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Context and Motivation

• Public debates; political pressure to reform current asylum and refugee policies

• Various policy reforms proposed, offering contrasting ideas

• We know very little about public preferences in this policy area

• Key: ‘multidimensionality’
This study

What asylum and refugee policies do Europeans prefer?

• Examine public support for asylum and refugee policy and the extent to which it is contingent on certain policy features

• Focus on public support for key principles underlying policies rather than for specific reform proposals

Contributions:

• first-ever analysis of public’s multi-dimensional preferences in this policy area

• analysis considers non-binary policy choices, i.e. we go beyond “oppose/support” by analysing the role of limits/conditions
Conceptualizing Asylum and Refugee Policy

Key dimensions of asylum and refugee policy:

- how refugees and asylum-seekers **access protection** in EU countries;

- the **quality of protection** that is provided by EU countries to asylum-seekers and refugees;

- how **national governments and the EU govern** the asylum and refugee process

- provision of **financial assistance to “first countries of asylum”** in/near conflict regions
Methods

A Cross-National Conjoint Experiment

• Fully randomized conjoint experiment on nationally representative samples in eight EU countries: Austria, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Spain, Sweden

• Experiment fielded online by survey company Respondi in May 2019; 1,500 individuals per country (12,000 respondents in total)

• Introduction briefly explains *asylum seekers, refugees, resettlement*

• 5 conjoint tasks: constrained choice between 2 randomly selected policies that vary along 6 dimensions (binary choice; rating 1-7)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Dimension</th>
<th>Randomly Allocated Values in Experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications for Asylum</td>
<td>a. anyone can apply for asylum in [YOUR COUNTRY] with <strong>no annual limits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. anyone can apply for asylum in [YOUR COUNTRY] until an <strong>annual limit</strong> is reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement of Recognized Refugees</td>
<td>a. <strong>no resettlement</strong> of United Nations-recognized refugees to [YOUR COUNTRY]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. <strong>low resettlement</strong> of United Nations-recognized refugees to [YOUR COUNTRY] (1 persons per 10000 citizens per year, i.e. [country specific population])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. <strong>high resettlement</strong> of United Nations-recognized refugees to [YOUR COUNTRY] (2 or more persons per 10000 citizens per year, i.e. [country specific population])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to Harm</td>
<td>a. refused asylum seekers are <strong>never</strong> sent back to countries where they could face serious harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. in some cases, refused asylum seekers can be sent back to countries where they could face serious harm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy Dimensions 4-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Dimension</th>
<th>Randomly Allocated Values in Experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Family Reunification**                 | a. recognized refugee can **always** bring his/her spouse and children  
                                           | b. recognized refugee can bring his/her spouse and children **only if**  
                                           | c. recognized refugee **cannot** bring his/her spouse and children  |
| **Decision on asylum applications**      | a. **each EU country** makes its own decisions on asylum  
                                           | b. **A centralised European Union agency** decides applications for  
                                           | asylum for all EU countries  |
| **Financial assistance to non-EU countries** | a. [YOUR COUNTRY’s] provides **unconditional** financial assistance to non-EU countries that host refugee  
                                           | b. [YOUR COUNTRY’s] provides financial assistance to non-EU countries that host refugees **only if** they help reduce asylum seekers coming to Europe  
                                           | c. [YOUR COUNTRY’s] provides **no** financial assistance to non-EU countries that host refugee  |
## Sample Conjoint Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Option A</th>
<th>Policy Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement of recognized refugees</td>
<td>There is <em>no resettlement</em> of United Nations-recognized refugees directly from non-EU countries neighboring conflict regions to [YOUR COUNTRY]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return of asylum seeker whose applications have been unsuccessful</td>
<td>Refused asylum-seekers are <em>never</em> sent back to countries where they could face harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions on asylum applications</td>
<td><em>A centralized European Union agency</em> decides applications for asylum for all EU countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications for asylum</td>
<td>Anyone can apply for asylum in [YOUR COUNTRY] until an <em>annual limit</em> is reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial assistance to non-EU countries</td>
<td>[YOUR COUNTRY] provides <em>unconditional</em> financial assistance to non-EU countries that host refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Reunification for Recognized Refugees</td>
<td>A recognized refugee <em>can always</em> bring his/her spouse and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A recognized refugee bring his/her spouse and children <em>only if the refugee can pay for their cost of living</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Empirical strategy

- Analyse the results by computing the Average Marginal Component Effects (AMCEs)
- Unit of analysis is the rated policy (n=120,000)
- Clustered standard errors by respondent
- Entropy balancing weights
Results, all countries

Effects of policy features on the probability of accepting an asylum and refugee policy
Effects of policy features on the probability of accepting an asylum and refugee policy
Results, Germany

Effects of policy features on the probability of accepting an asylum and refugee policy
Results, Hungary

Effects of policy features on the probability of accepting an asylum and refugee policy

[Diagram showing various policy features and their impact on the probability of accepting an asylum and refugee policy, with estimated AMCE values.]
Results, Italy

Effects of policy features on the probability of accepting an asylum and refugee policy
Results, Spain

Effects of policy features on the probability of accepting an asylum and refugee policy
Conclusions

- Europeans generally committed to policies that provide protection to asylum seekers and refugees but this commitment is contingent on use of limits and conditions

- Overall pattern of policy preferences remarkably similar across eight countries included in our study

=> Challenges common idea that Europeans are hopelessly divided on asylum and refugee policy issues
Future work

- Relationships (trade-offs?) between policy features across different policy dimensions

- Role of trust in political institutions in conditioning public preferences for asylum and refugee polices
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Results, France

Effects of policy features on the probability of accepting an asylum and refugee policy
Results, Sweden

Effects of policy features on the probability of accepting an asylum and refugee policy
Results, Poland

Effects of policy features on the probability of accepting an asylum and refugee policy
Results, MM all
No survey fatigue