants was even more incomplete. Even now, during their first five years of residence, migrants lose their State health insurance if they become unemployed; there are also serious administrative barriers.

Lastly, it is worth noting that two “neighbour” countries – the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey – despite the fact that they have low GDPs and are not in the EU, nevertheless have scores that are comparable with those in EU15/EFTA countries. In both countries, a drive towards universal coverage has taken place.

Conclusions

The *EC Report on Health Inequalities in the European Union, 9/2013*,²² p. 9, states:

“... since 2009, the EU has extended the right of migrants to **equal treatment in social security, including health care, to all third-country nationals** who apply to reside in or have been admitted to a Member State for the purpose of work, or who have been admitted for other purposes but are allowed to work and hold a residence permit” [our emphasis].

However, the Single Permit Directive to which this source refers does not apply to health care, only to sickness benefits (payments made to a person incapacitated by illness). This directive only concerns third-country nationals moving from one EU country to another; in any case, its provisions have only to a limited extent been implemented.

Our findings show that in reality, there are wide disparities between EU/EFTA countries regarding entitlements to health care for legally residing third-country nationals. Unconditional inclusion without administrative barriers (i.e. an overall score of 100) is only found in six countries: France, Sweden, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Belgium and Germany. In post-2000 accession countries, as well as some EU15 ones such as Portugal, the United Kingdom, Spain and Ireland, policies tend to be highly inequitable. This can be because entitlement depends on long-term residence and/or employment, or because of administrative barriers, such as discretionary judgements and/or documentation that is difficult for migrants to obtain.

The conclusion from these findings is that although concern about migrants' entitlements has up to now been mainly focused on UDMs, exclusion and unfair costs are also suffered by migrants whose presence is entirely legal.

Asylum seekers

International legal requirements

In principle, the health-care entitlements of asylum seekers should be more uniform than those of other (legal) migrants because they are linked to international treaties and EU directives. However, on closer examination, the requirements are in many respects unspecific, which probably accounts for the fact that in reality, entitlements vary greatly between countries.

Requirements for the treatment of refugees were laid down by the 1951 Geneva Convention, but no distinction was made between asylum seekers and those who have been awarded protected status. Moreover, the Convention contained no clear provisions concerning health care. Article 24 conferred on “refugees lawfully staying in the territory” the right to “the same treatment as is accorded to nationals” in respect of social security – but it is unclear whether social security should include health care in addition to sickness and disability benefits.

By contrast, the 2003 EU *Minimum standards on the reception of applicants for asylum in Member States*, which were updated and expanded in 2008, apply explicitly to health care and to asylum seekers. The “recast” version of 2008 contains quite extensive provisions:

- Material reception conditions must provide a standard of living that protects asylum seekers’ physical and mental health (Art. 17).
- Asylum seekers must be told where they can get information on health care, in a language they are reasonably supposed to understand (Art. 5).
- They must receive the necessary health care that shall include, at least, emergency care and essential treatment of illness or mental disorders. Those with special needs must receive medical or other assistance, including appropriate mental health care when needed, under the same conditions as nationals (Art. 19).
- Even when material reception conditions are reduced or withdrawn, asylum seekers must have access to subsistence, emergency health care and essential treatment of illness or mental disorder (Art. 20).
- Vulnerable persons, such as minors, unaccompanied minors, disabled people, elderly people, pregnant women, single parents with minor children, victims of trafficking, persons with mental health problems and persons who have been subjected to torture, rape or other serious forms

of psychological, physical or sexual violence, shall always be considered as persons with special needs in the national legislation implementing the provisions of Chapter II relating to material reception conditions and health care (Art. 21).

- Minors who have been victims of any form of abuse, neglect, exploitation, torture or cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment, or who have suffered from armed conflicts, must have access to rehabilitation services. Appropriate mental health care must be developed and qualified counselling provided when needed (Art. 22).
- The detention of a person with special needs can only take place if a qualified professional certifies that their health, including their mental health, and well-being, will not significantly deteriorate as a result of the detention (Art. 11).
- Provision of health care can be made conditional on having insufficient means; a contribution can be required from asylum seekers who have sufficient resources; contributions can be demanded retrospectively if it only appears later that the asylum seeker had sufficient resources (Art. 17).

Provision of health services

MIPEX measures “inclusion in a system of health care coverage”, but the system concerned does not have to be the same as that used by nationals: what matters is its equity. Indeed, health services for asylum seekers are not always provided within the mainstream health system. Both the organization of services and the way they are funded may be wholly or partly separate from the mainstream.

In some countries (e.g. the Netherlands or the United Kingdom), there has been a shift from specialized (“categorical”) services for asylum seekers to mainstream (“regular”) ones, especially in the field of mental health. To some extent, this has taken place for reasons of administrative streamlining, but it has also been supported by the realization that the health needs of asylum seekers overlap to a large extent with those of the general population (Kramer, 2009). This overlap concerns both the type of conditions that need to be treated and the manner of service delivery. Previously, it was widely assumed that asylum seekers require more expertise concerning imported infectious diseases and post-traumatic stress disorder than was available in mainstream services; today, both of these conditions are also considered to be mainstream

problems. Concerning cultural competence, increasing diversity in the general population makes such skills necessary for any health worker. Despite this, however, it remains possible that specialized services for asylum seekers can draw on experience that enables them to respond better to the special needs of this group than mainstream ones.

Funding mechanisms. Exempting asylum seekers from normal contributions to the health system can be done in different ways. Separately organized primary care facilities in the centres are available free of charge. When asylum seekers use mainstream services, they can be registered in the national system of coverage without having to pay contributions or taxes: for example, they can be given the same health card as other users. In both types of system (NHS and SHI), they may also be granted exemption from OOP charges, which nationals have to pay.

We may note in passing that although most asylum seekers pay no income tax, they are liable for sales tax (VAT). Like all migrants, in every country they contribute in this way towards the costs of the health system, though the burden involved is relatively slight and applies to everybody else as well.

Most countries do not allow asylum seekers to undertake paid work. However, in the small number of countries that do, they may then be required to pay income tax and/or health insurance contributions. We have not examined this issue because it seems unlikely that inequities will arise as a result of it. Indeed, it would arguably create inequities for everyone else if asylum seekers were allowed to earn money without being subject to the usual deductions; this would amount to higher pay for the same work.

Although there are nine countries that grant asylum seekers unconditional entitlement to the same range of services as nationals, other countries impose two kinds of limitation. First, some treatments may be omitted from the standard package of services available; second, asylum seekers may under certain conditions be granted even less coverage. On the positive side, when restrictions exist, there may be exemptions from them for certain conditions regarded as a public health threat, or for certain groups regarded as vulnerable. Finally, there may be administrative barriers that prevent the asylum seeker from enjoying the entitlements that the law provides; documentation may be required, which is difficult to get hold of, and discretionary judgements may be made that limit access in unpredictable ways.

Through the combination of all these factors, there are large variations between countries in the coverage offered. It is difficult to decide when countries meet the requirements of the European Union’s Minimum Standards – a level that is “adequate for health and well-being” – because of the inherent vagueness of these requirements; but it is clear that asylum seekers are much better cared for in some countries than in others.

Inclusion in health system and services covered

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|--------------------|
| 2a | Asylum seekers: conditions for inclusion in a system of health-care coverage | A | B | C |
| | A. Inclusion is unconditional. B. Some conditions for inclusion. C. No inclusion (costs must be paid in full by the user or by a commercial insurance policy). Please specify any conditions for obtaining health care coverage, such as length of stay, residing in a State facility, etc. (Ignore the conditions which have to be satisfied in order to be classed as a "migrant" rather than a "visitor".) | 16 BE, FR, IT, LU, NL, NO, ES, UK, DK, MK, IS, RO, SE, CH, HR, DE | 18 AT, BG, BH, CY, CZ, EE, FI, GR, HU, IE, LT, LV, MT, PL, PT, SI, SK, TR | 0 |
| 2b | Asylum seekers: extent of coverage | A | B | C |
| | A. Same coverage as nationals. B. More than emergency care, but less than for nationals. C. Emergency care only (or none if no inclusion). | 15 FR, TR, GR, AT, CZ, IE, IT, LU, NL, NO, ES, BG, HU, UK, EE | 17 BE, DK, MK, IS, RO, SE, CH, BH, CY, FI, LV, LT, MT, PL, PT, SK, SI | 2 HR, DE |

The responses to these questions are cross-tabulated in the following table:

Table 3: Cross-tabulation of conditions and extent of coverage for asylum seekers

| | | 2a. Conditions of coverage | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|---|------------------|
| | | 1 – Unconditional | 2 – Some conditions | 3 – No inclusion |
| 2b Extent of coverage | 1 – Same as nationals | 7 FR, IT, LU, NL, NO, ES, UK | 8 AT, BG, CZ, EE, GR, HU, IE, TR | 0 |
| | 2 – Less than nationals, more than emergency care | 7 BE, DK, CH, MK, IS, RO, SE | 10 BH, CY, FI, LT, LV, MT, PL, PT, SK, SI | 0 |
| | 3 – Emergency care only | 2 HR, DE | 0 | 0 |

Question 2a: Conditions of coverage

The different kinds of conditions that may determine entitlement are shown in the following table. Countries that acceded to the EU since 2000 are set in italics: we can see that they tend to impose more conditions.

Table 4: Conditions for inclusion in the national system of health-care coverage

| | No. | Countries |
|----------------------------|-----|---|
| Unconditional inclusion | 16 | BE, FR, IT, LU, NL, NO, ES, UK, DK, MK, IS, <i>RO, SE, CH, HR, DE</i> |
| Must remain in centre | 8 | <i>AT^a, BG, BH, EE, IE^a, FI, LT, SK</i> |
| Means test | 7 | <i>CY, CZ, GR, HU, MT, IE, PT</i> |
| Care in selected locations | 3 | <i>LV, PL, PT</i> |

Note: ^a Full coverage only available if asylum seeker remains in “designated area of residence” (Austria) or “direct provision” (Ireland).

It is possible that a means test is applied in more countries than those listed here. Discretionary judgements play a large role in the access to care for asylum seekers, so it might be the case that the asylum seeker’s financial situation is taken into account in these judgements.

Other conditions

Bulgaria: Asylum seekers must first register in the National Health Insurance System and find a General Practitioner (GP), which is sometimes difficult.

Turkey: Full coverage is available for Syrian asylum seekers both inside and outside the camps, but for other asylum seekers, coverage outside the camps is more limited.

Question 2b: Limitations on the basket of services provided

Fifteen countries grant the same range of services to asylum seekers as to national citizens, while 17 provide coverage that goes beyond emergency care but is less than the complete package and 2 provide emergency care only.

A wide range of terms is used to describe the services that can be used. At the restrictive end of the scale (e.g. in Finland, Iceland, Romania, Sweden and Slovenia), terms such as “urgent”, “life-threatening” and “essential” are used; this comes close to the criterion of emergency care. In many countries, the care must be necessary or appropriate in the view of the service provider or relevant authority, without further specification of what precisely is meant (e.g. Bosnia

and Herzegovina, Switzerland, Cyprus, Lithuania, Latvia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Malta, Portugal, Romania and Slovakia). At the more generous end of the scale, there are countries (e.g. Denmark, the Netherlands and Poland) that cover the full package of basic health care available to national citizens, excluding only a handful of treatments that are regarded as not being strictly necessary in medical terms (for example in vitro fertilization, cochlear implants, gender reassignment operations) or considered to be of uncertain medical value (chiropractic care, long courses of physiotherapy, sanatorium and spa therapy).

Emergency care

Two countries (Germany and Croatia) limit entitlement to emergency care, though exemptions from this restriction are granted for certain conditions regarded as a public health threat and for groups regarded as vulnerable. Cyprus requires asylum seekers to access treatment via emergency departments, but this does not mean that only emergency treatment can be given. (It is quite common in many countries for non-urgent conditions to be treated in emergency departments, especially when other pathways to care are problematic.)

The case of Germany is particularly worth examining because this country has recently received the largest numbers of asylum seekers in Europe. German law makes a sharp distinction between asylum seekers who have been in the procedure for a longer or shorter period than 15 months. A procedure lasting more than 15 months should only be necessary to decide the most complicated cases; we have therefore decided to consider the rules that apply in the first 15 months, because they will apply to the vast majority of asylum seekers.

In Germany, we have coded entitlement as “unconditional” because all asylum seekers are subject to the same policy during this period. Regarding the basket of services covered, only in case of acute pain and illness do they have access to necessary medical and dental treatments. Aside from this emergency care, they are granted access to vaccinations, and pregnant women are provided with maternal care. However, chronic illnesses (such as high blood pressure or diabetes) and mental health problems are only covered exceptionally in acute cases and even then, only after special authorization has been obtained.

Question 2c: Special exemptions from restrictions

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---------------|
| 2c | Asylum seekers: special exemptions | Three or more exemptions | One or two exemptions | No exemptions |
| | A. Antenatal and/or perinatal and/or postnatal care. | 14 | 12 | 2 |
| | B. Infectious disease (e.g. TB, HIV/AIDS). | | | |
| | C. Care for minors (or for unaccompanied minors if other minors are covered). | BG, EE, GR, TR, BE, DK, RO, SE, CY, FI, PT, SI, CA, HR | AT, BG, CY, CZ, NZ, RO, DE, GR, IE, LT, SI, US | MT, SK |
| | D. Care for vulnerable groups (e.g. victims of torture, trafficking or traumatization). | | | |
| | E. Other (specify). | | | |
| Score Option 1 if full coverage for this group is granted anyway (Option 1 in 2a and 2b). | | | | |

We have not attempted to tabulate these exemptions as was done for legal migrants, because legislation does not always make clear whether the exemption applies to other groups. Where this is unclear, this indicator is less reliable.


Question 5: Administrative barriers

Most of these barriers concern administrative discretion: this is found in 26 countries, compared with 12 countries in the case of legal migrants (difference significant at $p < .003$ by Fisher's Exact Test, two-tailed). Where asylum seekers are concerned, it seems that countries want to be able to exercise a considerable degree of discretion regarding the treatments that are allowed and the asylum seekers who may receive them.

| | | | | |
|---|--|----------------------------|---|--|
| 5 | Administrative discretion and documentation for asylum seekers | Neither | A or B | A and B |
| | A. Administrative demands for documents which may be difficult for migrants to produce. | 7 | 17 | 10 |
| | B. Coverage for migrants may depend on decisions with uncertain outcome. | | A (3) | HR, CY, EE, DE, LV, LT, MT, PT, SI, UK |
| | <i>Examples of A:</i> proof of low income on the basis of tax returns; identity documents available only from the police; proof of address from local authority records. | AT, FR, GR, PL, RO, SK, TR | IT, NO, ES | |
| | <i>Examples of B:</i> Decisions made by administrators (receptionists, managers or committees), health workers making clinical judgements about criteria for entitlement such as "urgency", financial departments deciding how rigorously to pursue unpaid bills, etc. | | B (14) BE, BH, BG, CH, CZ, DK, FI, MK, HU, IS, IE, LU, NL, SE | |
| | | | | |

Finally, we present a table of the summed scores (positive entitlements – coloured; freedom from barriers – grey) for all countries. The reader is reminded that no attempt has been made to give different weights to different restrictions or concessions, and the same total score can be arrived at in different ways. The total scores should only be regarded as a rough-and-ready estimate of the generosity or restrictiveness of entitlements for asylum seekers.

Figure 5: Entitlement score for asylum seekers



Key to colours:

- Blue: EU15 countries
- Purple: EFTA countries
- Green: Post-2000 accession countries
- Yellow: EU neighbour countries
- Red: Non-European countries
- Grey refers to (freedom from) administrative barriers.

As with legal migrants, we see that there is a predominance of EU15 countries at the top end of the scale and post-2000 accession countries at the bottom. This is disappointing, because if the entitlements of asylum seekers are subject to international standards, they should be less strongly linked to differences in wealth and the other factors that distinguish post-2000 accession countries from the EU15. (It should be remembered that scores represent not the absolute standard of health-care provisions, but the discrepancy between provisions for nationals and those for asylum seekers.) Romania, the Czech Republic and

Poland stand out for their equitable treatment of asylum seekers, and the United Kingdom, Portugal and Germany for their restrictive policies.

Among EU neighbour countries, Turkey gives remarkably complete coverage (especially to Syrian asylum seekers), though there have been some critical reports about the actual availability of care. The negative effect of recent policy changes is clearly visible in Canada and Australia, though in Canada change for the better is currently expected.

Has the European Union's minimum standards directive achieved harmonization of health policies affecting asylum seekers? Although there are countries that have still not transposed it into national legislation, it is of course only a "minimum" standard, requiring only the provision of emergency care and essential treatment. A more appropriate standard would emphasize primary care, which human rights and public health principles (as well as cost-benefit considerations; see Bozorgmehr and Razum, 2015, and IOM, 2016) regard as having crucial importance.

Undocumented migrants

Access to health care for UDMs – in particular their limited legal entitlements, the great variations in the way they are applied, and the many administrative barriers – is currently an issue of great concern. The MIPEX study confirms that UDMs almost everywhere have a very low level of entitlement. Indeed, it was a challenge to develop a scoring system that would make it possible to use the same three-point scales with both UDMs and legal migrants. If the items discriminated well at the top of the scale, they did not do so at the bottom, and vice versa. (The problem was eventually solved by dividing different components of legal entitlement into the three indicators used in questions 1, 2 and 3.)

One major political problem and two technical ones seem to stand in the way of improvements to the entitlements of UDMs. The political problem is that many countries severely limit entitlements in the hope of encouraging UDMs to leave the country and deterring others from coming ("internal migration control", see WHO, 2013:107). The protection of health is often subordinated to this motive. But there also technical problems:

1. Incorporating UDMs in the mainstream health system can jeopardize their confidentiality and thus, their security. To give good care, their address and medical records must be available to other health workers. Only then is continuity of care and integrated service delivery possible. However, for UDMs, it is risky to be too easily traceable, as long as the possibility exists that information from health services can be passed on to immigration authorities.

2. Belgium and France operate separate systems for UDMs, perhaps in order to bypass the problems of integrating them in the mainstream. However, the Belgium system in particular is cumbersome and inefficient (Roberfroid et al., 2015).
3. There is a risk of creating inequities for all other groups in society if health care for one group of migrants is made completely free. Nationals are usually obliged to pay contributions to the national system through insurance premiums and/or income tax. In the case of asylum seekers, it is generally accepted that they will not be able to pay, especially where they are forbidden to work. Free health care for asylum seekers with insufficient means is generally accepted as equitable. For UDMs, however, the equity problem remains a thorny issue. Most countries operate a “means test” for them; some have introduced charges (usually relatively low ones).

Many countries detain UDMs. In those cases, the above problems do not apply; health care in detention is different from that available to UDMs living in the community. In principle, it can be more accessible and offer better continuity, but provisions vary greatly between countries (see the forthcoming Country Reports).

Inclusion in health system and services covered

Fifteen countries limit the coverage available to UDMs to “emergency care” (apart from special exemptions that may be available for certain groups and conditions).²³ However, the precise definition of an “emergency” and the conditions under which it is covered vary greatly. The MIPEX instrument allows us to distinguish the following three situations:

- a. Coverage of emergency care available for all UDMs (unconditional inclusion);
- b. Coverage of emergency care available only for UDMs who are unable to pay the bill, or coverage on payment of a nominal out-of-pocket charge (conditional inclusion);
- c. Emergency care provided, but it must always be paid for afterwards (no inclusion in the system of coverage). In some cases, a UDM who cannot pay will not be forced to do so, but this must be governed by explicit rules. Letting people off their bills on an arbitrary discretionary basis does not count as “coverage”.

These distinctions have not always been observed in previous reports, but they are very important to migrants in practice.

| | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|---|
| 3a | Undocumented migrants: conditions for inclusion in a system of health-care coverage A. Inclusion is unconditional. B. Some conditions for inclusion. C. No inclusion (costs must be paid in full by the user or by a commercial insurance policy). Please specify any conditions for obtaining health-care coverage, such as length of stay, residing in a State facility, etc. (Ignore the conditions which have to be satisfied in order to be classed as a "migrant" rather than a "visitor".) | A 11 AT, EE, FI, DE, GR, IT, LT, RO, SI, SE, SK | B 16 BE, BH, HR, CY, DK, FR, HU, IS, IE, LU, MT, NL, PT, ES, CH, UK | C 7 BG, CZ, LV, MK, NO, PL, TR |
| | 3b | Undocumented migrants: extent of coverage A. Same coverage as nationals. B. More than emergency care, but less than for nationals. C. Emergency care only (or none if no inclusion). | A 5 BE, CH, FR, LU, NL | B 7 DK, ES, IE, IT, MT, RO, SE |

The answers to questions 3a and 3b are cross-tabulated in the following table:

Table 5: Cross-tabulation of conditions and extent of coverage for undocumented migrants

| | | 3a Conditions of coverage | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 – Unconditional | 2 – Some conditions | 3 – No inclusion |
| 3b Extent of coverage | 1 – Same as nationals | 0 | 5 BE, CH, FR, LU, NL | 0 |
| | 2 – Less than nationals, more than emergency care | 3 IT, RO, SE | 4 DK, ES, IE, MT | 0 |
| | 3 – Emergency care only | 8 AT, EE, FI, GR, DE, LT, SI, SK | 7 BH, HR, CY, HU, IS, PT, UK | 7 BG, CZ, MK, LV, NO, PL, TR |

The bottom row of table 5 corresponds to the situations a, b and c described in the previous paragraph. It can be noted that seven countries allow emergency care but insist that it must be paid for.

Question 3a: Conditions of coverage

The different conditions that may be imposed on coverage are summarized below:

Table 6: Conditions for inclusion in the national system of health-care coverage

| | No. | Countries |
|--|-----|--|
| Unconditional inclusion (if only for emergency care) | 11 | AT, EE, FI, DE, IT, LT, RO, SI, SK, SE, GR |
| Inability to pay own medical bills | 11 | BE, BH, HR, DK, FR, HU, IS, IE, NL, PT, UK |
| Must join SHI and pay premiums | 2 | CH, LU |
| Must have resided longer than three months | 2 | FR, PT |
| Payment of EUR 10 per consultation | 1 | CY |

Question 3b: Limitations on the basket of services provided

Apart from the special exemptions described in question 3c, 7 countries do not even cover emergency care. Fifteen provide (conditional or unconditional) coverage for it, 7 cover more than emergency care, while 5 cover all services.

- *Emergency care* is defined in various ways. For example, in Cyprus, it refers to care obtained at an emergency department (which, as we saw in the case of legal migrants, may not necessarily be acute or life-saving). In Norway, it refers to emergency treatment and “absolutely essential medical assistance, defined as health care that cannot be delayed for more than 3 weeks without endangering life, risk of permanent, severe loss of function, serious injury or strong pain”.
- *More than emergency care, but less than full coverage* includes further care after an emergency admission in Denmark, “essential care” (in practice interpreted as emergency care, but in principle broader) in Ireland, and “urgent and essential” care in Italy, defined as follows:
 - **Urgent care** means the treatments that cannot be delayed without endangering the lives or causing damage to the health of individuals.
 - **Essential care** means the health-care, diagnostic and therapeutic services relating to pathologies that are not dangerous immediately and in the short term, but that over the time might determine a higher risk for human health or lives (complications, chronic conditions or worsening).

- Furthermore, the principle of the continuity of urgent and essential care was reaffirmed, in the sense of providing patients with a complete therapeutic and rehabilitative cycle relating to the possible elimination of the disease.

In Spain, the basket of services allowed to UDMs varies between regions and service providers, while in Malta coverage is at the discretion of the service provider. In Romania, UDMs may access “family medicine, family planning and consultations for serious diseases”, while in Sweden only “care that cannot be postponed” is provided.

- *Same as nationals* includes the basket of services regarded as necessary for national citizens (i.e. not requiring supplementary insurance), although there may be some relatively minor limitations. In Switzerland and Luxembourg, UDMs are included in the national SHI system and enjoy the standard coverage. In France, in vitro fertilization and some prostheses are excluded, while in the Netherlands, care for a UDM who is about to be deported can be confined to that which is immediately necessary. In Belgium, the name of the system for UDMs refers to Urgent Medical Aid, but in reality, coverage is not confined to urgent cases and can include the full range of services available to nationals. (In some cases, such as treatment of trafficked persons, it may include even more.) However, in Belgium, all coverage is at the discretion of a physician.

We see from the above that countries have exercised great creativity in the definition of coverage for UDMs, but the definitions remain elastic and urgently in need of harmonization. The unpredictability of coverage can be a serious barrier to making use of it, because UDMs accessing health care run the risk of being saddled with potentially catastrophic health costs if they make a wrong estimate of their eligibility for coverage.

Question 3c: Special exemptions from restrictions

| | Undocumented migrants: special exemptions | Three or more exemptions | One or two exemptions | No exemptions |
|----|---|--|--|---------------|
| 3c | A. Antenatal and/or perinatal and/or postnatal care. | | | |
| | B. Infectious disease (e.g. TB, HIV/AIDS). | | | |
| | C. Care for minors (or for unaccompanied minors if other minors are covered). | 15 | 16 | 3 |
| | D. Care for vulnerable groups (e.g. victims of torture, trafficking or traumatization). | BE, BG, CY, DK, EE, ES, GR, HR, IT, NO, PT, RO, SE, SI, UK | AT, BH, CZ, DE, FI, FR, HU, IE, IS, LT, LU, LV, MK, NL, PL, TR | MT, CH, SK |
| | E. Other (specify). | | | |
| | Score Option 1 if full coverage for this group is granted anyway (Option 1 in 3a and 3b). | | | |

These exemptions refer to conditions in which restrictions are suspended on humanitarian or public health grounds. We have not given a breakdown of the frequencies of different exemptions because definitions are variable and legislation is often unclear about whether an exemption applies to UDMs.

Question 6: Administrative barriers

| | Administrative discretion and documentation for undocumented migrants | Neither | A or B | A and B |
|---|--|------------------------|--|---|
| 5 | <p>A. Administrative demands for documents which may be difficult for migrants to produce.</p> <p>B. Coverage for migrants may depend on decisions with uncertain outcome.</p> <p><i>Examples of A:</i> Proof of low income on the basis of tax returns; identity documents available only from the police; proof of address from local authority records.</p> <p><i>Examples of B:</i> Decisions made by administrators (receptionists, managers or committees), health workers making clinical judgements about criteria for entitlement such as "urgency", financial departments deciding how rigorously to pursue unpaid bills, etc.</p> | <p>1 CH</p> | <p>13 A (3): FR, LU, TR</p> <p>B (10): CY, CZ, GR, HU, IS, IT, NL, NO, PL, SE</p> | <p>20 AT, BE, BH, BG, HR, DK, EE, FI, MK, DE, IE, LV, LT, MT, PT, RO, SK, SI, ES, UK</p> |


These barriers are significantly more frequent for UDMs than for asylum seekers or legal migrants (see Figure 7).

- A. Documents required to obtain health-care coverage vary greatly, and it is not always easy to estimate how difficult they will be for UDMs to provide. At one extreme, Croatia and Latvia require the UDM to present an official ID, which in Croatia can only be obtained from the police. In Latvia, the Government's view is that this should encourage UDMs to register with State authorities (which often means detention). Since 2011, UDMs in Portugal have to prove their "financial need" (and that of all family members) using documents that they are very unlikely to possess. At the other end of the scale, the requirement to provide an address may simply be intended to make follow-up care possible, though for a UDM, it is always potentially dangerous to reveal where they live. Moreover, health systems today are increasingly automated, and access without an electronic health card can present a substantial barrier.

- B. Discretion most often concerns a clinical judgement about whether a situation constitutes an emergency (or a similar criterion). However, discretion may also enter into judgements about financial need. The predictability of coverage for UDMs is undermined by this sort of discretionary judgement in no less than 30 out of 34 countries (88%). In the Netherlands, the care allowed is (in theory) not subject to discretionary judgements, because all care belonging to the basic package is allowed; here, the administrative discretion concerns the amount of effort that a service provider puts into chasing up unpaid bills.

Figure 6 shows scores for UDMs on section A for all 38 countries. It can be seen that scores are much lower than those of legal migrants (on average, only half). There is also an extremely wide range of values: from 8 in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Latvia, to 75 in Switzerland. As with the other categories of migrant, EU15 countries usually give more generous entitlements than post-2000 accession countries. Positive exceptions to this rule are Cyprus, Romania and Hungary; negative ones are the United Kingdom, Portugal, Germany, Finland and Austria. There are wide variations in the traditional countries of immigration, with very low scores for the United States.

Figure 6: Entitlement score for undocumented migrants




Key to colours:

- Blue: EU15 countries
- Purple: EFTA countries
- Green: Post-2000 accession countries
- Yellow: EU neighbour countries
- Red: Non-European countries

Results for all groups

Figure 7 shows that administrative barriers make a major contribution to the drop in entitlement scores across categories of migrants. For UDMs, the problem lies just as much in the higher administrative barriers as in the lower legal entitlements.


Figure 7: Contribution of legal entitlements and administrative barriers to scores on section A (Entitlement) for three groups of migrants



Average of all groups

It makes sense to average entitlements for all groups because there is a degree of intercorrelation between the scores of legal migrants, asylum seekers and UDMs (Cronbach's alpha = .61). As discussed in section E, however, there is no particular reason why the scores for the three groups should be given equal weight in calculating the average.

Figure 8: Entitlement score – average of all groups



Key to colours:

- Blue: EU15 countries
- Purple: EFTA countries
- Green: Post-2000 accession countries
- Yellow: EU neighbour countries
- Red: Non-European countries

3.2. Policies to facilitate access

In contrast to section A, scores on other sections are not presented separately for the three migrant groups. Some differences between groups in levels of provision were noted, which will be described below, but after experimenting with separate scores for section B, it was decided that a single score would suffice. This is because scores for the three groups were quite strongly intercorrelated: a country with a high score for legal migrants on section B tended also to have a high score for asylum seekers or UDMs (Cronbach’s alpha = .86). Whether combined or separate scores were used had little effect on a country’s rank on section B.

Nevertheless, it should be borne in mind that the level of information provision for UDMs (questions 8 and 9) is not as good as it is for legal migrants, although for asylum seekers, it is at least as good if not better. It should also be noted that it is difficult to give accurate separate scores on provision of information, because information intended for legal migrants (e.g. on websites)

may also be read by UDMs. UDMs are also slightly less well provided with intercultural mediators than the other two groups. The advantage of separate scores is that question 12 on reporting on UDMs is not included in the section total for other migrants. However, since question 12 has a reasonable item-total correlation with the rest of section B (.40), this is not likely to distort total scores to a significant extent.

Scores on individual questions

Since it has been frequently reported by other studies that service providers appear to be badly informed about migrants' entitlements to care, question 7 addressed this issue.

| | Information for service providers about migrants' entitlements | Both A and B | Only one of these (please specify) | Neither |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| 7 | <p>A. Service provider organizations receive up-to-date information on migrants' entitlements.</p> <p>B. Organizations pass on up-to-date information about these entitlements to their employees.</p> | <p>4 BH, FI, MK HU</p> | <p>16 BE, HR, CY, CZ, EE, FR, GR, IT, NL, NO, PT, RO, ES, SE, CH, UK</p> | <p>13 BG, DK, DE, IS, IE, LV, LT, LU, MT, PL, SK, SI, TR</p> |


When only one answer was checked, it was usually because information was available to service providers but not systematically passed on to employees. Only four countries were regarded as satisfying both conditions, so it is clear that improved policies are badly needed.

Question 8 examined the provision of information about entitlements for migrants:

| | Information for migrants concerning entitlements and use of health services | More than one of these (specify) | One of these (specify) | None of these |
|----|---|---|---|------------------------|
| 8a | <p>Method of dissemination</p> <p>A. Websites.</p> <p>B. Brochures in public places.</p> <p>C. One-stop shops.</p> <p>D. Classes or individual instruction.</p> <p>E. Other (specify).</p> | <p>22 AT, BE, CH, ES, FR, IE, IS, PT, SI, CY, MT, NO, RO, SE, BH, CZ, EE, LU, LV, PL, TR, NL</p> | <p>11 IT, FI, GR, SK, DE, DK, HR, LT, UK, BG, MK</p> | <p>1 HU</p> |

Only Hungary appears not to provide any information for migrants about their entitlements. Figure 9 shows the relative popularity of different methods (i.e. the probability that a country will use them).

Figure 9: Methods of disseminating information



The next table speaks for itself:

| 8b | Number of languages in which information for migrants concerning entitlements and use of health services is available (not including the official languages of the country or English) | Four or more languages (specify) | One to three languages (specify) | None |
|----|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | <p>22</p> <p>AT, BE, CH, CY, DK, ES, FI, FR, GR, HR, IE, IS, IT, MT, NO, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI, SK, UK</p> | <p>8</p> <p>BG, CZ, DE, EE, LT, LU, LV, TR</p> | <p>4</p> <p>BH, HU, MK, NL</p> |

Lastly, question 8c looks at the provision of information about entitlements to different groups of migrants.

| 8c | Groups reached by information for migrants on entitlements and use of health services A. Legal migrants. B. Asylum seekers. C. Undocumented migrants. <i>Skip this question if answered Option 3 to question 8a.</i> | All three groups | Only two groups (please specify) | Only one group (please specify) |
|----|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>10</p> <p>BE, BH, CH, ES, FR, IE, IS, IT, PT, SI</p> | <p>18</p> <p>AT, CY, CZ, DE, EE, FI, GR, LT, LU, LV, MK, MT, NL, NO, RO, SE, SK, TR</p> | <p>5</p> <p>BG, DK, HR, PL, UK</p> |

The following table shows the number of countries providing information for each group.

Table 7: Number of countries providing information for each group of migrants

| Group | Number |
|----------------|--------|
| Legal migrants | 27 |
| Asylum seekers | 29 |
| UDMs | 13 |

We see that UDMs are less than half as often targeted as the other two groups.

Question 9 has exactly the same structure, but investigates health education and health promotion. Later, it was discovered through factor analysis that this question would have been equally at home in section C on the responsiveness of health services, but it has been left here (see section 4.1 of this report).

| | Health education and health promotion for migrants Method of dissemination | More than one of these (specify) | One of these (specify) | None of these |
|----|---|---|---|--|
| 9a | A. Websites. B. Brochures in public places. C. One-stop shops. D. Classes or individual instruction. E. Other (specify). (Please mention in the Comments box whether content is adapted to take account of cultural differences, and if so how.) | 13 AT, BE, CH, DK, FI, IE, IS, LU, MT, PT, RO, SE, TR | 14 BG, BH, CY, DE, EE, ES, FR, IT, LT, NL, NO, PL, SK, UK | 7 CZ, GR, HR, HU, LV, MK, SI |

Health education and promotion are less often provided than information about entitlements, but the relative popularity of different methods of dissemination is roughly the same, so we have not reproduced the analysis reported above for question 8.

The next two sub-questions address the number of languages used and the migrant groups that are targeted:

| | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|---|
| 9b | Number of languages in which health education and health promotion are available (not including the official languages of the country or English) | Four or more languages (specify) 17 AT, BE, BH, CH, DK, ES, FI, FR, IE, IS, IT, MT, NO, PL, PT, SE, UK | One to three languages (specify) 8 BG, DE, EE, LT, LU, NL, RO, TR | None 9 CY, CZ, GR, HR, HU, LV, MK, SI, SK |
| 9c | Groups reached by health education and health promotion A. Legal migrants. B. Asylum seekers. C. Undocumented migrants. Skip this question if answered Option 3 to question 9a. | All three groups 13 AT, BH, CH, ES, FI, FR, IE, IS, IT, PT, SE, SK, UK | Only two groups (please specify) 10 BE, CY, DE, LT, LU, MT, NL, NO, RO, TR | Only one group (please specify) 4 BG, DK, EE, PL |

Seven countries offer no health education or health promotion. The number of countries providing it for each group (out of 34) is as follows:

Table 8: Number of countries providing health education or health promotion for each group of migrants

| Group | Number |
|----------------|--------|
| Legal migrants | 23 |
| Asylum seekers | 25 |
| UDMs | 5 |

| | | | | |
|------------|--|--|---|--|
| 11a | Provision of “cultural mediators” or “patient navigators” to facilitate access for migrants | Guaranteed across the system or in major immigrant areas 2 BE, IS | On a smaller or ad hoc basis 15 AT, BH, CH, CZ, DE, DK, FI, FR, IT, LT, LU, MT, NL, SE, SK | Not available 17 BG, CY, EE, ES, GR, HR, HU, IE, LV, MK, NO, PL, PT, RO, SI, TR, UK |
|------------|--|--|---|--|

Question 10 on practical barriers had to be dropped from the questionnaire (see Part D above). Question 11 concerns the use of “cultural mediators” or “patient navigators” to help migrants find the way to health care.

Cultural mediation seems to be used in only half of the 34 countries. It is not (or hardly ever) used in Denmark, Ireland, Romania, Norway, Sweden, Spain and Portugal, even though these countries score above the median on section B. In Spain and Portugal, this is due to cuts resulting from austerity measures.

The number of groups for which cultural mediators are provided is as follows:

| | Groups for which cultural mediators are provided | All three groups | Only two groups (please specify) | Only one group (please specify) |
|------------|---|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| 11b | A. Legal migrants. B. Asylum seekers. C. Undocumented migrants. Skip this question if answered Option 3 to question 11a. | 5 CH, FR IS, IT, LU | 10 AT, BE, BH, CZ, DE, LT, MT, NL, SE, SK | 2 DK, FI |

In terms of groups reached, the totals are as follows:

Table 9: Number of countries providing cultural mediators for each group of migrants


| Group | Number |
|----------------|--------|
| Legal migrants | 15 |
| Asylum seekers | 13 |
| UDMs | 9 |

Question 12 applies only to UDMs; the table speaks for itself. Legal deterrents for UDMs seeking medical help and health workers aiding them must be regarded as a serious matter, even where it is claimed that they are seldom or never used.

| | No obligation to report undocumented migrants | Explicitly forbidden in law and/or professional codes of conduct | No relevant legislation or professional codes of conduct | Explicitly required in law |
|------------|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| 12a | Are health-care professionals or organizations required to report undocumented migrants to the police or immigration authorities? | 10 CH, CZ, DK, ES, FR, IS, IT, NL, NO, PT | 18 AT, BE, BG, CY, EE, FI, MK, GR, HU, IE, LV, LT, LU, MT, PL, RO, SK, TR | 6 BH, HR, DE, SI, SE, UK |

| | | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|---|
| 12b | No sanctions against helping undocumented migrants | No legal sanctions or other pressures on professionals to deter them from helping migrants who cannot pay | Only organizational sanctions exist (organizations discourage carers from helping migrants who cannot pay) | Legal sanctions exist against helping undocumented migrants |
| | Are there legal or organizational sanctions against health-care professionals or organizations assisting undocumented migrants? | <p style="text-align: center;">23</p> AT, BG, BH, CH, CY, CZ, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, HU, IE, IS, IT, LV, MT, NO, PL, PT, RO, SE, SK | <p style="text-align: center;">7</p> BE, LT, LU, MK, NL, SI, UK | <p style="text-align: center;">4</p> DE, GR, HR, TR |

Figure 10: Scores on scale B (Accessibility)



Key to colours:

- Blue: EU15 countries
- Purple: EFTA countries
- Green: Post-2000 accession countries
- Yellow: EU neighbour countries
- Red: Non-European countries

Conclusion

As with entitlements, it is noticeable that the EU15 countries tend to score much better than post-2000 accession countries. The overall impression from this section is that there are serious gaps in information provision, not just to migrants but also to the service providers and health workers themselves. Relatively simple and inexpensive measures could make services much more accessible for migrants by disseminating up-to-date information about

entitlements, how and when to use health services, and how to look after one's own health. Although websites need to be made available in several different languages, they are an obvious way of disseminating this information to large numbers of migrants. The development of "apps" for mobile telephones is also a promising line of innovation.


3.3. Responsive health services

This section measures the extent to which health services are adapted to meet the special needs of migrants. This mainly involves tackling linguistic barriers and improving understanding between migrants and health workers. Question 13 deals with interpretation.

| | | | | |
|-----|--|--|---|---|
| 13a | <p>Availability of qualified interpretation services for patients with inadequate proficiency in the official language(s)</p> | <p>Interpreters are available free of charge to patients</p> <p>15 AT, BE, DK, FI, DE, IS, IE, IT, LU, NO, PT, ES, SE, CH, UK</p> | <p>Interpreters are available but patients must pay all (or a substantial part) of the costs</p> <p>5 CZ, FR, HU, MT, NL</p> | <p>No interpretation services available</p> <p>14 BH, BG, HR, CY, EE, MK, GR, LV, LT, PL, RO, SK, SI, TR</p> |
| 13b | <p>Methods used for interpretation</p> <p>A. Face-to-face. B. Telephone interpretation. C. Interpretation by video link. D. Credentialed volunteers. E. Employment of "cultural mediators". F. Employment of competent bilingual or multilingual staff.</p> | <p>Three or more methods are available (please specify)</p> <p>14 AT, BE, CH, CZ, DE, FI, IE, IT, LU, MT, NL, NO, SE, UK</p> | <p>One or two methods are available (please specify)</p> <p>6 DK, ES, FR, HU, IS, PT</p> | <p>None of these methods are available</p> <p>14 BG, BH, CY, EE, GR, HR, LT, LV, MK, PL, RO, SK, SI, TR</p> |

Only in 20 countries is interpretation offered, to any extent, as a matter of policy. Figure 11 shows the probability that a given method is used in these countries.

Figure 11: Methods of interpretation



Question 14 deals with requirements for “culturally competent” or “diversity-sensitive” services. Over half (19) of the countries in the sample have no such requirements; in none of the countries in this sample that have them are standards monitored by a relevant authority, as they are in Australia, New Zealand and the United States.

Question 15 shows that 15 countries have no provision for training staff in the necessary skills. This includes Bosnia and Herzegovina, Belgium, Iceland and Hungary, despite the existence of (local) standards or guidelines in these countries that staff are supposed to follow.


| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 14 | <p>Requirement for “culturally competent” or “diversity-sensitive” services</p> <p>Standards or guidelines require that health services take account of individual and family characteristics, experiences and situation, respect for different beliefs, religion, culture, competence in intercultural communication.</p> <p>A. Standards or guidelines exist on “culturally competent” or “diversity-sensitive” services.</p> <p>B. Compliance with these standards or guidelines is monitored by a relevant authority.</p> | <p>A and B</p> <p>0</p> | <p>Only A</p> <p>15 AT, BE, BH, CH, DE, DK, FI, HU, IE, IS, IT, MT, NL, RO, UK</p> | <p>Neither of these</p> <p>19 BG, CY, CZ, EE, ES, FR, GR, HR, LT, LU, LV, MK, NO, PL, PT, SE, SI, SK, TR</p> |
| 15 | <p>Training and education of health service staff</p> <p>Policies exist to support training of staff in providing services responsive to the needs of migrants.</p> <p>Training may be part of basic professional education and/or in-service professional development (please specify which).</p> | <p>At national level</p> <p>3 CH, NO, UK</p> | <p>At local or organizational level</p> <p>16 AT, CY, CZ, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, IE, IT, LU, MT, NL, PT, RO, SE</p> | <p>Neither of these</p> <p>15 BE, BG, BH, EE, GR, HR, HU, IS, LT, LV, MK, PL, SI, SK, TR</p> |

Question 16 concerns the involvement of migrants in health services. In today’s Europe, many health workers are themselves migrants; however, this question only concerns activities they carry out as a result of policies to increase migrant involvement. Just over half the countries surveyed do not involve migrants in such ways.

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|--|
| 16 | <p>Involvement of migrants in information provision, service design and delivery</p> <p>A. Migrants are involved in service delivery (e.g. through the employment of “cultural mediators”).</p> <p>B. Migrants are involved in the development and dissemination of information.</p> <p>C. Migrants are involved in research (not only as respondents).</p> <p>D. Migrant patients or ex-patients are involved in the evaluation, planning and running of services.</p> <p>E. Migrants in the community are involved in the design of services.</p> <p>Mention only forms of migrant involvement that are explicitly encouraged by policy measures (at any level).</p> | <p>Three to five of these (please specify)</p> <p>3 AT, IE, UK</p> | <p>One or two of these (please specify)</p> <p>13 CH, CZ, DE, DK, ES, FI, HU, IT, MT, NL, NO, RO, SE</p> | <p>None of these</p> <p>18 BE, BG, BH, CY, EE, FR, GR, HR, IS, LT, LU, LV, MK, PL, PT, SI, SK, TR</p> |
|----|---|---|---|--|

Figure 12 shows the probability, in the 16 countries that do involve migrants, of their being involved in different ways.

Figure 12: Involvement of migrants in health services



The answers to these questions can be compared with those to question 24b on migrants' contribution to health policymaking at national or regional level. There is a slight but significant correlation between the answers to these two questions.

Question 17 concerns measures to increase the diversity of the health service workforce. Only a quarter of the countries had such measures, and respondents were often unsure about the precise reasons for their existence.

| | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|--|---|
| 17 | <p>Encouraging diversity in the health service workforce</p> <p>Recruitment measures (e.g. campaigns, incentives, support) to encourage participation of people with a migrant background in the health service workforce:</p> <p>This question does not concern policies aimed at recruiting or employing health-care professionals from abroad because of a national shortage of staff.</p> | <p>At national level</p> <p>2 SE, UK</p> | <p>At local or organizational level</p> <p>7 AT, BE, DE, HU, LT, LU, NO</p> | <p>Neither of these</p> <p>25 BG, BH, CH, CY, CZ, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GR, HR, IE, IS, IT, LV, MK, MT, NL, PL, PT, RO, SI, SK, TR</p> |
|-----------|--|---|--|---|

All the other adaptations described in the section concerned improvements to the way services are delivered, but question 18 examined the willingness to vary diagnostic procedures and treatment methods. Most countries fell in the middle category; adaptations were tolerated but not encouraged.

| | | | | |
|-----|--|--|---|--|
| 18a | <p>Development of capacity and methods</p> <p>Diagnostic procedures and treatment methods are adapted to take more account of variations in the sociocultural background of patients.</p> | <p>Policies exist to encourage the adaptation of diagnostic procedures and treatment methods to sociocultural diversity</p> <p>2 CH, UK</p> | <p>Adaptation of diagnostic procedures and treatment methods is to a limited extent tolerated, but not encouraged</p> <p>18 AT, BE, BH, CY, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, HU, IE, IT, LU, MT, NL, NO, PT, SE</p> | <p>Policies are exclusively focused on standardizing diagnostic procedures and treatment methods</p> <p>14 BG, CZ, EE, GR, HR, IS, LT, LV, MK, PL, RO, SI, SK, TR</p> |
| 18b | <p>Specific forms of the above</p> <p>Policies exist to encourage:</p> <p>A. Development of treatments for health problems specific to certain migrant communities (e.g. female genital mutilation, effects of torture, rare import diseases, genetic risk factors).</p> <p>B. Adaptation of standard treatments for routine health problems in order to better serve migrant communities.</p> <p>C. Use of complementary and alternative “non-Western” treatments for physical and mental health problems.</p> | <p>All three of these (please specify)</p> <p>2 AT, UK</p> | <p>One or two of these (please specify)</p> <p>18 BH, CY, FR, PT, ES, BE, HU, LU, DK, MT, NL, FI, IT, SE, DE, NO, IE, CH</p> | <p>None of these</p> <p>14 BG, CZ, EE, GR, HR, IS, LT, LV, MK, PL, RO, SI, SK, TR</p> |

Among the 20 countries in which methods are adapted, Figure 13 shows the probability of finding each of the three different types:

Figure 13: Adapting diagnostic methods and treatments





Figure 14: Scores on scale C (Responsiveness)



Key to colours:

- Blue: EU15 countries
- Purple: EFTA countries
- Green: Post-2000 accession countries
- Yellow: EU neighbour countries
- Red: Non-European countries

The wide range of this scale is striking. At the bottom are eight countries that score 0, while five score over 70. It is notable that the English-speaking countries, where the concept of cultural competence has been known for decades, all have high scores (except for Canada, where the last government rolled back some multicultural programmes).


3.4. Measures to achieve change

This section deals with measures taken to stimulate and coordinate improvements in policies on migrant health and with flanking measures necessary to support good policies. Questions 19 and 20 deal with data collection and research.

| | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| 19 | <p>Collection of data on migrant health Data on migrant status, country of origin or ethnicity is included in medical databases or clinical records.</p> <p>Choose Option 1 if linkage between medical databases and national databases containing the above personal information is practically possible.</p> | <p>Inclusion of such information is mandatory</p> <p>11 BG, BH, CH, DK, IT, MT, NL, NO, SE, SK, UK</p> | <p>Inclusion of such information is optional</p> <p>15 AT, BE, CY, DE, ES, FI, GR, HU, IE, LT, LU, LV, MK, PT, RO</p> | <p>Such information is never included</p> <p>8 CZ, EE, FR, HR, IS, PL, SI, TR</p> |
| 20 | <p>Support for research on migrant health Funding bodies have in the past five years supported research on the following topics:</p> <p>A. Occurrence of health problems among migrant or ethnic minority groups.</p> <p>B. Social determinants of migrant and ethnic minority health.</p> <p>C. Issues concerning service provision for migrants or ethnic minorities.</p> <p>D. Evaluation of methods for reducing inequalities in health or health care affecting migrants or ethnic minorities.</p> | <p>Three or four topics (please specify)</p> <p>17 AT, BE, BG, CH, CZ, DE, DK, ES, FI, IT, MK, MT, NL, NO, PT, SE, UK</p> | <p>One or two topics (please specify)</p> <p>12 BH, CY, EE, FR, GR, HU, IE, LT, RO, SI, SK, TR</p> | <p>None of these topics</p> <p>5 HR, IS, LU, LV, PL</p> |

There are still countries in which data on migrant health is not routinely available and research is not supported. In the 29 countries where support is provided, the probability of research on a given topic being supported is as follows:

Figure 15: Research topics supported



Question 21 reveals that a "health in all policies" approach is practically unknown in most countries.

| | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|--|---|
| 21 | <p>"Health in all policies" approach Attention to the health impact of all policies.</p> | <p>Mandatory consideration of the impact on migrant or ethnic minority health of policies in other sectors than health</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1 UK</p> | <p>Ad hoc consideration of the impact on migrant or ethnic minority health of policies in other sectors than health</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6 AT, BH, ES, FI, IE, IT</p> | <p>No consideration taken of the impact on migrant or ethnic minority health of policies in sectors other than health</p> <p style="text-align: center;">27 BE, BG, CH, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, FR, GR, HR, HU, IS, LT, LU, LV, MK, MT, NL, NO, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI, SK, TR</p> |
|-----------|---|---|--|---|

Question 22 addresses the issue of “mainstreaming” versus categorical approaches to service provision for migrants. In the 38 per cent of all countries (13) that pay systematic attention to migrant health issues, 9 regard them as only a priority for specialized departments or organizations, versus 4 for all organizations.

| | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|--|
| 22 | <p>Whole organization approach Migrant or ethnic minority health is a priority throughout service provider organizations and health agencies (“integrated” versus “categorical” approach).</p> | <p>Commitment to providing equitable health care for migrants or ethnic minorities is present in all departments of service provider organizations and health agencies</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4 IE, NO, SE, UK</p> | <p>Concern for migrant or ethnic minority health is regarded as a priority only for specialized departments or organizations</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9 AT, BH, CH, DK, ES, IT, MK, MT, NL</p> | <p>No systematic attention is paid to migrant or ethnic minority health in any part of the health system. Measures are left to individual initiative</p> <p style="text-align: center;">21 BE, BG, CY, CZ, DE, EE, FI, FR, GR, HR, HU, IS, LT, LU, LV, PL, PT, RO, SI, SK, TR</p> |
|-----------|---|---|---|--|

Question 23 examines the extent to which government gives leadership in achieving change. Only in Ireland and Norway have government plans been published that are also implemented. In 15 countries, policies are introduced ad hoc; a plan may be published, but it is not implemented (or not to a significant extent). In half the countries surveyed, governments show no leadership on matters relating to migrant health.

| | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|--|--|
| 23 | <p>Leadership by government A. Government publishes an explicit plan for action on migrant health. B. Policies are implemented to support these measures.</p> | <p>A and B</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2 IE, NO</p> | <p>Only ad hoc policies introduced on migrant health</p> <p style="text-align: center;">15 AT, BH, CH, CY, CZ, DK, EE, ES, HR, HU, MK, PT, RO, TR, UK</p> | <p>No policy measures introduced on migrant health</p> <p style="text-align: center;">17 BE, BG, DE, FI, FR, GR, IS, IT, LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, SE, SI, SK</p> |
|-----------|--|---|--|--|


Finally, we examine whether stakeholders in general (question 24a) and migrant organizations in particular (question 24b) are involved in consultations and policymaking on migrant health.

| | | | | |
|------------|--|--|---|---|
| 24a | <p>What is the policy to involve stakeholders in the design of (national or regional) migrant health policies?</p> <p>Is there an advisory body or centre of expertise promoting cooperation amongst stakeholders on migrant health policy?</p> <p><i>Note:</i> This can be led by government, service providers, or NGOs/institutes. Stakeholders include administrative and health authorities at various levels of governance, service providers, health insurers, professional bodies, universities, accreditation agencies, NGOs and commercial organizations.</p> <p>NB: participation at service provider level is covered by question 16.</p> | <p>Through structural cooperation (e.g. via advisory body or centre of expertise)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3 DK, MK, NO</p> | <p>Through ad hoc cooperation (e.g. during consultations on new health strategy or law or through projects)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">18 AT, BE, BH, CH, CZ, DE, EE, ES, HU, IE, IT, LT, MT, PT, RO, SK, TR, UK</p> | <p>None</p> <p style="text-align: center;">13 BG, CY, FI, FR, GR, HR, IS, LU, LV, NL, PL, SE, SI</p> |
|------------|--|--|---|---|

In 13 countries there is no consultation with stakeholders; in 3, there are structural bodies that bring stakeholders together, and in 18, there are only ad hoc consultations. The next question shows that structural involvement of migrants themselves is even less common.

| | | | | |
|------------|--|---|---|--|
| 24b | <p>Migrants' contribution to health policymaking at national or regional level</p> <p>How do migrant stakeholders (e.g. NGOs and CSOs) participate in national policymaking affecting their health?</p> <p>NB: participation at service provider level is covered by question 16.</p> | <p>Through structural cooperation (e.g. involvement in advisory body or regular review of health legislation, services and outcomes)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1 MK</p> | <p>Through ad hoc cooperation (e.g. during consultations on new health strategy or law or through projects)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">11 CZ, DE, EE, ES, IE, IT, LT, MT, NO, RO, UK</p> | <p>Immigrant organizations are not explicitly consulted on health policy</p> <p style="text-align: center;">22 AT, BE, BG, BH, CH, CY, DK, FI, FR, GR, HR, HU, IS, LU, LV, NL, PL, PT, SE, SI, SK, TR</p> |
|------------|--|---|---|--|

Figure 16: Scores on scale D (Achieving change)



Key to colours:


- Blue: EU15 countries
- Purple: EFTA countries
- Green: Post-2000 accession countries
- Yellow: EU neighbour countries
- Red: Non-European countries

What is not clearly visible on the above graph is the association between scores on this section and the way a country finances its health system (taxation or social insurance contributions). This difference is significant at $p < .02$ by T-test.

| | N | Score |
|-----------------|----|-------|
| Tax-based | 13 | 46.8 |
| Insurance-based | 21 | 28.8 |

This difference could reflect a tendency towards more “top-down” forms of health system governance in countries with a tax-based system. Alternatively, it may be an indirect relationship, caused by the fact that more concern for equity and the introduction of a tax-based system both reflect some feature of national ideology. It is not caused by a confounder such as GDP or the period in which the country joined the EU, because type of financing is not associated with these variables.

Figure 17: Total scores on the Health strand



Key to colours:

- Blue: EU15 countries
- Purple: EFTA countries
- Green: Post-2000 accession countries
- Yellow: EU neighbour countries
- Red: Non-European countries

High scores are obtained by non-European countries – with the exception of Canada, where the government that was removed from office by the voters in 2015 weakened many “migrant-friendly” measures. The wealthy EFTA countries Switzerland and Norway also occupy top positions. Perhaps because of its remote geographical position, EFTA country Iceland is not well adapted to the needs of migrants.

EU15 countries, with the exception of Luxembourg, Germany, Portugal and Greece, occupy fairly high positions. Post-2000 accession countries have the lowest scores; the potential candidate country Bosnia and Herzegovina scores better than all of them, while the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey have scores around the mean of the accession countries.

4. Statistical analyses

4.1. Reliability, validity and structure of the scales

How homogenous is the MIPEX Health strand in the statistical sense? To what extent do all its items “measure the same thing”? These two questions should not be confused with each other. Researchers often attempt to deal with the second question by answering the first – by calculating the internal reliability of a scale, i.e. the extent to which the items in the scale are correlated with each other. However, this only measures their tendency to vary together. This reflects the extent to which they are affected by the same determinants, but it does not tell us whether they have the same effects.

To make a valid instrument for MIPEX, however, it is more important that the policies measured should have the same effects than the same determinants. The aim of integration policies in the fields of labour, education, health and so on is to reduce inequities between migrants and nationals in those fields. In theory, the obvious way to validate a collection of policy items would be to examine the extent to which each of the items contributes to reducing the disadvantage of migrants. Indeed, the effects of the policies that MIPEX studies are increasingly being investigated. However, this work is hampered by the well-known problems of all research into the effects of policies; they usually need time to have an effect, and the effect can be obscured by many other uncontrollable factors. In the case of the Health strand, the shortage of good data on unmet needs and utilization of health services among migrants is a particular obstacle to validation. Nevertheless, such validation should definitely be a goal of future research.

In the meantime, measuring the homogeneity of the scale is the only way we have of estimating whether its items, in some sense, measure the same thing. The limitations of this approach are immediately obvious when we examine

section A on Entitlements. This part of the Health strand measures both the health-care benefits that the law grants to migrants and the administrative barriers that stand in the way of their claiming these benefits. In general, laws are made by parliaments but administered by subordinate authorities (in this case, the Health Ministry or regional health authorities). All too often, disjunctions arise that complicate the implementation of the law; often, the rights that Parliament has granted to migrants cannot be exercised because of administrative barriers arising at a lower level. The administrative arrangements are also policies, so the “implementation gap” results from a clash between policies at different levels.

As we will see later, in our sample of countries legal entitlements and administrative barriers do not correlate statistically with each other. They both impinge on the same target (furthering or frustrating the migrant’s right to health care), but their determinants do not seem to be related. This is probably because they are produced by different agencies. (They might, of course, be related in a Machiavellian way: the administrative barriers might sometimes be deliberate, allowing a government to claim that its laws are generous in principle while making sure that little is given away in practice.) Although entitlements and administrative barriers are uncorrelated, it seems logical to combine them in a single score if we want to predict migrants’ chances of getting equitable health-care coverage.

Another example is found in section B. Policies to inform service providers about migrants’ entitlements show only a weak statistical relationship with other policies designed to make it easier for migrants to reach health services. Here too, different agencies are presumably involved; policies of the first kind are usually a government responsibility, while the second kind are often carried out at a local level or by NGOs. Nevertheless, policies of both kinds affect migrants’ knowledge of their entitlements.

Section C contains another item that is only weakly related to the rest of the scale. Question 17 asks about the existence of “policies to encourage diversity in the health service workforce”, but the presence or absence of such policies appears to be only weakly related to others that aim to make services responsive to migrants’ needs. According to respondents, such policies are mainly connected with avoiding discrimination in recruitment procedures. Nevertheless, diversity in the workforce can still be regarded as “migrant-friendly”. Section D has no items with a particularly low item-total correction.²⁴ This table shows the reliabilities of each section.

Table 10: Reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of each scale

| Section | No. of items | Alpha |
|----------------------|--------------|------------------|
| A – Entitlements | 6 | .53 ^a |
| B – Accessibility | 5 | .51 ^b |
| C – Responsiveness | 6 | .87 ^c |
| D – Achieving change | 6 | .77 |

Notes:

- ^a Alpha is .79 for questions 1, 2 and 3 on legal rights; for questions 4, 5 and 6 on administrative barriers, it is .63.
- ^b Alpha rises to .69 if question 7 (Policies to inform health workers about migrants' entitlements) is omitted.
- ^c Alpha rises to .88 if question 17 (Encouraging diversity in the health service workforce) is omitted.

The homogeneity of all 23 questions turns out to be high (Alpha = .86). However, this tells us nothing about the structure of the list. To explore this, we have to examine the correlations (*r*) between the four sections, i.e. the degree to which the section totals co-vary:

| | | | |
|---|------|-------|-------|
| B | .40* | | |
| C | .23 | .48** | |
| D | .04 | .29 | .67** |
| | A | B | C |

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed).

There is a tendency for each section to correlate with neighbouring sections, while there is no correlation between sections A and D. This is very interesting, because it suggests that measures to achieve change (D) are not related to legal entitlements and administrative barriers; rather, they are strongly related to the responsiveness of health services (section C).

Section D is concerned with the flanking measures that have to be introduced to promote equity in health service provision (data collection, research, prevention, mainstreaming improvements, leadership by government, coordination of efforts and involvement of migrant groups). The lack of correlation between D and A suggest that such measures are not aimed at improving legal entitlements and the way they are implemented. In other words, D is concerned with increasing the responsiveness of health services to migrants' needs (section C, $r < .67^{**}$), but not with the legal entitlements and administrative procedures that would give more migrants the right to use those services. This suggests that the policies in section D tend to focus on technical questions about adapting services better to migrants' needs, rather than political

questions about improving coverage. This was also a conspicuous feature of the “cultural competence” movement in the United States towards the end of the twentieth century. Then as now, the problem that so many migrants and minority group members lacked health-care coverage was “the elephant in the room” whose existence was seldom mentioned.

Factor analysis

More insight into the structure of the MIPEX Health strand can be obtained by carrying out a factor analysis on the 23 questions. Principal component analysis was performed on the correlation matrix and the resulting factors were subjected to Promax rotation. As usual, the four traditional countries of immigration were not included in this analysis.

The scree plot suggested that a three-factor solution is preferable to two factors. The percentage of total variance explained by these three factors is 23 per cent, 14 per cent and 12 per cent (total: 49%). These percentages mainly reflect the number of questions that load on each factor, i.e. the way the scale was constructed. The rotated component matrix for the three-factor solution is shown below.

1. The first component includes most items in sections C and D, which together we label “quality”. However, question 17 (Encouraging diversity in the workforce) is not included. As we mentioned earlier, this variable is not strongly related to the rest of section C; it more closely related to the second component (legal entitlements).
2. The second component relates to legal entitlements (questions 1, 2 and 3).
3. The third component relates to barriers to access: it combines questions 4, 5 and 6 (barriers to claiming entitlement) with questions 8 to 12 (barriers to reaching services). We saw already that question 7 (information for service providers about entitlements of migrants) does not correlate strongly with other items in section B; it is not included in this factor. It is interesting that question 9 (Health education and health promotion for migrants) loads weakly on “quality” as well as “access”. These activities are not only concerned with helping migrants find their way to the health services, but also with delivering services to them.

The factor analysis suggests that quality can be treated as a single issue, but that barriers to obtaining entitlement can be distinguished from barriers to reaching services.

Table 11: Factor analysis of MIPEX Health strand

| | Variable | Pattern matrix | | |
|---|----------|----------------|-----|-----|
| | | Component | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| A | 1 | .14 | .75 | .05 |
| | 2 | .09 | .60 | .10 |
| | 3 | .05 | .90 | .27 |
| | 4 | .18 | .20 | .67 |
| | 5 | .08 | .35 | .63 |
| | 6 | .06 | .17 | .64 |
| B | 7 | .32 | .08 | .11 |
| | 8 | .06 | .14 | .44 |
| | 9 | .35 | .18 | .50 |
| | 11 | .27 | .28 | .72 |
| | 12 | .27 | .39 | .61 |
| C | 13 | .44 | .43 | .31 |
| | 14 | .44 | .10 | .24 |
| | 15 | .68 | .16 | .17 |
| | 16 | .85 | .03 | .00 |
| | 17 | .25 | .54 | .30 |
| | 18 | .65 | .34 | .08 |
| D | 19 | .57 | .07 | .01 |
| | 20 | .64 | .14 | .03 |
| | 21 | .67 | .08 | .21 |
| | 22 | .83 | .01 | .03 |
| | 23 | .77 | .50 | .15 |
| | 24 | .70 | .33 | .19 |


We noted above that the internal statistical properties of a scale reflect the determinants of the items, but not the effects. Although the factor analysis shows that the first three items in section A (legal entitlements) have different determinants from the second three (barriers to entitlement), the items nevertheless both affect coverage for migrants using health services; the former allows it while the latter denies it. However, researchers wishing to analyse the determinants of entitlements and barriers in more detail would be better advised to group the items according to the above results from the factor analysis.

If the emphasis lies on the effects of the policies, it makes more sense to leave the four sections labelled as they are. Further simplification can be obtained by dividing the questionnaire in two halves and giving each country two scores.

- The first score, for Access, is the sum of sections A and B. It is concerned with giving migrants the right to use the health system and the ability to reach the services they need.
- The second, for Quality, is the sum of sections C and D.²⁵

By creating these two new variables – Access and Quality – we can examine the relative priority given in each country to each of these two aspects of migrant health policy. Displaying these scores on the following graph shows that while they are slightly related to each other ($r = .36$, $p < .05$ two-tailed), countries often score extreme values on one variable but not on the other. (Again, the statistics reported are based only on the 34 countries in the EQUI-HEALTH European sample, but the graph also shows the positions of the four non-European countries.)

Figure 18: Relation between Access and Quality



Key to colours:

- Blue: EU15 countries
- Green: Post-2000 accession countries
- Purple: EFTA countries
- Yellow: EU neighbour countries
- Red: Non-European countries

The horizontal and vertical grid lines are placed at the median value on each axis. The contrast between France and the United Kingdom is particularly striking. France scores highest on access, but very low on quality: for ideological reasons, attention to diversity is discouraged in the French health system (see Country Report). The United Kingdom presents a mirror image: nowhere else is so much attention paid to quality, in the sense of adapting services to the needs of migrants (viewed as “minority ethnic groups”). However, the United Kingdom’s 2014 Immigration Act made it more difficult for many migrants to use these services. (Interestingly, six years ago the United Kingdom would have gained a higher score for access and the United States a lower one: whereas the United Kingdom legislation reduced health-care coverage for migrants, the 2010 Affordable Care Act in the United States increased it.) Most other countries lie closer to the diagonal, i.e. there are not such striking discrepancies between the two scores. Nevertheless, Austria, Ireland, Norway, New Zealand, the United States and Australia are (like the United Kingdom) stronger on quality than on access, while Iceland resembles France in having the opposite priorities.

4.2. Relation of MIPEX Health strand scores to other variables

The results in this section should be regarded as exploratory in nature, because more research will be required to answer these questions properly. A number of country characteristics were found to correlate quite highly with Health strand scores: GDP per capita (adjusted for cost of living); the percentage of resident third-country nationals (i.e. non-EU/EFTA migrants); total health expenditure per capita (adjusted for cost of living); the type of health system (insurance-based or tax-based); the average score on other MIPEX strands; and whether a country was a member of the EU15 or acceded to the EU after 2000. The figures below refer only to EU28 countries. Values for 2014 were used except in the case of health expenditure, which was measured for 2013. Correlations (*r*) significant at $p < .01$ are marked with two stars, at $p < .05$ with one.²⁶

Table 12: Correlations between country characteristics and Health strand scores

| | Total | Access | Quality |
|---------------------------|-------|--------|---------|
| GDP | .75** | .52** | .69** |
| % third-country nationals | .44* | .29 | .42* |
| Health expenditure | .71** | .56** | .61** |
| NHS health system | .40* | -.06 | .50** |
| Other MIPEX scores | .61** | .55** | .47* |
| EU15 | .75** | .60** | .64** |

However, as the following matrix shows, many of these variables are quite strongly correlated with each other, and this makes it difficult to decide which of them are most important.

Table 13: Correlations between country characteristics


| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| % third-country nationals | .69** | | | | |
| Health expenditure per capita | .95** | .71** | | | |
| NHS health system | .29 | .28 | -.14 | | |
| Other MIPEX strands | .57** | .46* | .60** | .31* | |
| EU15 | .79** | .68** | .82** | .34 | -.76** |
| | GDP | % third-country nationals | Health expenditure per capita | NHS system | Other MIPEX strands |

One of the most surprising findings is that whether a Member State belongs to the EU15 or the 13 post-2000 accession countries is a strong predictor of Health strand scores. In the next table we see that there are large differences between these two groups of countries on a number of indicators that are related to the Health strand. This table summarizes those differences (significances calculated by T-test). Underneath the table is a graph showing GDP. EU15 countries are coloured blue, accession countries green. Apart from severely crisis-hit Greece and Portugal, we see that accession countries occupy all the lowest places.

Table 14: Differences between EU15 and post-2000 accession countries

| Indicator | EU15 | Accession 13 | % diff | Significance: p < |
|--|-------|--------------|--------|--------------------|
| GDP per capita ²⁷ | 121 | 71 | 59 | .001 |
| % third-country nationals ²⁸ | 7.6 | 3.3 | 43 | .001 |
| Tolerance of migrants ²⁹ | 44 | 37 | 84 | .05 |
| Health expenditure as % of GDP ³⁰ | 10,0 | 7,2 | 72 | .001 |
| Health expenditure per capita ³¹ | 2,927 | 1,305 | 45 | .001 |
| % with NHS system ³² | 53% | 23% | 43 | .001 ³³ |
| EHCI 2014 | 753 | 593 | 79 | .001 |
| MIPEX Health strand | 52 | 31 | 60 | .001 |
| Other MIPEX strands | 61 | 42 | 69 | .001 |
| Access | 59 | 43 | 72 | .001 |
| Quality | 45 | 18 | 40 | .001 |

Figure 19: GDP per capita adjusted for cost of living, 2014



The economic differences seen above are to a certain extent to be expected. The economic situation of most countries that joined the EU after 2000 was weak, sometimes grave; all of them except Cyprus and Malta had been seriously affected by the turmoil following the collapse of the Soviet Union. It was hoped that sharing in the prosperity generated by “the free movement of goods, services, capital and persons” would quickly regenerate their economies, but the 2008 financial crisis and the slow, erratic recovery that followed have held back the growth of these 13 countries.

Directly related to this is the fact that post-2000 accession countries attract very few migrants born in non-EU/EFTA countries. (It is necessary to discount the minorities in Estonia and Latvia who were born in other parts of the Soviet Union but did not return there after these countries became independent, as well as those fleeing from other Balkan countries to Croatia in the 1990s.) In 2013, the outward flow of migrants actually exceeded the inward flow in Croatia, Bulgaria, Romania, Cyprus, Poland, Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia.³⁶ Many populations are shrinking, while wages and benefits are low. Migrant workers as they are known in the EU15 are relatively rare in these countries, and their needs enjoy little priority, as can be seen from the figures for health as well as the other strands of MIPEX.

In any case, health care in the post-2000 accession countries is seriously underfinanced, resulting in low scores on the EHCI. These countries spend a smaller percentage of their GDP on health and their GDP is low to start with, so their average spending per capita is very low (45% of the EU15 average).

These extreme, across-the-board inequalities within the EU make it difficult to identify the variables with the greatest influence on the Health strand scores. Many of these variables are strongly correlated with each other, which makes it hard to discover which of them have the most direct influence.

This kind of statistical problem is usually tackled by using multivariate analysis, but it may be unwise to rely on results from such methods because they require many assumptions about the data to be satisfied. In Table 9, we saw which variables correlate most strongly with the MIPEX Health strand. To begin with, it would be unwise to include both GDP and Health expenditure in a regression equation, because their very high correlation (.94) could lead to unstable results. We therefore opted to keep GDP, because it is a better predictor of most of the Health strand scores examined.

When GDP, migrant stock, type of health system and accession status are inserted into a multiple regression, the following variables emerge as significant predictors:

Table 15: Results of multiple regression

| Dependent variable | Independent variables | Standardized beta | Significance (p) |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Total health strand | GDP | .53 | .017 |
| | Accession status | .47 | .033 |
| Access | Accession status | .64 | .031 |
| Quality | GDP | .57 | .023 |
| | NHS health system | .32 | .033 |

What do these findings mean? First, the fact that “accession status” is significant in two of the analyses means that the predictive power of this variable is very high. For Access, the best predictor of migrant health policies is simply whether or not the country in question is an old or a new EU Member State. This suggests that post-2000 accession status is associated in its own right with restrictive policies governing migrants’ access to health care, i.e. not just because of its connection with other influential variables.

Perhaps this should not come as a surprise; most countries acceding to the EU have experience of emigration, but not of immigration. In most of them, policies concerning migrants and their rights are in an early stage of development, and this is particularly true for policies on inclusive health coverage and equitable service delivery. Moreover, the negative economic climate of recent years has made it harder for such countries to implement reforms quickly. A recent study of policy coordination by Eurofound (2015) found that nearly all Central and Eastern European countries have only moderate or low scores on policy

coordination for third-country nationals. Although policies are supposed to be harmonized with the rest of the EU, measures to ensure this is done have only had partial success.

When it comes to Quality, GDP is joined as a predictor by the type of health system (NHS or SHI). This is contrary to expectations: NHS systems are generally assumed to provide better access to health care, rather than better quality. However, as we saw when reviewing the results on entitlement from section A, NHS countries are just as likely as SHI ones to restrict coverage for migrants.

Yet NHS systems in the EU do seem to put more effort into adapting services to the needs of migrants. This may be because they tend to have more top-down systems of governance, making it easier to introduce ideas such as cultural competence or sensitivity to diversity across the system. Another explanation might be that both the NHS system and the “migrant-friendly” policies have common origins in a political tradition of egalitarianism in the country. More definite answers to the above questions will have to await further analyses of the MIPEX Health strand results, which are also expected to show interesting relationships with a wide range of other variables.

Appendix: Names of researchers and peer reviewers

| Country | Researcher(s) | Peer reviewer(s) |
|------------------------|---|--|
| Australia | Michal Morris, Bernice Murphy | Lidia Horvat |
| Austria | Ursula Trummer | Sonja Novak-Zezula, Martin Sprenger |
| Belgium | Marie Dauvrin | Vincent Lorant, Hans Verrept, Ilse Derluyn |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | Bojana Babic | Tanja Pavlov |
| Bulgaria | Neda Deneva | Milen Petrov, Mariya Samuilova |
| Canada | Mandana Vahabi, Belinda Smith | Ilene Hyman |
| Croatia | Mitre Georgiev | Helga Špadina, Sunčana Roksandić Vidlička |
| Cyprus | Panagiotis Petrou, Chrystalla Pithara | Christina Kouta |
| Czech Republic | Helena Hnilicova, Karolína Dobiášová | Pavel Cizinsky |
| Denmark | Natasja Koitzsch Jensen, Allan Krasnik | Morten Sodemann |
| Estonia | Kristina Kallas | Elena Jurado |
| Finland | Maili Malin | Minna Saavala |
| France | Paul Dourgnon | Gesine Sturm |
| Germany | Michael Knipper, Theda Borde, Silke Brenne, Oliver Razum, Inessa Markus | Ulrike Kluge |
| Greece | Elli Ioannides | Ioanna Kotsioni |
| Hungary | Sándor Illes | Atila Dobos |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Iceland | Bjarney Fridriksdóttir | Guðrún Pétursdóttir |
| Ireland | Anne MacFarlane, Diane Nurse, Una Rafferty | Jane Pillinger |
| Italy | Margherita Giannoni | Antonio Chiarenza |
| Japan | Atsushi Kondo | Keizo Yamawaki, Claudia Ishikawa, Jun-ichi Akashi |
| Latvia | Ilmārs Mezs | Aiga Rurane |
| Lithuania | Linas Šumskas | Daiva Bartušienė, Gintarė Guzevičiūtė |
| Luxembourg | Serge Kollwelter | Laurence Hever |
| Malta | Sandra Buttigieg | Marika Podda Connor |
| Netherlands | David Ingleby | Walter Deville |
| New Zealand | Grace Wong | Anne Mortensen |
| Norway | Bernadette Kumar | Arild Aambo |
| Poland | Ela Czapka, Anna Kosińska | Ola Chrzanowska |
| Portugal | Beatriz Padilla, Sonia Hernández Plaza | Claudia de Freitas |
| Republic of Korea | Kwang-II Yoon | Young-Lan Kim |
| Romania | Alexe Irese | Stefan Leonescu |
| Slovakia | Daniela Kallayova | Marek Majdan |
| Slovenia | Uršula Lipovec Čebren | Jelka Zorn |
| Spain | Manuel García Ramírez, Tona Lizana | Daniel La Parra |
| Sweden | Slobodan Zdravkovic, Carin Björngren Cuadra | Peter Bevelander |
| Switzerland | Paolo Ruspini, Buelent Kaya | Milena Chimienti, Patrick Bodenmann, Sandro Cattacin |
| The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia | Fimka Tozija | Brankica Mladenovik |
| Turkey | Seval Akgun | Coskun Bakar |
| United Kingdom | Mark Johnson | Hiranthi Jayaweera |
| United States | Westy Egmont, Tanya Broder | Leighton Ku |

Bibliography

- Bilgili, O., T. Huddleston and A.-L. Joki
2015 *The Dynamics between Integration Policies and Outcomes: a Synthesis of the Literature*. Barcelona Centre for International Affairs/Migration Policy Group, Barcelona. Available from www.migpolgroup.com/wp_clean/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/MIPEX_Literature-review_The-Dynamics-Between-Integration-Policies-and-Outcomes.pdf
- Bollini, P.
1992 Health Policies for Immigrant Populations in the 1990s: A Comparative Study in Seven Receiving Countries. *International Migration (Special Issue: Migration and Health in the 1990s)*, 30:103–119.
- Bollini, P. and H. Siem
1995 No real progress towards equity: Health of migrants and ethnic minorities on the eve of the year 2000. *Social Science & Medicine*, 41(6):819–828.
- Bozorgmehr, K. and O. Razum
2015 Effect of Restricting Access to Health Care on Health Expenditures among Asylum-Seekers and Refugees: A Quasi-Experimental Study in Germany, 1994–2013. *PLoS ONE* 10(7): e0131483. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0131483.
- Carballo, M., J.J. Divino and D. Zeric
1998 Migration and health in the European Union. *Tropical Medicine and International Health*, 3:936–944.

Council of Europe

- 2011 *Recommendation CM/Rec (2011)13 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on Mobility, migration and access to health care*. Strasbourg (Council of Europe, Strasbourg, 2011). Recommendations: <https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=1872157>
Explanatory Memorandum: <http://bit.ly/23mbizn>

Deville, W. et al.

- 2011 Health care for immigrants in Europe: Is there still consensus among country experts about principles of good practice? A Delphi study. *BMC Public Health*, 11:699. DOI: 10.1186/1471-2458-11-699. Available from www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3182934/

Eurofound

- 2015 *Challenges of policy coordination for third-country nationals: Publications Office of the European Union*, Luxembourg. Available from www.eurofound.europa.eu/publications/report/2015/labour-market-social-policies/challenges-of-policy-coordination-for-third-country-nationals

European Council

- 2000 Presidency Conclusions, Lisbon European Council, 23–24 March 2000. Available from www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/lis1_en.htm

Huber, M. et al.

- 2008 *Quality in and Equality of Access to Healthcare Services: HealthQUEST*. Directorate General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, Brussels. Available from www.euro.centre.org/detail.php?xml_id=866

Huisman, A., C. Weilandt and A. Geiger (eds.)

- 1997 *Country Reports on Migration and Health in Europe*. Compiled on behalf of the Commission of the European Communities. Wissenschaftliches Institut der Ärzte Deutschlands e.V., Bonn.

- Ingleby, D. et al.
2005 The role of health in integration. In: *Social integration and mobility: Education, housing and health*. IMISCOE Cluster B5 State of the art report, Estudos para o Planeamento Regional e Urbano Nº 67 (M.L. Fonseca and J. Malheiros, eds.). Centro de Estudos Geográficos, Lisbon, pp. 88–119. Available from www.ceg.ul.pt/migrare/publ/Cluster%20B5.pdf
- Ingleby, D. et al. (eds.)
2011a *Health Inequalities and Risk Factors among Migrants and Ethnic Minorities*. COST Series on Health and Diversity, Volume 1. Garant Publishers, Antwerp/Apeldoorn.
2011b *Inequalities in Health Care for Migrants and Ethnic Minorities*. COST Series on Health and Diversity, Volume 2. Garant Publishers, Antwerp/Apeldoorn.
- International Organization for Migration (IOM)
2016 Cost analysis of health care provision for migrants and ethnic minorities. EQUI-HEALTH, Regional Office for the European Economic Area, the European Union and NATO – Migration Health Division, Homepage. Available from <http://equi-health.eea.iom.int>
- Knapp, T.R.
1990 Treating ordinal scales as interval scales: An attempt to resolve the controversy. *Nursing Research*, 39(2):121–123.
- Kramer, S.A.
2009 *Gewoon bijzonder: het vertoog over migranten en vluchtelingen in de GGZ* [Just special: the discourse over migrants and refugees in mental health care]. PhD thesis, University of Tilburg, Tilburg.
- Kutzin, J.
2011 Bismarck vs. Beveridge: is there increasing convergence between health financing systems? Conference paper for the First Annual Meeting of SBO Network on Health Expenditure, 21–22 November. Available from www.oecd.org/gov/budgeting/49095378.pdf

Liaropoulos, L. and I. Goranitis

- 2015 Health care financing and the sustainability of health systems. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 14:80. Available from www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4570753

McKee, M., T. Hervey and A. Gilmore

- 2010 Public health policies. In: *Health Systems Governance in Europe: The Role of EU Law and Policy* (E. Mossialos, et al., eds.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 231–281.

Mladovsky, P.

- 2007 *Migration and health in the EU*. Research note for the European Commission Directorate-General Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities. Unit E1 - Social and Demographic Analysis. Available from http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/social_situation/docs/rn_migration_health.pdf
- 2009 A framework for analysing migrant health policies in Europe. *Health Policy*, 93(1):55–63.

Norredam, M., A. Mygind and A. Krasnik

- 2005 Access to health care for asylum seekers in the European Union—a comparative study of country policies. *European Journal of Public Health*, 16(3):285–289.

Padilla, B. et al.

- 2009 Health and Migration in the European Union: Good Practices. In: *Health and Migration in the European Union: Better Health for All in an Inclusive Society* (A. Fernandes and J.P. Miguel, eds.). Instituto Nacional de Saude Doutor Ricardo Jorge, Lisbon, pp. 101–115. Available from www.insa.pt/sites/INSA/Portugues/Publicacoes/Outros/Documents/Epidemiologia/HealthMigrationEU2.pdf

Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants (PICUM)

- 2007 *Access to Health Care for Undocumented Migrants in Europe*. PICUM, Brussels. Available from http://picum.org/picum.org/uploads/file_/Access_to_Health_Care_for_Undocumented_Migrants.pdf

Rechel, B. et al. (eds.)

- 2011 *Migration and health in the European Union*. World Health Organization on behalf of the European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies, McGraw Hill/Open University Press, Maidenhead, England and New York. Available from www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/161560/e96458.pdf

Roberfroid, D. et al.

- 2015 *What health care for undocumented migrants in Belgium?* Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE). KCE Reports 257Cs, D/2015/10.273/110 (Synthesis: KCE Reports 257, D/2015/10.273/111). Health Services Research, Brussels: Available from https://kce.fgov.be/publication/report/what-health-care-for-undocumented-migrants-in-belgium#.Vw05O_I97IU

Romero-Ortuño, R.

- 2004 Access to health care for illegal immigrants in the EU: should we be concerned? *European Journal of Health Law*, 11:245–272. Available from www.vardforpapperslosa.se/files/vardforpapperslosa/access_to_healthcare_for_im.pdf

Ruedin, D.

- 2011 *The Reliability of MIPEX Indicators as Scales*, SOM Working Paper No. 2011-03. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1990223>

Ruedin, D., C. Alberti and G. D'Amato

- 2015 Immigration and Integration Policy in Switzerland, 1848 to 2014. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 21(1):5–22. DOI: 10.1111/spsr.12144.

Seeleman, C. et al.

- 2015 How should health service organizations respond to diversity? A content analysis of six approaches. *BMC Health Services Research*, 15:510. DOI 10.1186/s12913-015-1159-7.

United Nations

- 1998 *Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration – Revision 1. ST/ESA/STAT/SER.M/58/ Rev.1.* United Nations Publication, New York.

Vulpiani, P., J.M. Comelles and E. van Dongen

- 2000 *Health for All, All in Health. European experiences on health care for migrants.* Cidis/Alisei, Perugia.

Watters, C.

- 2002 Migration and mental health care in Europe: Report of a preliminary mapping exercise. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 28(1):153–172.

World Health Organization (WHO)

- 2000 *The World Health Report 2000: Health Systems: Improving Performance.* WHO, Geneva. Available from www.who.int/whr/2000/en
- 2013 *Review of social determinants and the health divide in the WHO European Region. Final report.* WHO European Office, Copenhagen. Available from www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-policy/health-2020-the-european-policy-for-health-and-well-being/publications/2013/review-of-social-determinants-and-the-health-divide-in-the-who-european-region.-final-report

Endnotes

1. An Excel file containing the Health strand scores can be obtained from j.d.ingleby@uu.nl
2. See www.mipex.eu/history
3. See www.cost.eu/COST_Actions/isch/IS1103
4. See www.cost.eu/
5. See www.cost.eu/COST_Actions/isch/ISO603
6. In MIPEX, the term *undocumented migrant* is used. The term currently preferred by most organizations is *irregular migrant*, standing for “migrant in an irregular situation” (abbreviation: IM). For the sake of consistency with other MIPEX publications, the older term will be used in this report.
7. European Union (2011), Directive 2011/24/EU on the application of patients’ rights in cross-border health care. Available from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:088:0045:0065:EN:PDF>
8. European Union (2007), Regulation (EC) No. 862/2007 on Community statistics on migration and international protection and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No. 311/76 on the compilation of statistics on foreign workers. Available from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:199:0023:0029:EN:PDF>
9. The 2013 revision of the 2001 National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services in Health and Health Care (National CLAS Standards) urged attention to “socio-economic status, race, ethnicity, disability status, sexual orientation, gender identity and other factors”, while nevertheless continuing to emphasize “culture” as the main driver of disparities. See www.thinkculturalhealth.hhs.gov

10. These were the topics of the COST Action HOME referred to above, described in the Action's published books (Ingleby et al., 2011a, 2011b).
11. Padilla et al., 2009:107.
12. See www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3182934/
13. See <http://bit.ly/1KxPBk9>
14. See www.coe.int/t/dg3/health%5CSource%5Cdeclaration_en.pdf
15. See www.episouth.org/doc/r_documents/Challenges_for_Health_in_the_age_of_Migration.pdf
16. See http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/WHA61-REC1/A61_Rec1-part2-en.pdf
17. See <http://bit.ly/1o0ZqQJ>
18. See http://ec.europa.eu/health/social_determinants/policy/commission_communication/index_en.htm
19. Ideally, rules should be written down, but instructions given verbally (e.g. by management to staff) can also be regarded as "explicit" rules.
20. UNHCR and WHO, Fact sheet on the Right to Health, Fact sheet no. 31 (UNHCR, Geneva, 2008).
21. Greece refers to its health system as the "national health system (NHS)", although it is mainly financed by social health insurance. In this report, the "s" in NHS stands for service rather than system.
22. See http://ec.europa.eu/health/social_determinants/docs/report_healthinequalities_swd_2013_328_en.pdf
23. Our results may differ from those of other surveys, in which what we call "exemptions" are included in the concept of "coverage".
24. In all statistical analyses reported here, the sample is confined to the 34 European countries in the EQUI-HEALTH study. To enable comparisons to be made, however, the positions of four non-European countries (Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States) are also shown in some graphs.
25. It must be remembered that we are not concerned with the absolute level of quality in health services; the aim of the policies measured here is to reduce inequities in service delivery by making services more responsive to migrants' needs.
26. Luxembourg is also omitted from these analyses because its GDP of 264 is an outlier that drastically affects correlations.

27. GDP per capita 2014, adjusted for cost of living.
28. Figures for Croatia, Estonia and Latvia adjusted to take account of long-standing “statistical migrants” from the Soviet Union.
29. Question QA11.2 from the Eurobarometer (2014).
30. WHO health databank (2013).
31. Expenditure per capita in euros (Eurostat 2013, supplemented by data from WHO).
32. A NHS system is one in which health costs are mainly financed from taxation and other government sources, rather than social health insurance (SHI) contributions.
33. Fisher’s Exact Test.
34. See http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Migration_and_migrant_population_statistics

IOM Migration Research Series

1. *Myths and Realities of Chinese Irregular Migration*
Ronald Skeldon, December 2000
2. *Combating Trafficking in South-East Asia: A Review of Policy and Programme Responses*
Annuska Derks, December 2000
3. *The Role of Regional Consultative Processes in Managing International Migration*
Amanda Klekowski von Koppenfels, May 2001
4. *The Return and Reintegration of Rejected Asylum Seekers and Irregular Migrants: An Analysis of Government Assisted Return Programmes in Selected European Countries*
Khalid Koser, May 2001
5. *Harnessing the Potential of Migration and Return to Promote Development*
Savina Ammassari and Richard Black, August 2001
6. *Recent Trends in Chinese Migration to Europe: Fujianese Migration in Perspective*
Frank N. Pieke, March 2002
7. *Trafficking for Sexual Exploitation: The Case of the Russian Federation*
Donna M. Hughes, June 2002
8. *The Migration-Development Nexus: Evidence and Policy Options*
Ninna Nyberg-Sorensen, Nicholas Van Hear and Poul Engberg-Pedersen, July 2002
9. *A Review of Data on Trafficking in the Republic of Korea*
June J.H. Lee, August 2002
10. *Moroccan Migration Dynamics: Prospects for the Future*
Rob van der Erf and Liesbeth Heering, August 2002
11. *Journeys of Jeopardy: A Review of Research on Trafficking in Women and Children in Europe*
Elizabeth Kelly, November 2002

12. *Irregular Migration in Turkey*
Ahmet İçduygu, February 2003
13. *Bordering on Control: Combating Irregular Migration in North America and Europe*
Philip Martin, April 2003
14. *Migration and Development: A Perspective from Asia*
Graeme Hugo, November 2003
15. *Is Trafficking in Human Beings Demand Driven? A Multi-Country Pilot Study*
Bridget Anderson and Julia O'Connell Davidson, December 2003
16. *Migration from Latin America to Europe: Trends and Policy Challenges*
Adela Pellegrino, May 2004
17. *The Development Potential of Zimbabweans in the Diaspora: A Survey of Zimbabweans Living in the UK and South Africa*
Alice Bloch, January 2005
18. *Dynamics of Remittance Utilization in Bangladesh*
Tom de Bruyn, January 2005
19. *Internal Migration and Development: A Global Perspective*
Priya Deshingkar and Sven Grimm, February 2005
20. *The Millennium Development Goals and Migration*
Erica Usher, April 2005
21. *Migration and Development: New Strategic Outlooks and Practical Ways Forward: The Cases of Angola and Zambia*
Dr Savina Ammassari, May 2005
22. *Migration and Development: Opportunities and Challenges for Policymakers*
Macha Farrant, Anna MacDonald, Dhananjayan Sriskandarajah, April 2006
23. *Migration, Human Smuggling and Trafficking from Nigeria to Europe*
Jorgen Carling, September 2006

24. *Domestic Migrant Remittances in China: Distribution, Channels and Livelihoods*
Rachel Murphy, September 2006
25. *Remittances in the Great Lakes Region*
Tom de Bruyn and Johan Wets, October 2006
26. *Engaging Diasporas as Development Partners for Home and Destination Countries: Challenges for Policymakers*
Dina Ionesco, November 2006
27. *Migration and Poverty Alleviation in China*
WANG Dewen and CAI Fang, March 2007
28. *A Study of Migrant-Sending Households in Serbia Receiving Remittances from Switzerland*
Nilim Baruah and Jennifer Petree, April 2007
29. *Trafficking in Human Beings and the 2006 World Cup in Germany*
Jana Hennig, Sarah Craggs, Frank Laczko and Fred Larsson, April 2007
30. *Migration, Development and Natural Disasters: Insights from the Indian Ocean Tsunami*
Asmita Naik, Elca Stigter and Frank Laczko, June 2007
31. *Migration and Climate Change*
Oli Brown, January 2008
32. *Irregular Migration from West Africa to the Maghreb and the European Union: An Overview of Recent Trends*
Hein de Haas, April 2008
33. *Climate Change and Migration: Improving Methodologies to Estimate Flows*
Dominic Kniveton, Kerstin Schmidt-Verkerk, Christopher Smith, and Richard Black, April 2008
34. *Migration and Development: Achieving Policy Coherence*
Asmita Naik, Jobst Koehler, Frank Laczko, September 2008
35. *Migration, Development and Environment*
Frank Laczko, November 2008

36. *IOM Global Database Thematic Research Series: Trafficking of men – A trend less considered: The case of Belarus and Ukraine*
Rebecca Surtees, December 2008
37. *The Impact of Financial Crises on International Migration: Lessons Learned*
Khalid Koser, December 2009
38. *An Assessment of Principal Regional Consultative Processes on Migration*
Professor Randall Hansen, January 2010
39. *Angola: A Study of the Impact of Remittances from Portugal and South Africa*
Sandra Paola Alvarez Tinajero, February 2010
40. *Migrant Resource Centres: An Initial Assessment*
Paul Tacon, Elizabeth Warn, April 2010
41. *The Role of Migrant Care Workers in Ageing Societies: Report on Research Findings in the United Kingdom, Ireland, Canada and the United States*
Sarah Spencer, Susan Martin, Ivy Lynn Bourgeault, Eamon O'Shea, December 2010
42. *Climate Change, Migration and Critical International Security Considerations*
Robert McLeman, January 2011
43. *Gallup World Poll: The Many Faces of Global Migration*
Neli Esipova, Julie Ray, Anita Pugliese, PhD, November 2011
44. *Ending the 2006 Internal Displacement Crisis in Timor-Leste: Between Humanitarian Aid and Transitional Justice*
Peter Van der Auweraert, June 2012
45. *Regional Inter-State Consultation Mechanisms on Migration: Approaches, Recent Activities and Implications for Global Governance of Migration*
Charles Harns, April 2013
46. *Migration and Development within the South: New Evidence from African, Caribbean and Pacific countries*
September 2013

47. *Displaced Youth's Role in Sustainable Return: Lessons from South Sudan*
Marisa O. Ensor, October 2013
48. *Mobility of Health Professionals to, from and within the European Union*
Caroline Schultz and Barbara Rijks, February 2014
49. *The South–South remittance corridor between Argentina and Bolivia*
Matteo Mandrile, March 2014
50. *A New Global Partnership for Development: Factoring in the Contribution of Migration*
Elaine McGregor, Melissa Siegel, Nora Ragab, Teresa Juzwiak,
September 2014
51. *Vulnerability to Environmental Stress: Household Livelihoods, Assets and Mobility in the Mekong Delta, Viet Nam*
Jane M. Chun, December 2014
52. *Summary Report on the MIPEX Health Strand and Country Reports*
David Ingleby and the ADAPT network, November 2016

Titles in the series are available from:

International Organization for Migration, Publications Unit
17 route des Morillons, P.O. Box 17, 1211 Geneva 19, Switzerland
Tel.: +41 22 717 91 11; Fax: +41 22 798 61 50; E-mail: pubsales@iom.int
① The MRS can be downloaded for free or purchased from IOM website at
<http://publications.iom.int/>

Single issue: USD 16 + postage

*Payments may also be made by international bank draft or money order payable to
International Organization for Migration, Publications Unit, Geneva.*

Also available online at:
<http://publications.iom.int/>

The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) Health strand is a questionnaire designed to supplement the existing seven strands of the MIPEX, which in its latest edition (2015) monitors policies affecting migrant integration in 38 different countries. The questionnaire measures the equitability of policies relating to four issues: (A) migrants' entitlements to health services; (B) accessibility of health services for migrants; (C) responsiveness to migrants' needs; and (D) measures to achieve change. The work described in this report formed part of the EQUI-HEALTH project carried out by the International Organization for Migration from 2013 to 2016, in collaboration with the Migrant Policy Group (MPG) and COST Action IS1103 (Adapting European health services to diversity). Part I of this report shows that many studies have already been carried out on migrant health policies, but because they tend to select different countries, concepts, categories and methods of measurement, it is difficult to integrate and synthesize all these findings. The MIPEX Health strand sets out to surmount this obstacle by collecting information on carefully defined and standardized indicators in all 38 MIPEX countries, as well as Bosnia and Herzegovina and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Part II describes the conceptual framework underlying the questionnaire and the way in which aspects of policy were operationalized and scored in the 38 indicators. This is followed in Part III by a detailed description of the pattern of results found in 34 European countries on each item in the questionnaire. Part IV reports the results of statistical analyses of collected data.



ISSN 1607-338X
ISBN 978-92-9068-731-3

USD 16