EUROPEAN COMMISSION
EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS DG

Contract VC/2004/0171

STUDY ON IMMIGRATION, INTEGRATION AND SOCIAL COHESION

FINAL REPORT

Focus Consultancy Ltd

Erasmus University Rotterdam, Faculty of Social Sciences

21 October 2005

GUIDE TO THE REPORT

The report is based on the findings of two main parts of research. The first part of the research provides an overview of the situation in the enlarged European Union with regard to the integration and social inclusion of immigrants. The second part of is designed to analyse and discuss integration policies on a national and local level in three selected fields related to the social and economic integration of migrants.

Chapter 2 of the report summarises the research findings on integration policies and the situation of third-country immigrants in the enlarged European Union. The information is presented under three main headings corresponding to different sectors of integration policies: <u>legal-political sector</u> , <u>socio-economic sector</u> and the <u>socio-cultural sector .</u>

Chapters 3-5 analyses recent policies of integration in relation to employment, social cohesion and social protection, in a selected number of Member States. The chapters highlight key issues and experiences in the context of the individual national settings. Chapter 3 discusses policies in Spain, Sweden and the UK with regards to Employment ; Chapter 4 contains an analysis of social protection measures in Austria, Denmark, Italy and the UK; Chapter 5 investigates issues on social cohesion in France, Germany, Netherlands and Portugal

Chapter 6 presents an overview of trends and tendencies on immigration and integration in the Member States that joined the European Union in 2004. The chapter discusses issues of integration in the fields of employment, social protection and social cohesion, and a comparison is made with developments in the older Member States.

In order to put the policies on a national and local level in the perspective of further EU-wide collaboration in the field of integration, chapter 7 outlines the current framework of policy on integration on EU-level, and discusses some possibilities for future development of this framework.

Chapter 8 summarises the key conclusions, lessons and ideas that can be drawn from the research findings. The findings are used as a starting-point to outline recommendations and ideas for future policy developments on EU and national levels (chapter 9.)

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The context of the study

The challenge of integrating third-country nationals lies at the heart of the core objectives of the European Union. It is crucial to the successful delivery of the objective, established at the Lisbon Council, for the EU to become more economically competitive while maintaining and strengthening social cohesion. In the context of the Employment Strategy, issues at stake include the integration and socio-economic inclusion of disadvantaged groups (including migrants), as well as the potential for migrants to make an important contribution towards alleviating labour shortages which have arisen as a consequence of demographic developments.

At the Tampere European Council in 1999, Member States reinforced their commitment to cooperation in the field of justice and home affairs, including asylum, immigration and integration. Following the action plan set up in Tampere, a series of initiatives has been progressed by the EU which highlights the importance of taking a more proactive stance towards integrating third-country nationals, with the objective of providing them with a comprehensive set of rights and obligations comparable to those of EU citizens.

However, integration is a multifaceted process that goes beyond formal rights and obligations to include a wide range of social, economic and cultural elements connected with inclusion and participation in European societies. It should entail equal access to and participation in education, the labour market and social security systems, as well as a range of other sectors. An effective strategy for integration must therefore transcend the formal structures of rights and obligations to develop proactive policies in all relevant fields. In this context, improved direct collaboration and exchange between Member States is of particular importance, given the complexity of the subject. Although institutional, social, political and other contexts (as well as policy responses) differ across the EU, most Member States face now - or will soon face - similar challenges in terms of achieving the successful integration of immigrants.

The present study aims to contribute to strengthening cooperation between Member States by outlining the challenges involved and presenting some of the ways in which Member States have dealt with them. The study will investigate policy initiatives aimed at dismantling barriers and promoting opportunities for immigrants that could be promulgated throughout the enlarged European Union.

1.2 The project: goals, phases, and approach

The goals of this study are recapitulated below:

1. Outline patterns of immigration and describe the situation of third-country immigrants (in particular second-generation) in the EU, in relation to key indicators of social inclusion and integration.
2. Analyse the policies of integration against the background of the different national institutional and political settings. Assess the impact of the policies in terms of both

successful integration (economic efficiency and cohesiveness), and the effects on social protection systems. Discuss good practices.

3. Relate the findings to the European policy framework with a view to developing new ideas for policy initiatives.

To realise these three goals, the research was divided into three parts:

i. An overview of the main issues relating to immigration and integration in the EU-25;
ii. Case studies from the fields of employment, social protection and social cohesion; and;
iii. A concluding discussion, in which the findings of the study are summarised and indicative conclusions and recommendations are outlined.

1.3 <u>Part I: Providing an overview of integration (policies) – objectives and method</u>

The first part of the research consisted of sketching an overview of the current situation of immigrants and policies related to their integration across the enlarged European Union. The results of this research are presented in Chapter 2 of the present report. The overview aims at providing a comprehensive perspective on the issues related to immigration and integration, taking into account most of the relevant regulations, policies and practices across different sectors.

For this purpose, the research team developed a research grid that allowed for the collection of data on immigration and immigration policy and processes and policies mainly in the fields of legal-political, socio-economic and socio-cultural integration (see table in Annex IV). For each field, relevant sub-sectors were defined, drawing upon commonly cited indicators of risks and opportunities in integration (see Annex I). This information was then distilled and compared. It includes both quantitative and qualitative data on the situation of third-country immigrants in the specific fields, as well as descriptions of institutional structures and recent policy developments. Most of the information draws upon sources of secondary analysis, both country-specific reports and major thematic European studies. In addition, as far as possible, the team has aimed to identify sources and actors in civil society and, where possible, organisations representing immigrants.

1.4 <u>Part II: Thematic case studies - objectives and method</u>

The second part of the research involved an investigation of integration in relation to the three areas of employment, social protection and social cohesion, set against the background of different national institutional and political settings. The three areas have here been broadly defined to include components of the legal-political, socio-economic and socio-cultural fields dealt with in the overview research. The results of the research are presented in Chapters 3-5.

The objective of this analysis was to assess the impact of policies in respect both of successful immigrant integration (economic efficiency, social cohesion) and of their effects on social protection systems. This means that policies of integration in the three areas had to be assessed not only in terms of direct costs-benefits for the society (for example, labour

market participation of immigrants) but also in terms of their wider effects on social cohesion (for example, some policies might prove less cost-effective in the short term but could serve not only to promote participation but also to yield positive effects in terms of establishing processes of self-help and proactive inclusion).

One specific objective was to highlight policies and practices that could provide good examples and learning opportunities for the Member States. The policies and practices presented in Chapters 3-5 are representative of recent attempts at national, local and regional levels to improve the integration of immigrants in each of the three areas. It is, however, very difficult to set up criteria for good practice in this field, since success in terms of the criterion of economic efficiency, for example, may not be success in terms of social cohesion. The team therefore aimed to develop a critical discussion around the initiatives, highlighting elements of success but also, where relevant, indicating the eventual shortcomings of initiatives. For the purpose of providing a balanced view, the team also gathered (as far as was possible depending on the availability of data) the views of migrants and NGOs on policies and official initiatives. In this context, a restricted number of interviews have been conducted with key migrant organisations and NGOs in some of the countries selected for comparison. In addition, where possible and relevant, information on civil society initiatives has also been included.

Method

Three to four countries were selected for each of the three themes of employment, social cohesion and social protection. To make the results of the in-depth analyses relevant for as many of the Member States as possible, a comparison was made between Member States with diverging policies, based on interesting recent initiatives identified in the first phase. Whilst differing policies made direct comparisons a more complex issue, it facilitated the development of recommendations that are relevant to all EU Member States. For the assessment and comparison of policies, specific areas in each theme were selected for consideration, drawing on literature on integration and, most notably, on the integration indicators in Annex I. In accordance with the terms of reference, the team has aimed to integrate a gender perspective and also to take into account as far as is possible the situation of second-generation immigrants.

Primary sources were used for information on policies and practices at national, regional and local levels. These were complemented by secondary sources for the comparison and analysis of the policies and initiatives. The data was primarily collected through desk research, as well as some direct contacts with policy-makers and centres of expertise. In addition, national experts were utilised for the conducting of specific enquiries and to contribute complementary information where necessary.

The EU policy framework on integration

In parallel to the thematic research described above, the team conducted a short overview research and analysis of EU policies, processes and programmes relevant to the field of integration. These findings are presented in Chapter 7. The objective of the research was to provide an overview of existing EU initiatives, with a view to establishing the links between action taken at EU and at national levels, in order to develop recommendations for future cooperation between the Member States.

1.5 <u>Part III: Conclusions and recommendations</u>

The last part of the research consisted of bringing together the research findings of the previous parts. The conclusions aim at picking up key lessons as well as trends and tendencies, with a view to developing recommendations for future policies at both Member State and EU level. The conclusions and recommendations can be found in Chapters 8 and 9.

1.6 <u>Problems encountered</u>

For the overview presented in Chapter 2, the research team aimed to collect and present quantitative data. However, during the desk-research phase, it became apparent that available data is sparse, incomplete and inconsistent in many of the fields connected with immigration and especially integration. Furthermore, the variations in definitions and means of data collection meant that comparable data was virtually non-existent. Given the limited timeframe and scope of the study, it was therefore not possible to produce tables of quantitative data on the base of data collected through the country-by-country research. Instead, Annex II includes reproductions of tables with key data presented in major thematic studies that we have consulted in the research. In addition, key data and tables are referred to in footnotes.

A related problem concerned the lack of information on the topic of immigrant integration in a number of countries, and in particular those Member States which joined the EU in May 2004. Data suggests that the immigration phenomenon is less important in these States, and this would account for the fact that, in general, less attention has to date been given to the issue of immigrant integration. Given the lack of available information, the examples in Chapter 2 mostly relate to the 'old' Member States. However, given the increasing number of immigrants, it is anticipated that over time the topic will gain in importance in the 'new' Member States. For that reason, we decided to include a separate section, Chapter 6, to present trends and tendencies in the new Member States with respect to the three themes of employment, social cohesion and social protection. The chapter also includes a discussion on how these countries could learn from the experience of the 'old' Member States in these areas.

1.7 <u>The central concepts</u>

Before starting the research on integration (policies) in the EU-25 in part I, the key concepts were explored and roughly outlined. The concepts were tested during the overview research in phase I and then refined for the research in the second phase. Below is a summary of the core components of the concepts.

Immigration

This concept is important for distinguishing the group of immigrants, the object of this study (that is, their particular situation as well as the policies targeted at this group). Eurostat defines "immigrants" as: "persons arriving or returning from abroad to take up residence in the country for a certain period, having previously been resident elsewhere". The problem

with such a definition is that it does not cover how far a person needs to move and for how long before he/she can be classified as a migrant.

It is difficult to provide a precise definition which is relevant to this study, since the label "immigrant" is often used without explicit definition in national policies and sometimes also in statistics as a designation for one or several categories of immigrants. However, as far as the data allowed, the team tried to be specific about immigrant groups in terms of origin, citizenship status and length of stay (the difference between foreign-born and foreign national).

In accordance with the aims of the project, the main focus is on migrants from outside the EU - i.e. third-country immigrants. The study inevitably focuses on migrants from non-Western countries for the reason that the bulk of integration policy measures are oriented towards immigrants from lower socio-economic strata. Data shows that non-Western migrants are most disadvantaged and are the main victims of the various barriers to social inclusion. The study focuses on legal migrants who are now or who plan to become long-term residents. Both first and successive generations will be considered. It is often the case that integration does not succeed with the first generation, which is why it is important to pay particular attention to the second (and third) generations. Successful integration can be measured in part in terms of the situation of the second generation relative to that of the first generation.

Other groups are included where relevant. For example, the situation of and the policies with regards to undocumented immigrants is given consideration, on the grounds that undocumented migrants play an important role both from an economic and from a social cohesion perspective. In a similar vein, we give brief consideration to temporary labour migrants, on the ground that it is common for a temporary stay to become permanent. Moreover, temporary labour migration directly relates to one of the central topics of this study – namely, the question of its impact on social protection systems.

Integration

Integration is a very complex concept and also one which has been much contested. It is used in this study both in a broad sense (referring to the general philosophy and approach of national policies in dealing with the impact of immigration) and also more descriptively (describing the situation of immigrants and the related policies, on the basis of available data).

At an abstract level, integration refers to a process that brings more closely together the parts of a larger entity; it also refers to the result of this process: the interconnected "whole". In the context of immigrant integration, "integration" denotes "the adding of populations to existing social structures and the 'quality' of connectedness of these new populations to the existing system of socio-economic, legal and cultural relations" (Heckmann 1997). Integration is a two-way process, affected both by the recipient society (processes of inclusion and exclusion in institutions, attitudes of recipient society) and by the role migrants themselves play in the integration process (actions, orientations and positions).

There are many dimensions to integration. For this study, we distinguish three that are commonly recognized: legal-political, socio-economic and socio-cultural integration (Penninx 2004, Entzinger & Biezeveld 2004, Heckmann 1999; the last two references go on to distinguish some additional dimensions). For each of these three dimensions, indicators for

integration can be detected (see Entzinger & Biezeveld 2004, WODC 2004). These indicators are used as departing point for this study. Key indicators of integration relate to the development of the position of migrants in relation to the opportunity structure (that is, the adaptation of the society to the impact of immigration). Because the immigrant integration discourse is often focused on the risks of non-integration, the team has aimed at gathering information and data with regard to both "opportunity indicators" – favourable conditions for integration – and "risk indicators" – unfavourable conditions for integration (See: WODC 2004). The full set of indicators can be found in Annex I.

Social cohesion

Social cohesion is frequently discussed in relation to integration and social inclusion policies, but the concept is highly contested and very seldom defined in precise terms. This concept refers to the more general issue of unity within diversity. Immigration is one element in the general composition of a society; other elements relevant to the issue of unity within diversity would include, for example, national minorities, regional differences, religious diversity, linguistic diversity and class stratification. In the context of this study, we consider whether and how the immigrant issue is related to concerns about social cohesion in general.

Social cohesion is defined primarily in terms of two major strands: (1) reducing not only social exclusion but also disparities between the various groups that constitute the population; and (2) strengthening social relations and social capital (within and between these various groups). (For a discussion on this subject, see for example Vertovec 1997, Berger-Schmitt 2000.) In terms of individual integration, the two strands are linked, in the sense that in order for individuals to have a sense of shared belonging and responsibility in society, they need to be given the opportunity to participate on equal terms. The assumption is made that all States strive for social cohesion, but that the emphasis can fall on either of the two different strands, dependent both on the State in question and on developments over time in a particular State. In consequence, policy priorities and means to achieve social cohesion are conceived differently, according to the national contexts of the Member States. The specific components of social cohesion policies that are included in this study are outlined at the beginning of Chapter 5.

Employment

In this study, integration in the field of employment refers mainly to the participation of immigrants in the labour market. Our comparison primarily focuses on the position of immigrants relative to the position of natives, but the study also compares labour market participation of different categories of immigrants, as far as available data allows. In this context, the position of second-generation immigrants and their prospects of progression are particularly important. The study is concerned with economic and social outcomes both for the immigrants themselves and for the society and economy as a whole. Building on the overview in Chapter 2.4, the section on employment (Chapter 3) considers individual challenges identified in the EU, relating, for example, to skills and human capital. It also discusses the opportunities and barriers particular to different (institutional) settings, such as access to equal opportunities, anti-discrimination policies, etc. The study not only focuses on the formal labour market, but also considers the informal economic sector, to the extent that available data allows.

Social protection

In this study, social protection refers both to social security (public provision of unemployment, old age, disability benefits) and to social assistance (programmes to cover the basic needs of the poorest - for example, social housing, public health).

The issues of social protection and of immigration are related in two major ways:

Firstly, the social protection of immigrants as such - access to public provisions; entitlements attached to status; the proportion of immigrants making use of the provisions; the way social protection provisions promote the social inclusion of immigrants in the host society. In this context, the study has gathered information on the social protection of immigrants and the way this either supports or hinders their integration and participation in society. Key issues include the eligibility of different categories of immigrants to benefit from diverse welfare services, the way this impacts on their situation, and the strategies they use to cope with it.

Secondly, at a time when populations as a whole are ageing and the proportion of those of working age is shrinking, immigrant integration links in with the debate on the sustainability of the European welfare states, as well as the policies directed at ensuring sustainability. More specifically, the key issue is the debate on the potential economic and social contribution of immigration and immigrants to maintaining the welfare states in Europe, and the relevant associated policies. The study addresses developments, policies and discussions with regard to the interrelation between immigration and the welfare state and attempts to change that relation (for example, through facilitating the immigration of migrants of particular use in the welfare sector), as well as the impact of these attempts on the situation of the immigrants.

2 OVERVIEW OF INTEGRATION (POLICIES) IN THE EU-25

2.1 The context: immigration, immigrants and immigration policies

Migration flows

The phenomenon of migration forms the essential background for the study on immigrant integration. In fact, the core subject of the present study is the impact of past and recent immigration (and emigration) streams on the societies and politics of EU Member States. Differences in policies and in the situation of migrants are to a certain extent related to the streams and stocks of immigrants in the Member States.

There are great differences between the Member States with regard to migration streams. In the absence of accurate migration data for all the Member States, net migration is estimated on the basis of the difference between population change and natural increase between two set dates. This "crude rate of net migration" for the period of 1990-2002 was generally positive in the EU-15, and often negative in the new Member States. This shows that on the whole immigration streams dominate in the EU-15, while emigration streams dominate in the new Member States (with the exception of Malta and Cyprus). There are, however, signs that the new Member States are gradually transforming from emigration into transit and immigration countries (Giudici & Guarneri 2004). In 2002, only Latvia, Lithuania and Poland showed a negative crude net migration rate (CEC 2004c: 12).[1]

Migration streams are extremely varied. In the context of this study and its focus on the integration of immigrants, the most relevant entry streams are: labour, family and asylum migration. The relative importance of the different streams in the EU Member States varies. Family migration constitutes some 40-50% of total immigration in northern Europe. In southern Europe, the percentages are much lower; only Italy has been generous with this policy, and here family immigration constitutes about 25% of legal immigration flows (Baldwin-Edwards 2002). Asylum-seeking immigration is negligible in southern Europe, while for many of the northern European countries it is a critical type of immigration (Baldwin-Edwards 2002). According to recent data, in relative terms, the type of inflow that dominates are asylum migration in Austria, France and Sweden; labour migration in Czech Republic and the UK; and family migration in Denmark and the Netherlands (Salt 2005b:10-11; see also: OECD 2005: 30)[2]. When considering exclusively immigration from outside the EU, with data available in 2000 for 11 of the EU-15 Member States, labour migration accounts for the largest inflow of migrants in Italy and Portugal, while family migration is the most important factor in the Netherlands, Sweden, France, Denmark and Finland (CEC 2003b: 187).

The demographic impact of migration differs from country to country. Migration makes an especially important contribution to population increase in countries like Germany, Greece, Italy, Slovenia and Slovak Republic, given the negative natural growth of these countries (CEC 2004c: 12).

Stocks of foreign population

---

[1] See Annex II, table 4: Net migration.
[2] See Annex II, table 3: Immigration flows to selected European countries.

The total numbers of migrants and their descendants in the Member States determines the impact of migration on societies. Data on foreign populations is available in many Member States, but data on foreign-born and third-country nationals - not to speak of second generations - is much more difficult to come by.

Data on the total number of non-nationals and foreign-born is available for many of the EU-25 Member States. Luxembourg has the highest proportion of foreigners resident within its borders, but this is an unusual case. Belgium, Germany and Austria have sizeable non-national populations, around 9 % of their totals. Next come Greece, France and Sweden with percentages ranging between 7 and 5 % (CEC 2004c: 12; CEC 2004e: 105; OECD 2005)[3]. The proportion of foreigners in Central and Eastern European countries remains relatively low. Germany, France and the UK have the largest foreign-born population, consisting of inhabitants with foreign citizenship, citizens of the country who may have been born abroad, together with former foreign nationals who have naturalised (Salt 2005a: 15). In 9 EU Member States the foreign-born constituted over 10 per cent of the population.[4]

Figures that differentiate the foreign citizens of EU Member States from third-country nationals are also available, but only for the EU-15 (see: Ederveen at al 2004). These statistics show that in Luxembourg and Belgium foreigners with EU-nationality form the largest group. Sizeable groups of third-country nationals can be found in Germany, Austria, Luxembourg, Denmark, France and Sweden. The numbers of third-country nationals reflect differences in nationality law and citizenship policies. Data on the country of birth of residents for the year 2001 is available for fewer than half of the EU Member States. According to this data, the proportion of residents born abroad is highest in Sweden, France, Slovenia and the Netherlands, at more than 10 % of the total population (Ederveen et al 2004: 34-35).

In comparison with the northern countries, the four Mediterranean 'old' Member States have quite low levels of legal immigrants. However, the combined presence of legal, illegal, semi-legal, and seasonal migrants in these four southern countries is fairly large - perhaps even exceeding 10% of the total labour force (Baldwin-Edwards 2004). In southern Europe, 80-90% of immigrants are known to have entered without work permits and their presence was subsequently legalised. According to Baldwin-Edwards (2002), this is the normal mode of labour migration into southern Europe.[5] He states that the principal function of the immigrants in the labour market of these countries seems to be "to provide flexibility where the rigid legislation of over-protected employment impedes economic process, while native workers refuse low-pay employment" (Baldwin-Edwards 2002: 5). The immigrants also play an important role in the relatively large informal or shadow economy of these countries.[6]

Migration and asylum policies

---

[3] See Annex II: table 1: Stock of foreign population as a percentage of total population in selected European countries, 1995-2003; and figure 1: Share of non-national citizens living in the EU-25 Member States.

[4] See Annex II: table 2: Size of foreign born and foreign-national populations in selected European countries.

[5] See Annex II: table 9: Numbers of authorised foreign people and estimates of unauthorised immigrants (in Italy, Spain, Greece and France).

[6] See Annex II: table 10: Size of the shadow economy in 21 OECD countries. See also European Industrial Relations Observatory on-line on undeclared work in the EU Member States: http://www.eiro.eurofound.eu.int/thematicfeature8.html

There is a general trend within the EU Member States towards tightening controls over the entry and stay of foreigners. At the same time, there is a growing interest in policies and measures to promote specific migration for employment purposes – especially in the cases of highly skilled workers and of temporary seasonal workers (OECD 2005). In addition, some European countries (Denmark, the Netherlands, Ireland, Italy, France, Germany) are trying to scale back family reunification, which still accounts for the bulk of migration flows in these countries (OECD 2005: 91). Other related developments concern more efficient and more rapid processing procedures of asylum seekers and (international co-ordination of) policies to enhance controls of irregular immigration flows (OECD 2005).

In the new Member States, recent developments in immigration policy are largely the consequence of accession requirements and of the demand to harmonise the immigration laws and policies to the EU acquis. The free movement between the new Member States (with the exception of Malta and Cyprus) and the other Member States is restricted due to transitional arrangements agreed in the accession negotiations.

The southern countries are also developing more restrictive immigration policies because of pressures from the EU, including the requirements of the Schengen agreements (Baldwin-Edwards 2004). Much of the recent legislation on immigration in these countries is concerned with attempting to legalize the position of the large numbers of irregular immigrants (Baldwin-Edwards 2002).

2.2 The development of immigrant integration policies in the Member States

In response to the settlement of immigrants and the social impact of immigration, most of the Member States have developed measures and policies to support and improve the integration of immigrants. A great variety of national integration policies are being developed with regard to integration objectives, scope, target groups and actors. But besides the many differences, there are also similarities (see CEC 2003a).

Differences and similarities in policies are in part related to the particular phase of immigration and the main types of immigrants present in the country. Comprehensive national integration policies have so far only been developed in some of the older immigration countries, especially in the social-democratic welfare states, of Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands and the Belgian region of Flanders.[7] In addition, the UK has developed a co-ordinated integration policy at national level; while Germany, since the new Immigration Act came into force, is also developing a more coherent overall policy at federal level. Other 'old' European migration countries have taken mainly a mainstreaming approach (notably France; to a certain degree, also Luxembourg) or only some dispersed measures (Austria). Recent immigration countries - mainly southern Member States and Ireland - are in the process of developing national integration policies. In these countries some *ad hoc* integration initiatives has been undertaken while they make their first attempts to develop a policy towards integration (especially in Ireland, Spain and Portugal). Most of the new Member States have only recently started to experience net migration, while some (Poland, Baltic States) are still mainly emigration countries. These countries have developed either no integration measures at all, or only some specific ones aimed at certain categories of immigrants (especially refugees). In these new Member States, the integration of ethnic and

---

[7] These policies come closest to what the Commission calls a 'holistic approach' towards integration (CEC 2003a).

national minorities often takes priority. For example, Estonia and Latvia have integration policies for the large Russian-speaking minority in particular, with specific measures aimed at linguistic-communicative integration.

The objectives of integration policies are often phrased in quite similar terms: insertion, active participation in society and the labour market in particular. The policies are defined as a two-way process, supported by principles of equal opportunities, non-discrimination and recognition of diversity. The target groups of the specific integration policies or measures vary from all long-term immigrants from ethnic minority groups (in, for example, the Netherlands) to one or a few specific groups (for example, new immigrants in Denmark, refugees and recognised asylum seekers in Poland and Slovakia, and temporary refugees from former Yugoslavia in Slovenia). The scope of the integration policies differs considerably, as discussed above. There is a trend in those countries with a more established tradition of immigration to focus on the reception and integration of newcomers, in order to prevent the development of disadvantages, and to mainstream the integration measures for the 'older' immigrant groups within general policies. The development of integration programmes for newcomers often goes hand in hand with a greater emphasis on obligations and mandatory measures, legitimated in terms of citizenship and 'give and take' (for example, in Denmark, the Netherlands, Germany, Flanders, France and Austria). Since 1997 Sweden has presented an interesting example of a mainstreaming policy which, aiming at equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities for all, should in principle permeate all policy areas (the UK has taken a similar approach).

Responsibilities for the development and implementation of national integration policies differ according to the state type and political tradition. In the federal states of Belgium and Germany (and to a certain extent also in Spain and Austria), responsibilities for integration issues fall largely under the powers of regional authorities. However, the new Immigration Act in Germany also aims at a more coherent policy, by transferring some competencies to the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees. Some of the Member States – Denmark, the Netherlands – have created new Ministries for alien and integration affairs. In many other countries, special bodies or departments within ministries – often those of Home Affairs or Social Affairs – have been created, to coordinate and take the lead on developing policies. The policies are in many cases developed in collaboration with other stakeholders, such as social partners, NGOs and immigrant communities.

Policies are in general mostly implemented at local and regional levels. Sometimes, in the absence of a national integration policy, authorities of municipalities and regions with large proportions of immigrants take the lead in developing integration policies at local and regional levels. This is, for example, the case in Portugal (Lisbon) and in Austria (Vienna). Local policies in cities and municipalities can play an important role in the settlement and integration process of immigrants. Local authorities everywhere have to find solutions for similar kinds of problems to do with housing, education, unemployment and health of immigrants, as well as segregation and xenophobia (Penninx et al 2004). However, insufficient information and data on local policies has been collected to be able to present more specific observations on this point.

NGOs form another group that is active in promoting the integration of immigrants in all Member States. Especially in southern Member States, but also in the new Member States, NGOs and civil society play a very important role, sometimes by implementing national policies, sometimes - in the absence of official integration measures - by taking the place of

public assistance and support. In both Italy and Portugal, NGOs play a major role in providing integration measures. Local initiatives and the role of civil society will be further explored under the in-depth thematic studies in the next phase, in particular in the context of policies and initiatives relating to social cohesion.

In many Member States, some form of monitoring of the integration process has been established. However, the monitoring systems of the Member States often have deficiencies, hampering a systematic assessment of achievements in the integration process (Entzinger & Biezeveld 2003: 49-50). A major problem is that in most cases statistics are only available on nationality and not on ethnic background. This restricts the possibility of monitoring the integration process of immigrants and their descendants. Well-developed monitoring systems exist in some of the Member States with longer traditions of immigration, such as the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, and also in Germany (however, only for the category of foreigners); they are under development in Denmark and Sweden (Entzinger & Biezeveld 2003).

2.3 Legal and political integration

2.3.1   Legal position of foreigners

Two main principles with regard to migration law are equality and security (Peers et al 2000). Non-discrimination and equality are central principles in all EU Member States, but their application to the status of immigrants differs. A secure residence status is an important or even necessary prerequisite for the integration of migrants (see: Coussey 2000, Groenendijk et al 2000). However, there is a tension between the objectives of integration and the legal principles of equality and security on the one hand, and the objectives of immigration control on the other (Guild 2000).

Residence permits
In most countries, immigrants are in principle eligible only for temporary residence status. For certain categories of immigrants, this status can under certain conditions be converted into a secure permanent resident status, after a certain period of time. A recent study by Groenendijk et al (2000) on the legal status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents in the 15 'old' Member States shows that there are both similarities and differences in the national laws of Member States regarding the acquisition of long-term resident status.[8] The necessary requirements for such status vary, but not excessively. The number of years of residence required, however, varies considerably, from 2-4 years for Scandinavia and the UK, to 10 years in Portugal and Greece (Baldwin-Edwards 2002).

As far as labour migration is concerned, in most countries certain groups of migrant workers are able to obtain permanent residence status under certain conditions (Cholenwinski 2002). Groups of migrant workers who generally do not qualify for this are seasonal workers and various categories of migrants who receive permission to enter in order to take up a particular type of employment (*idem*). There is a trend that highly skilled migrants are more likely to receive a secure, permanent employment status. Often, dependency on social assistance or welfare provides grounds for the non-renewal of the residence permits of migrant workers, and may even trigger their removal altogether by the authorities (Cholenwinski 2002).

Until now, we have discovered recent information on regulations with regard to the legal position of immigrants for only some of the new Member States. For example, in Hungary, foreigners should have resided legally in the country for at least 3 years prior to the submission of their application for a permanent residence permit. In the new Member States, developments with regard to the legal status of third-country nationals have been encouraged by the requirements of the Community Acquis.

A serious problem of status in the new Member States of Central and Eastern Europe is that of statelessness. This problem arose after the fall of Communism and the subsequent shifting of borders because several countries failed to grant citizenship to all residents within their territories following a change of regime. At the moment this is an important problem in Estonia and Latvia, where many residents, mostly of Russian descent, have been denied citizenship following the formation of new states. There are also many stateless residents in Slovenia, immigrants from other territories of the former Socialist Federal Republic of

---

[8] See Groenendijk et al 2000 pp. 100-102 for an overview table summarizing the central elements of permanent residence status in the national law of Member States, including rights attached to status.

Yugoslavia (SFRY) who were living in Slovenia when it declared independence from Yugoslavia. In these countries the problem of people without legal residence status has not yet been definitively resolved.

There is only limited data available on the percentages of third-country nationals who have obtained permanent residence status. Data on five Member States - Austria, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Greece – show that approximately 50% or more of the registered third-country nationals have permanent residence status, except in the case of Greece, where it would appear that no migrants have been able to obtain this status (Groenendijk et al 2000).

There are important differences between the northern and southern Member States with regard to residence status (Baldwin Edwards 2002). The integration of immigrants in the legal structures of the southern Member States is problematic, especially because of the large numbers of irregular immigrants. These States are, however, attempting to improve the position of immigrants by the legalization of irregular immigrants, by awarding longer term residence permits and by minimizing the importance of continuous reemployment as a requirement for the renewal of the permits (Baldwin-Edwards 2001).

Security of residence also provides protection against expulsion. In all Member States, long-term residents can be removed or expelled on grounds of public order or security, but in several Member States there is a basic principle that the longer the residence, the more serious the violation of public order has to be in order to justify withdrawal of residence rights (Groenendijk et al 2000: 108-109).

With respect to the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents, the EU has recently adopted a Directive (2003/109/EC, approved on 25 November 2003) which grants the right to an EU-regulated permit status after 5 years' legal residence in the territory of a Member State. The Directive has to be transposed by 23 January 2006.

Family reunion and residence status of family members

There are substantial differences between the Member States with regard to both their policies on family reunion and the legal position of people admitted for reasons of family reunion.

With regard to the *rights of family reunion*: in most countries third-country nationals are entitled to family reunion before they have attained five years of residence or have acquired permanent residence status (Groenendijk et al 2000; Cholenwinski 2002: 107; see also Ederveen et al 2004). The conditions for family reunion differ but relate mainly to the possession of adequate accommodation and sufficient resources. However, there is a recent tendency in some countries to tighten the right of entry of family members by making the entry subject to further conditions (as part of the attempt to scale back family reunification). For example, in Denmark, additional criteria for family reunion have been introduced, such as a minimum age for foreign spouses (24) and 3 years of residence following the granting of permanent residence status; moreover, the couple's aggregate connection to Denmark must be stronger than is the case with any other nation (Entzinger 2004). The Netherlands has also introduced stricter conditions. In Austria, a quota system for family reunion exists, which has resulted in considerable delays in family reunification (Cholewinski 2002).

According to Baldwin-Edwards (2002), family reunification is more difficult in the southern countries than in the northern states. The requirements for legal residence are more difficult to satisfy in southern Europe, and there are also high additional demands to comply with, such as "satisfactory" housing and income. But the differences also relate to the phase of immigration, and southern Europe is still in its early days (Baldwin-Edwards 2002). In even more recent immigrant countries among the new Member States, the issue of family reunion plays a less important role.

There are also differences between the Member States over the extent to which family members enjoy secure status as a result of their relationship with a third-country national with long-term or permanent residence status. In some countries, permanent status is granted on admission (Italy, France, Sweden); in others, after one year (Belgium, UK); while in other Member States, family members have to fulfil all or most of the generic requirements for the status themselves. In several Member States (for example, Portugal, Spain, France, Netherlands, Belgium), there is a policy in favour of generous treatment of second-generation immigrants who were born on the territory or who were minors at the time of their admission into the country. On these issues it is not possible to discern clear trends in terms of a simple north-south division (Groenendijk et al, 107).

The political and socio-economic rights attached to status will be discussed in the relevant sections (see also: Groenendijk et al 2000, Cholewinski 2002).

2.3.2 Discrimination and anti-discrimination and equal treatment policies in general

Monitoring discrimination and racism in Europe

The European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) was established by a Council Regulation of June 1997 to collect data on discrimination in the EU. Its task is to provide the European Union and its Member States with objective, reliable and comparable information and data on racism, xenophobia, Islamophobia and anti-Semitism at the European level, in order to help the EU and its Member States to establish measures or formulate courses of actions against racism and xenophobia.

Each year the EUMC draws together from the EU Member States a collection of data on the phenomena and manifestations of racism, xenophobia, Islamophobia and anti-Semitism. A barrier to the monitoring of racism and xenophobia in the EU is that official data collection on racist violence in many EU countries is non-existent or ineffectual. The EUMC observes that only six Member States maintain a comprehensive system that adequately reveals the extent and nature of racist violence in their societies. An example of such a country is the UK. Looking at the data available from the few countries that have published figures for the period 2001-2003, the EUMC concludes that it appears that racist violence is somewhat decreasing. However, because of the under-recording of incidents, it is difficult to judge the situation accurately. General conclusions with respect to discrimination in employment, housing and education are also impossible, because of problems with the availability, reliability and compatibility of data (EUMC 2004b) (see section 4 of this chapter for information on the issue of discrimination in education and employment).

The International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights (2005) concluded in a recent report on 'Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims in the EU' that, in the aftermath of September 11, Muslim minorities in the EU have experienced growing distrust and hostility. In some of the new Member States, the policy towards ethnic and national minorities was a point of concern in the process of accession. Accession – and the requirements of the Community Acquis – has improved the situation of minorities in these states. However, there are still problems, for example, with the legal position of Russian-speaking minorities in the Baltic States, as mentioned earlier. And according the latest annual report of the EUMC (2004b), the Roma continue to be vulnerable to racism.

Anti-discrimination and equality policies

Anti-discrimination and equality policy is the one field in which the European Commission has had a major influence on recent policy developments. An important step was taken by the Framework Directives of 2000 related to combating discrimination on grounds of racial or ethnic origin in employment and beyond (the Racial Equality Directive and the Employment Equality Directive). The Member States were required to bring their national laws into line with these Directives by 19 July 2003 and 2 December 2003 respectively (and the new Member States by the date of their accession). Not all Member States managed to meet the deadlines (CEC 2003c, CEC 2004b, EUMC 2004a, Chopin 2004). Presently, most of the Member States have implemented both Directives, but some of them have yet to meet their obligations (see the website of the DG Employment and Social Affairs on the implementation of the Directives).

The Directives introduce for citizens of the EU a common minimum level of protection against all forms of discrimination. However, there are many Member States which, according to the principles of equal treatment, provide more favourable protection than that laid down in the Directives (Chopin 2004). The Racial Equality Directive also requires that the governments of the Member States set up a body, or designate an existing organisation, to support the legislation by promoting equality of treatment, helping victims of discrimination pursue their complaints, conducting independent surveys about discrimination, publishing independent reports on discrimination, and making recommendations. However, in some Member States the independence of the work of the equality bodies is questionable; for example, in Italy the new body is closely linked to a Ministry (Chopin 2004).

According to the EUMC (2004a), the implementation of the Directives triggered a major transformation in countries that lacked a history of strong anti-discrimination legislation. Countries with high immigration rates and a history of long-term residence amongst their immigrant population already had comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation in force. The Netherlands and the UK especially have for some time had distinctive anti-discrimination policies as a basis for prosecuting acts of racism and discrimination. While the countries with a history of relatively significant immigration from former colonies (NL, UK) used a 'minority concept' in their anti-discrimination policies, countries where recruitment of migrant workers has been dominant – for example, Germany, Austria and Luxembourg - and recent immigrant countries tended to use a 'foreigner concept' (EUMC 2004a).

On a European level, the implementation of the legal framework of the Directives is supplemented by a Community Action Programme to combat discrimination (2001-2006), managed by the DG for Employment and Social Affairs' Anti-Discrimination Unit.

2.3.3   Naturalisation and citizenship

Trends in naturalisation

The annual numbers of naturalisations in EU Member States are influenced by several factors, such as the legal regulations (the nature of the legislation relating to acquisition of citizenship), the necessary procedures, the waves of migration, and the stock of immigrants.

Some observations from Eurostat and OECD sources[9]:

- There has been a significant rise in the number of naturalisations in a number of Member States in 2002 (OECD 2005). This has been a trend for some time (Eurostat 2004).
- The number of citizenship acquisitions varies greatly between the 25 Member States. The sharpest increases in 2002 were in Spain and the UK; the steepest decline was noted in Germany. In absolute terms, Germany leads the naturalisation statistics (OECD 2005).

Trends in citizenship policies and laws

Each state's nationality law is based on juridical traditions, nation-state building, international influence and the role played by migration and the presence of minorities. Differences and similarities in citizenship legislation relate to two main factors, according to Weil (2001): legal tradition (of *jus soli* and *jus sanguinis*) and the disconnection between territory and constituted population, illustrated by the phenomenon of emigration and immigration. A trend towards convergence can be observed because of the context of the stabilization of borders and the incorporation of democratic values.

With regard to the 'disconnection between territory and constituted population', one can distinguish between countries of immigrants, countries of immigration, countries of emigrants, and countries of emigration (where parts of the population often emigrated - for example, many EU countries were in the past emigration countries). Citizenship laws in countries of immigrants (like the USA and Canada) are typically based on the principle *jus soli*, allowing the children of immigrants to acquire automatically the citizenship of the country of residence. In countries of emigrants, where a part of the core population is located outside the boundary of the state (for example, Germany and Hungary), with *jus sanguinis* nationality legislation, a link between the ethnic communities outside the state territory and the country of origin can be maintained. For countries of emigration, *jus sanguinis* as the prevalent criterion offers access to the nationality of origin for returning migrants. The southern Member States and the new Member States, but also Ireland and Finland, were until recently emigration countries, or still experience emigration to an important degree. This is often reflected in citizenship legislation. For example, the Irish Nationality and Citizenship Act provides that persons born outside Ireland may claim Irish citizenship by descent (where their grandmother or grandfather was born in Ireland).

However, owing to experiences with immigration, a convergence of citizenship laws has come into being. Countries with *jus soli* legislation have become more restrictive (for

---

[9] See Annex II, table 5: Acquisition of nationality in selected OECD countries.

example, the UK and France), and countries with legislation based on the *jus sanguinis* principle (for example, Germany) have liberalised their legislation, in order to open the way for long-term immigrants and their descendents to the right to accede to citizenship. The German nationality law - a paradigmatic example of legislation based on the principle of *jus sanguinis* - was amended by the introduction of new citizenship legislation in 1999.

After their independence in 1991, the Baltic states faced quite a different issue (see Weil 2001). Significant numbers of Russian minorities now live within the new borders of Estonia and Latvia in particular, and in these two states, the new nationality laws were quite stringent, excluding entire segments of the population (particularly long-term residents of Russian origin) and thus creating groups of stateless persons. Pressure from international and intergovernmental organisations, such as the Council of Europe, the OSCE and the EC, has led to some changes in the citizenship laws and practices of these countries. But the problems of statelessness are still not definitely resolved in these countries. For example, it is difficult for Russians in Estonia to meet the condition of passing an Estonian language exam to acquire citizenship, both because of the high requirements of the test and because of the segregation and marginalised position of large segments of the Russian minority.

Even with the trend of convergence, there are still substantial differences between the Member States with regards to rights and requirements for naturalisation, the issue of dual nationality, and access to citizenship for the second generation.[10] Austria - where foreign citizens still do not have individual entitlement to naturalisation - is one of the strictest countries in Europe. The minimum number of years of residence before one can apply for naturalisation varies from 10 years in Austria, Greece, Luxembourg, Italy, Lithuania and Spain, to 3-5 years in Belgium, France and the UK. Belgium seems to have one of the most liberal nationality laws, as a deliberate policy to promote integration. So far as nationality regulations for second-generation immigrants are concerned, the same countries again have very strict policies, especially Austria, Luxembourg and Greece (Weil 2001).

According to the "European Civic and Citizenship and Inclusion Index" (2005), naturalisation is one of the most problematic areas in the field of civic inclusion for the Member States. According to Niessen et al (2005: 20), this may simply reflect the current mindset on migration: "Member States have not yet decided whether to view migration as a temporary or long-term phenomenon". Naturalisation is also one of the policy areas in which the EU competencies are weakest.

The Member States have a firm grip on nationality legislation. That is understandable, because nationality - alongside territory - lies at the heart of the definition of the nation-state. At EU level, there is currently no legal basis for common action on nationality (it is even explicitly excluded from Communities policies). However, within the framework of the Council of Europe, a number of EU Member States have adopted and ratified the European Convention on Nationality, enforced in 2000.

---

[10] See Weil 2001 for overview tables of requirements for naturalisations (table 1-2, p.22-23) and access to citizenship for second generation immigrants (table 1-4, p. 26-27).

2.3.4   Civil and political participation

Political participation is the active dimension of citizenship. It refers to "the various ways in which individuals take part in the management of the collective affairs of a given political community" (Martiniello 2005:3). It is useful to distinguish between conventional forms of political participation (voting; running for elections; participation in parliament, in political parties, in consultative institutions) and less or non-conventional forms of political participation (trade unions, claim-making immigrant associations, all kinds of pressure groups and socio-political movements) (Martiniello 2005).

There is a great variety of forms of political participation among immigrants across the EU. This variety can be accounted for by at least three factors: (1) the variety of citizenship (nationality) laws and policies in the EU Member States; (2) the fact that EU countries are at different stages of the migratory process; (3) the fact that immigrants and their descendants are not a homogeneous group in terms of political attitudes and behaviour (Martiniello 2005). Because of these factors, it is difficult to compare and benchmark the participation of migrants across the EU. There is, moreover, the technical difficulty of the unequal availability of adequate statistical data in the various Member States (Martiniello 2005).

The first factor, the variety of citizenship laws and policies in the EU Member States, determines the political opportunity structure present for migrants: the granting or denying of voting rights to foreigners, facilitating or impeding access to citizenship, by establishing or not establishing arenas and institutions for consultative policies, etcetera (Martiniello 2005). (See the previous section on variations in nationality and citizenship laws.)

With regard to the second factor - differences relating to immigration history - according to Martiniello (2005: 16), in the "old" immigration countries in north-western Europe political participation, mobilisation and representation of immigrants and their descendants are often topical issues, while in the "newer" immigration countries in southern and eastern Europe this is not the case. Our data confirms this, but only to a degree. For example, local voting rights for foreigners are especially to be found in the older immigration countries, and the level of participation is probably higher in these countries (although we have no specific data to confirm this). But the levels of participation in non-conventional ways are also determined by the particularities of the different Member States. Further and more specific research is required to explain certain factors, such as the way that migrants have been particularly active in the trade unions. One possible explanation for this could be that, because of inadequate and deficient official integration policy, unions are seen to offer special services to immigrants (examples of this can be found in Spain).

The third factor, the heterogeneity of the group of immigrants and their descendants in terms of political attitudes and behaviour, is rather self-evident but sometimes overlooked. For example, collective participation of refugees and recognised asylum seekers is often more problematic because of the heterogeneity of the group and because they are often dispersed throughout the country. To illustrate this, an important element of the Irish integration policy is self-help by asylum seekers and refugees, but in practice this potential is undermined by another strand of government policy, which aims at spreading asylum seekers around the country. Differences between the forms of participation enjoyed by first- and second-generation immigrants should also be borne in mind. While many of the first-generation associations are internal and homeland-oriented, second-generation ones are oriented more towards the society of residence. And as the study of Tillie and Fennema (1999) shows,

there are also remarkable differences between ethnic groups with regard to forms of associations and the degree of their participation in them.

Conventional forms of political participation
Voting rights: In some countries (Denmark, Finland, Ireland, the Netherlands and Sweden) long resident third-country nationals are entitled to vote and to stand for election at municipal level. In Luxembourg, they are only entitled to vote. In Portugal and Spain, this right has been granted on the basis of reciprocity (for example, for Brazilians in Portugal and for Portuguese in Brazil). In the UK, because of the country's colonial past, there exists a rather complex situation; it extends voting rights as well as eligibility in national elections to all Commonwealth and Irish citizens. In most of these states the rights of third-country nationals to take part in elections are related to a period of lawful residence rather than by permanent residence status. The 1992 Council of Europe Convention on the participation of foreigners in public life at local level and the granting of voting rights in municipal elections to Union citizens has stimulated the public and parliamentary debate on this issue in several Member States, such as, for example, Belgium and Italy (Groenendijk et al 2000: 106).

Special advisory or consultative bodies: Consultative structures can function at both national and local levels. Such structures exist in most EU Member States, with national governments often taking the lead in setting them up (Niessen & Schibel 2004: 42). In some countries, the establishment of consultative bodies is required by law (for example, once the community of non-citizens reaches a certain size, as in Luxembourg and Denmark). Consultative bodies, especially at national level, often include representatives of non-governmental and migrant associations, along with representatives of public authorities and social partners. At local level, consultative bodies are often composed of locally elected representatives together with immigrants. Consultative bodies have no decision-making competence but they are usually entitled to deliberate and to make proposals, and generally these bodies respond to government policy or legislative proposals concerned with immigrant integration (Niessen & Schibel 2004: 42-43). The structure and mandates of the advisory bodies differ considerably (CEC 2003a).

Non-conventional forms of political participation
Non-conventional forms of political participation are diverse. There is little or no information on this topic for the different Member States, so it is not possible to point to trends at this stage of the research (but see Penninx & Roosblad 2000 for labour unions).

In all countries, immigrants and refugees form immigrant associations, mostly at local level but also at regional and national level (and even at EU-level). The opportunities for migrants to form immigrant association are dependent on national, regional and local government policies (funding, official acknowledgement, participation in consultative bodies); the qualities of the immigrant population (in countries such as Ireland and Italy the dispersal and diversity of immigrant populations forms a barrier to the formation of community associations); and the existence of other channels / NGOs lobbying for the interests of immigrants.

The EU Network on Integration of Refugees (2000) discerns two different approaches to immigrant participation: the top-down model of institutionalised consultation, and the bottom-up model of the promotion of refugee community organisations providing integration services and participating in local policy-making. In Portugal and the Netherlands, for example, the government chooses the first-mentioned approach as an important element of the strategy to encourage the participation of immigrants. Examples of the second form of strategy can be

found in the UK and Ireland, as a form of multiculturalism through which the authorities actively encourage the formation of community organisations as an element in their strategy of integration and collective self-support.

In this first phase of the research, we have found hardly any information worth reporting regarding other forms of civil involvement of immigrants.

Neither have we found much comparable information on the levels of participation of immigrants, either in conventional or in non-conventional forms. The only information that is relatively easily available relates to representation on advisory bodies for immigrants. Even comparable data on participation in politics (parliament, city councils) appears to be unavailable.

2.3.5   Integration programmes for newcomers

Most countries offer language courses to immigrants but until recently these were most commonly offered on a voluntary basis and usually taught by volunteers. Since the 1990s, due to an increasing awareness of the fact that successful integration in the longer term often depends on early efforts at integration, some governments have become more involved in reception programmes for newly arrived immigrants. The approaches (including objectives, organisation and financing of the programmes) vary among the European countries because of different immigration histories, different policy regimes and differences in the respective roles of government and civil society (CEC 2004a). However, there is a general consensus that these programmes should enable immigrants to function independently and in a self-supportive manner, and enable them to participate actively in all aspects of life (CEC 2003a).

More elaborate policies and programmes (with three major components: language tuition, orientation and labour-market training) have developed especially in the north-western part of Europe. Three factors seems to be of importance: (1) these countries have the longest immigration tradition in Europe (and integration programmes have developed because of the disappointing results of past policies); (2) the main reasons for current immigration tend to be primarily of a family reunification or a humanitarian nature; (3) these countries tend to have highly developed welfare systems (CEC 2003a, Entzinger 2004). In other countries, especially those with a less developed welfare state and/or where most or all immigrants have a job offer before entering the country, problems of integrating newcomers are seen to be more related to ensuring proper infrastructure, such as housing, and healthcare (CEC 2003a).

The integration programmes in the north-western countries vary among the Member States in relation to the objectives, content, organisation and enforcement of the programmes (Michalowski 2004). In some countries, integration programmes are purely an instrument of integration policy (UK, Sweden); while their availability is guaranteed, they are not mandatory. In others (Denmark, Austria, the Netherlands), these programmes are also an instrument of immigration policy, aimed at reducing the immigration of those categories of people who are perceived to be a burden to the welfare state (family reunion and foreign spouses, asylum seekers) (Entzinger 2004, RMO 2003). In the latter countries, integration policies have become strict and mandatory and have developed in conjunction with new and stricter immigration policies. In Austria and Denmark, passing a language exam or test is a prerequisite for obtaining a permanent residence permit. This will soon also be the case in the Netherlands. Finland and the Belgian region of Flanders occupy a middle position, while

France and Germany are moving in that direction. Southern Member States are also in the process of improving the integration of newly arrived immigrants. In some of these countries (especially Italy and Portugal), civil society (NGOs) plays a major role in providing integration measures.

In some Member States, language courses are developed and supplied not for newcomers as such but in relation to a language test as part of the naturalisation procedure. This is the case in the UK, and in some eastern Member States (Slovenia, Baltic States). In Estonia and Latvia, integration policy is mainly directed at linguistic integration of the large Russian minority, as part of the nation-building project. Social cohesion issues are also a motive behind developments in integration policies for newcomers in other Member States (UK, the Netherlands, Denmark), but in relation to immigrants and the social cohesion needs of a multicultural society rather than to national minorities. In other countries, such as Sweden, the function of integration programmes is particularly related to the preparation of newcomers for participation in the labour market.

2.4 <u>Socio-Economic Integration</u>

2.4.1   Employment

Employment participation rates

Employment participation rates for immigrants are below average in the majority of Member States, as well as in the European Union as a whole. Some notable exceptions to this rule are the more recent immigration countries, such as Portugal, Spain and Greece, where the participation rates of foreign nationals and foreign-born citizens are higher than average. This is also the case for Luxemburg. Where data is available for the new Member States, such as the Czech Republic and Hungary, it generally shows little difference in the employment rates of foreign nationals and the population as a whole. On average in the EU, overall employment rates of third-country nationals and foreign-born citizens are 52% and 57% respectively, compared to the EU average of 64% (CEC 2004d: 54)

In most of the 'older' immigration states, unemployment figures are in general much higher for both foreign nationals and the foreign-born population, whereas the rates in recent immigration states are either on a par with or below average (for example, Italy, Greece, Ireland) (OECD 2005:62-63) [11].

The potential for collecting comparable data across the EU has improved with the introduction in the Labour Force Survey of the categories "foreign-born" and "foreign nationals", although this has not yet been fully extended to apply to the Member States which joined the Union in May 2004. However, the significant differences in the make-up of the immigrant population, the reasons for migrating and the circumstances of entry to the host country have an inevitable impact on the employment situation and on the way this is captured in statistics. Without further investigation into national contexts, it is therefore difficult to make more precise comparisons between countries regarding their employment markets, beyond these very general conclusions.

---

[11] See Annex II, table 6 and figures 1-3 for overview tables of employment and unemployment rates of migrants in a selection of Member States.

Factors influencing the gap in employment rates

The "Employment in Europe Report" 2004 draws attention to the fact that employment rates vary significantly according to factors such as the region or country of origin and the level of education of the immigrants and descendants (CEC 2004d: 54).

Origin
Whereas foreign-borns from other EU Member States or other industrialised states have similar (or even in some cases higher) rates of employment, non-Western immigrants seem to have particular difficulties in accessing European labour markets. Data from the European Labour Force Survey indicates that North African immigrants in particular show lower participation rates and higher unemployment rates. This is especially the case for North African women, whose employment rate is just above half of the EU average (one-third compared to 58% of overall figure) (CEC 2004d: 54; see also Van Tubergen & Maas 2004).

Education and skill level
Levels of skills and education are commonly mentioned as an important determinant for employment opportunities in most countries. In general, immigrants are over-represented in the highest and lowest qualified groups, and non-Western immigrants are particularly over-represented in the latter group. As there is an increasing demand for higher and medium-skilled employees, low-skilled groups run a greater risk of unemployment and exclusion. Data suggests that in countries such as Austria, France, Germany and Belgium the unemployment rate for foreign-born and foreign nationals would drop if these groups had the same educational distribution as the main population. (OECD 2005:64).

But it is not always the case that higher education leads to better employment opportunities. In France, the unemployment rate of non-EU foreign nationals with a postgraduate diploma is almost three times the rate of EU-citizens. Similarly, reports from Sweden indicate that skills generally match the requirements of the Swedish labour market, concluding that the reasons for disadvantages in entering the labour market must be sought elsewhere.

A study conducted by the EUMC suggests that one of the reasons may be the difficulty in transferring skills from abroad, linked not only to linguistic problems but also to formal non-recognition of foreign (especially non-EU) diplomas. The study argues that evidence for this can be found to a certain extent in all Member States, but that it is particularly highlighted in the three Nordic countries (EUMC 2004b: 41).

The potential for transferring and retaining skills and, more broadly, for accessing labour markets is also connected with the reasons for migration and the regulations and conditions surrounding entry into a country. For example, studies have shown that it is more difficult for immigrants who originally arrived as asylum seekers to use their skills and find employment than, for example, immigrants arriving through family reunification (EUMC 2004b: 53). This is a particular concern in the Nordic countries, where refugees and asylum seekers form a substantial section of the immigrant population. The idea of allowing asylum seekers to take up employment earlier in the process, in order to facilitate their integration, has recently been a subject of debate in some other Member States, such as Luxembourg and the UK.

Nationality
The European Employment Report 2004 notes a growing difference in employment rates between the foreign-born population and foreign nationals. However, this does not

necessarily mean that naturalisations *per se* open up access to the labour market. Citizenship might on the one hand prove an advantage when seeking employment, but on the other hand a person who has been successful in seeking employment is also more likely to seek naturalisation (CEC 2004d: 53-54). Moreover, experience in many older immigration states show that structural barriers, such as segregation and discriminatory attitudes, persist for foreign-born citizens even when they have taken on the nationality of the host country. In one of the countries with the highest rates of naturalisation, Belgium, field studies by ILO have shown that candidates of foreign origin were discriminated against, regardless of whether or not they had taken Belgian nationality (Centre for Equal Opportunities 2003: 21-22). According to a study conducted by the EUMC, the difficulties and inequalities faced by immigrants in the northern and western European States with longer traditions of immigration cannot be fully explained or dealt with without taking into account the factor of discriminating practices (EUMC 2004d: 84).

Characteristics of the host country
The above example regarding the existence of discriminatory practices illustrates the fact that the policies and structures of the labour market and, more broadly, of the host society as a whole greatly impact on the employment opportunities of immigrants and their descendants. Factors include, for example, socio-economic conditions, the structure of the labour market, access to and content of employment measures, policies and practices to promote integration. Studies have shown that differences in the institutional context of the host countries can result in significantly different outcomes in labour market integration for groups of immigrants departing from the same county of origin (Ray 2004:18-20; Van Tubergen & Maas 2004). The institutional contexts of a selected number of Member States, and the specific policies and practices they develop to promote the integration of immigrants in the labour market, will be further investigated in the next phase of the project.

Labour migration and quota systems

In the majority of the Member States, there is a general ban on labour immigration, with certain exceptions related to workers with specific qualifications. Quotas aimed at restricting and controlling labour immigration are mainly used by the recent immigration States and by some of the post-enlargement Member States. Portugal recently set annual limits for labour migration, and Spain has in later years experimented with labour quotas, with mixed results and responses from the population. In these States the quotas are also set against the background of an extensive presence of undocumented immigrants. While quotas may be a means to deal with the issue, experience in Spain shows that, in cases where applications for the quotas must be filed in the country of origin, the quotas can have an adverse affect on the ability of this group to gain regular and stable employment and residence in the country.

At the other end of the spectrum, countries that have been long closed to labour immigration are using quotas and selection systems to facilitate entry for specific groups of skilled workers, such as computer scientists (France and Germany), or professionals within the health and education sectors (UK). Discussions on the opening up of labour immigration do exist in the traditional immigration countries but they are not very prominent.

Policies and programmes to promote inclusion

Guideline 7 in the new and reinforced National Action Plans on Employment encourages Member States to promote the integration of and combat discrimination against people who are at a disadvantage in the labour market, including immigrants and ethnic minorities.

A review of the National Action Plans 2004 reveals that, although a majority of Member States pay attention to the issue, remarkably few have set specific targets for immigrants and ethnic minorities in terms of employment rates. The Netherlands is an exception, with precise year-by-year targets.

The most common actions mentioned in the National Action Plans relate to improving language proficiency and skills and establishing a direct contact with the labour market. Examples of initiatives include improvement of vocational training programmes (for example, the bilateral vocational training programmes in Germany), language training (Denmark) and workplace induction schemes (Sweden).

In addition to improving the skills and opportunities for individuals, Member States with longer traditions of immigration have increasingly started to take action to improve the structure and environment of their labour markets. In particular, many countries are involved in raising awareness among employers on the subject of combating discrimination and promoting equal opportunities for under-represented groups. Several countries have in place concrete initiatives and policies to encourage companies to develop and promote diversity policies (Belgium, the UK). In this context, there is a tendency in some countries to develop different forms of partnerships between authorities and social partners and employment organisations (see, for example, Sweden, Spain, Belgium).

In the next phase of the project we will further investigate policies and strategies to promote the inclusion of immigrants in the labour market in a selected number of countries.

2.4.2 Social Policy and Social Protection

Access of immigrants to social protection schemes

Social protection includes social security (unemployment, old age, invalidity benefits) and social assistance (programmes for the poorest to cover their basic needs). In general, immigrants with permanent residence status have access to social security benefits on the same basis as nationals in all Member States. There are greater differences in regulations relating to social assistance, where the great majority of the States provide access to long-resident third-country nationals on the same basis as for nationals, while some States seek to reserve economic benefits solely for their own nationals (Austria, Greece and Luxembourg) (see, for example, Groenendijk et al 2000:105-106). Regulations and practices regarding the provisions available for asylum seekers also differ. Contribution-based benefits are generally accessible on the same basis as they are for nationals. However, there are often limitations linked to minimum contributions or waiting periods. This is particularly relevant for employment-based benefits, including parental leave and old-age insurance (Steinhilber 2003).

Conditions of access to different social protection schemes can have an important impact on the social inclusion of immigrants and their potential for contributing to the systems. In Sweden, it has been noticed that initial difficulties in entering the labour market are augmented in cases where immigrants cannot access unemployment benefits because of

their lack of work experience and instead become dependent on social assistance. Although in principle both support systems should give access to employment services, in practice only the latter gives full access to support services such as work-place induction schemes and support for further education (Swedish Integration Board 2001:25-26).

Social protection policies

Two opposite lines of arguments have dominated the debate around the role of immigration in relation to European welfare states. On the one hand there has been a fear that welfare provisions would act as a "pull" factor to attract immigrants and, in particular, asylum seekers who would then become an additional cost burden to the system. On the other hand, given demographic changes and the ageing population, (highly) skilled immigrants have been seen as a means to fill labour shortages and support welfare systems. However, both arguments have serious weaknesses: asylum seekers do not generally have any detailed knowledge of the welfare systems of the countries they go to, and immigration cannot be the unique solution to the sustainability of welfare systems (Geddes 2004).

Cost-benefit studies on immigrants' use of and contributions to welfare systems are very difficult to conduct, mainly because of the lack of data which could provide a breakdown according to nationality and/or ethnic origin. Moreover, relative costs and benefits are difficult to assess, as the impact of immigration on welfare systems depends on a number of factors linked to both types of immigration and type of welfare states. The likelihood of dependency on the social security system depends, for example, not only on the educational level of the person, his/her skill endowment, age, family socio-economic characteristics and reasons for migrating, but also on the economy and the social security system of the receiving society and the social rights connected with resident status.

A small study commissioned by the Spanish government in relation to the health system concluded that immigrant contributions to the system were greatly superior to the costs they imposed on the system (Felip Santamaría N., et al 2002). Nevertheless, in some countries there is a tendency to reduce access to welfare provisions for immigrants. In the Netherlands, for example, tougher social security measures for immigrants are planned. In Denmark similar changes have already been introduced: the legislation on the integration of refugees reduces social benefits for refugees by up to 50% compared to Danish citizens for a period of 7 years.

In summary, the complex inter-relationships between the types of immigration and the types of welfare systems have a substantial impact on the extent to which immigrants can utilise and contribute to the systems. In the next phase of the project we will further explore these linkages in a select number of countries which have different welfare regimes and a variation of policy views on welfare provision for immigrants.

2.4.3   Education and training

Enrolment

Directly comparable data regarding the numbers of immigrants or children of immigrants presently enrolled in compulsory schooling in the Member States is not available, since there are considerable differences in different countries' collection of data and definitions of

population categories. While most use citizenship as their primary category, others use majority or minority groups.

According to a comprehensive study conducted by the EUMC, enrolment figures of foreign nationals or ethnic minorities vary between 3% and 15% in the pre-enlargement Member States. In general, the higher figures can be found in Member States with a longer tradition of immigration. However, the young immigrant population is growing fast in some of the newer immigration countries. In Greece, the number of pupils of foreign origin has doubled since the end of the 1990s to reach 10% of the total number of school children (EUMC 2004c: 10-123).

It should also be noted that, for Member States with longer traditions of immigration, data based on nationality is likely to conceal the number of children of immigrants or second-generation immigrants who are enrolled in schools. Country-specific statistics should therefore be treated carefully when taken out of their national context. In the Member States which recently joined the Union, the contingent of foreign-born students figures are in general very low (IOM 2004).

Educational attainment

Ethnic minorities and children of immigrants are in general under-represented in academic branches of upper secondary schooling and over-represented in branches with an orientation towards vocational training. This tendency is valid both in newer immigration states and in states with a longer tradition as host countries (EUMC 2004c: 43-53). Despite indications from some Member States that immigrant children achieve higher education levels than their parents (for example, in Germany), it would thus seem that there is still some way to go before similar levels of skills and education can be attained across the population as a whole.[12]

There are also significant differences in educational attainment, not only in comparison with the majority population but also within the group of immigrants. The longer pupils have lived in a host country, the better their chances of graduating. However, data from countries which collect data on second-generation immigrants and ethnic minorities shows that even pupils born in the host country to foreign parents underachieve in comparison with their peers (see, for example, data from Sweden: Swedish Integration Board 2004: 183-185). Moreover, evidence from the UK and the Netherlands seems to suggest that certain ethnic minority groups tend to achieve better than others. When investigating the reasons for underachievement, it is thus important to take into account both the length of stay in the host country, as well as any eventual differences between groups of ethnic minorities.

A comparative study across the pre-enlargement Member States conducted by the EUMC suggests that reasons for underachievement go beyond language and cultural differences and the time of settlement, to include social and structural causes. Significant factors include socio-economic status, the level of education achieved by the parents, the access to more

---

[12] EUMC (2004) *Migrants, minorities and education - Documenting discrimination and integration in 15 member states of the European Union* Tables 5 "Enrolment figures for Foreign citizens and Ethnic minorities during a recent school year "-university level p.40

prestigious public or private schools, the lack of or poor quality of support programmes, the low reputation of schools in segregated areas (EUMC 2004c: 54-56).

Policies

In many of the States with longer traditions of immigration, there is a rising concern about segregation and its effects on equal chances of quality education. Educational policies often form part of urban policy programmes, and several countries provide specific educational support to areas with a high representation of immigrants. Most of the public support is directed to primary and secondary education, but there are sporadic examples of initiatives from universities and higher education institutes aimed at increasing representation of ethnic minorities and immigrants (see, for example, Sweden, France, Netherlands, UK, Belgium).

Almost all Member States provide specific support to immigrant children in schools. Support for learning the language of the host country is by far the most common component. Moreover, most countries, both in the pre-and post-enlargement States, include inter-cultural educational components in their school curricula and/or teacher training. However, support for the language and culture of origin is not offered systematically, although various initiatives do exist in many Member States. In some States, these programmes are only available where there are bilateral agreements with the emigration country (Belgium); in others, programmes are only available in certain localities (Denmark, Austria). The Netherlands, moreover, has recently abolished these programmes (Eurodyce 2004).

2.4.4 Housing

Access to housing

With the exception of a few Member States such as Malta, all legal residents regardless of origin or nationality status have equal access to housing and public housing across the EU. However, in many cases equal access is in practice limited. Our data points to a series of issues subject to debate in the Member States, including shortage of housing at reasonable prices (for example, Italy, Austria); unsatisfactory standard of housing (for example, Portugal); unequal access and discriminatory practices by public and/or private landlords (for example, France, Belgium, Spain, Finland, Austria).

There is in general no systematic collection of detailed data and information on the extent and expressions of the discriminations faced by immigrants with regards to access to housing. However, results from surveys and other research studies conducted in some countries suggest that discriminating practices are a widespread phenomenon, particularly in the private property market. The problem exists both in newer immigration States as well as in States with longer experience of immigration. Studies from France show that, in some areas, discriminatory patterns have been established whereby landlords invariably perceive immigrants or foreign-born citizens as a menace to the reputation of the neighbourhood (GELD 2001). To raise awareness of the issue and combat discriminatory practices, the French General Directorate of Urbanism, Habitat and Construction produced and distributed a brochure in 2003 on the rights of those seeking to rent an apartment.

The new Directive implementing the principle of equal treatment between people irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, which has recently been implemented in the Member States,

provides a new tool to combat discrimination in housing, but it is too early to measure its impact.

Segregation

Concern about ethnically segregated neighbourhoods is widespread across the EU, including both pre- and post-enlargement Member States. The causes of segregation are numerous, and include the above-mentioned problems of access and discrimination, access to employment opportunities, choices linked to family reunification and cultural preference.

The consequences of segregation are numerous and complex, and have an impact both on the society as a whole and on the opportunities of individual immigrants. Key issues in this respect are access to and quality of education, labour market opportunities, quality of housing, social relations and social cohesion.

Several Member States with longer traditions as immigration countries report particular difficulties for youth in segregated areas with regards to accessing higher education and entering the labour market. There are several underlying factors, as evidenced by data from France, Belgium and Sweden. For example, lack of investment in schools in deprived areas has a negative impact both on the quality of education and on the support required to encourage socially disadvantaged students to go on to higher education. In addition, young people in segregated and deprived areas are often excluded from the informal social networks which allow access to many employment opportunities. Moreover, in some countries there is a concern that the accumulation of these disadvantages may develop into so-called "neighbourhood effects", where a person gets discriminated against by potential employers because of their place of residence or the school he or she attended.

Urban policy

Urban policies have gained increased attention in many Member States during the past decade, as a means of combating the problems of disadvantaged segregated areas and run-down city neighbourhoods. Although few urban policies make specific reference to issues directly related to immigration, the policies remain highly relevant in terms of improving the situation of immigrants, given that they are more than often over-represented in socio-economically vulnerable neighbourhoods and areas.

The development of urban policies started in Member States with longer traditions as immigration countries, such as France, the UK and the Netherlands, and later spread to neighbouring countries, where the policies are often less extensive. For example, in the two Scandinavian countries, urban policies were introduced to selected neighbourhoods and localities on an experimental basis in the latter half of the 1990s.

Most urban policy programmes include a mix of the following components:
- Social cohesion and participation (typically education and employment opportunities);
- Social relations and inter-cultural issues (including security-related issues and cultural diversity);
- Physical environment (refurbishment and renovation);
- Economic regeneration (support to local economy and enterprises).
(See Van den Berg et al, 2004.)

The focus of the initiatives and the balance between the different components differ according to the general policy priorities and objectives established by local or national authorities in each of the policy fields involved. As one of the first Member States to develop comprehensive urban policy programmes, France has focused on education and employment, providing assistance and investments to priority areas (zones) that are particularly vulnerable from a socio-economic perspective. But the content may also be influenced by specific problems encountered. For example, following riots in Brussels, security contracts were introduced in targeted neighbourhoods of the capital, aimed at supporting vulnerable groups, preventing crime and decreasing the sense of insecurity.

As previously mentioned, in the initiatives of most of the countries, objectives related to integration policies and amelioration of the situation of immigrants are implicit and mainstreamed across the initiatives. Sweden is the only country to specifically include combating segregation as a major objective of its initiatives.

The issues around segregated and deprived areas clearly demonstrate the inter-linkages between different policy sectors, where a disadvantage or discrimination in one area leads to further disadvantages in others. Urban policy programmes reflect the understanding that comprehensive multiple policy approaches are often required, in order to promote social cohesion and inclusion. In order to gain a better understanding of the way urban policies contribute to the double objective of enhancing social cohesion and improving the (economic and social) integration of immigrants, urban policies from a selected number of countries will be further analysed in the second phase of the present study.

2.4.5   Health and health care

The general health situation of immigrants

There appears to be a general lack of information on the health situation throughout the majority of the Member States. National health surveys rarely allow a breakdown of data according to foreign origin or nationality. The absence of any references to the health of immigrants or ethnic minorities in the Eurobarometer special survey on the health of adults in the European Union also reflects the lack of attention given to the subject up to now (Eurobarometer, 2003). However, a few Member States, such as France and Germany, have recently shown signs of increased awareness of the need to bridge this information gap. In Germany, the national health survey for children and young people is currently being amended with a view to providing more detailed data on the health situation of youth of immigrant origin, as from 2006 (German Federal Government 2003: 38).

In Sweden, one of the few Member States where data on the health situation of immigrants is already being collected, data shows that foreign nationals and foreign-born citizens are more likely to suffer from ill health than Swedish-born nationals. A national survey on self-declared health status conducted in 2003 revealed that women and men born outside Sweden, and in particular those born outside of the EU, suffer from both mental and physical ill health to a higher degree than Swedish-born nationals (National Institute of Public Health, 2003).

Improving the provisions of health services

Similarly, specific policies and projects targeted at improving access to health services for immigrants and ethnic minorities are rare. The most common initiative across the EU seems

to be the intercultural mediation services in hospitals, which are running in several Member States, such as, for example, the Netherlands and Belgium. But most of the targeted policies and projects in this field are for the moment concentrated in the two Member States with long traditions of multicultural policies - that is, the Netherlands and the UK. In the UK, for example, a good practice guide on improving access to health services for ethnic minority groups has been developed (UK Government 2003:56).

Access to health care for undocumented migrants

Although most Member States recognise the basic right of undocumented immigrants to access emergency health care, formal and practical restrictions often prevent this group from exercising their rights. France is one example of the recent attempts of some countries to limit access to healthcare for this group. Following a recent reform of the medical state aid, undocumented immigrants must now provide proof that they have been present on French territory for at least three months in a row, before they are able to request assistance. But even in countries where there are no formal restrictions, in practice lack of awareness and information on the rights and procedures among health service providers - as well as the immigrant groups themselves - discourages the use of health services (Romero-Ortuño 2004:263-267).

Interestingly, two of the Member States with the highest estimated numbers of undocumented immigrants - Spain and Italy - also have more generous conditions of access to healthcare for this group than most other Member States. In both countries under certain circumstances migrants have access to extended healthcare beyond emergency care.

2.5 Socio-Cultural integration

At the centre of the debate around socio-cultural integration lies the ways in which the host country conceptualises and copes with the issues of diversity within an inclusive society.

Traditionally, there are important differences between Member States with regard to policies and philosophies of social-cultural integration. The integration policies of the UK, the Netherlands and Sweden inspired by a multiculturalist ideology, can be contrasted with the French, German and Austrian policies that give - for different reasons – immigrants little room for cultural and religious expressions in the public sphere (Penninx 2004).   However, traditional patterns and philosophies of integration with regards to socio-cultural issues are starting to change. As discussed above, in both the Netherlands and the UK, earlier multiculturalist models are now being called into question and there is an emphasis on language proficiency, common values and increased contact between majority and minority populations. In both Sweden and the Netherlands one can see a shift in the official approach from group emancipation towards individual integration. In France, however, there are the first signs of the modification of the assimilationist discourse in the direction of an increasing openness towards other cultures, and it is now openly acknowledged that the state can only expect political and civic - and not cultural - integration.

In newer immigration states, and in the new Member States where the numbers of immigrants are lower but rising faster, the issues have not been discussed to the same extent. However, there is a tendency in the more recent immigration states, such as Portugal and Greece, to emphasise integration in terms of common values. The newer Member States have often been countries of emigration rather than immigration, and are in the early

stages of developing responses to increased immigration rates. However, these countries often have national minorities - such as the Roma in central and Eastern Europe and the Russian-speaking in the three Baltic States - where similar issues of diversity may arise.

Integration is a two-way process, which has an impact on the way in which both the immigrants and the host societies perceive and define their identity. One of the indicators used to measure socio-cultural integration is the degree to which immigrants identify themselves with the national community of the host country. A study on the situation of second-generation immigrant youths in selected EU Member States showed that France and the UK, with very different views and traditions on diversity of cultures, have equally high levels of young people who identify themselves both with their ethnic community and as nationals of the country where they were born (University of Bamberg 2001: 63-69). Even though the data from the study is not extensive enough to be able to draw any general conclusions, this does suggest that national "philosophies of integration" might play a lesser role than previously thought in the socio-cultural integration of second-generation immigrants

Identification issues also arise at the level of the society itself, in terms of how well it adapts to the changing face of its population and the policy responses it generates in relation to the acceptance of diverse groups. A recent analysis summarised the results of major surveys on majorities' attitudes towards minority populations in old and new EU Member States. The surveys included questions concerning, for example, opposition to civil rights for immigrants and resistance to a multicultural society. The analysis showed that half of the population in both western and eastern parts of Europe have a resistance to immigrants to a varying degree, while asylum seekers were more accepted, with only a third of the populations showing a resistance (EUMC 2005:18). Nearly two out of three people in 15 EU Member States considered there to be a limit to the development of a multicultural society, while this was less the case in the new Member States (who were candidate countries at the time) (*ibid*). Regional differences could also be seen in the form of a north/south divide: citizens in Greece and the Mediterranean countries were less positive, while Nordic countries were more positive. The reasons for the resistance vary according to the national contexts, and also evolve according to circumstances and the phases the countries go through. For example, some links could be found between a negative attitude to multiculturalism and high unemployment figures (*ibid*:19).

Religious diversity has been an issue of debate and concern in northern and western Member States. It can be argued that this lies at the heart of the debate on multiculturalism, where fears of communitarianism in France and other countries put pressure on the multiculturalist argument. Religion, together with language, is often "tightly bound up with notions of national identity". For that reason, diversity policies can be perceived as a threat to national identity (Penninx 2004: 11). One of the issues highlighted in this context is a concern about religious and cultural practices which are perceived as a threat to gender equality and the rights of women. Awareness-raising on gender equality is a central part of the integration contracts for newcomers in France. In Sweden and Denmark, initiatives have been put in place to support girls in families with highly patriarchal structures and to combat forced marriages and so-called "honour killings". Partly related to the gender dimension, in several countries there has also been concern over public displays of religious signs, as illustrated by the debates on headscarves in schools in France, the Netherlands and Belgium. Here again, States differ considerably in their responses. The French government has recently outlawed wearing headscarves and other religious symbols in public schools. In the UK and the

Netherlands a more pragmatic approach is still predominant, although there are signs of diminishing toleration of difference (*ibid*).

However, a study on religious and linguistic diversity still concludes that despite the discourse, acceptance of religious diversity is quite high in Europe as a whole (Vertovec & Wesseldorf 2005:25). In Ireland, it would appear that there has been a resurgence of spirituality in general because of the recent arrival of immigrants (Ugba 2005:20).

Social-cultural and religious integration to a great extent an issue of providing equal opportunities for the various cultural and religious groups to become organised, as well as allowing public manifestations of culture and religion (Penninx 2004). Notwithstanding signs of convergence, in particular on local level, there are still wide disparities regarding for instance religious instruction in state schools, and opportunities to set up religiously based schools (*ibid*). The traditional Dutch multicultural approach and the Dutch institutional and legal environment – due to its history of pillarization – offered Muslims and other religious groups opportunities for organising themselves, negotiating the public regulation of specific religious facilities, and establishing institutions such as publicly funded Islamic schools and Muslim broadcasting organisations (Rath et al 2001). This contrasts with the traditional general German approach, where there are in general strong reservations about Islamic organisations, although some cities and federal states have divergent policies. Penninx (2004: 15-16) argues that these different national approaches towards Islam and Islamic organisations have had an impact on the attitudes of the second generation of Muslim youth towards the receiving country and towards integration. Studies suggest that Turkish youth in Germany are more likely to have inward-oriented and even fundamentalist attitudes, compared to their counterparts in the Netherlands who would be more outward-looking and directed towards integration and participation. (Sunier 1996; Phalet, Van Lotharingen & Entzinger 2000). This illustrates that cultural and religious integration is a result of the interaction between the activities of migrants themselves and the receiving societies.

2.6 Conclusions

In this section, we will present some initial main conclusions and observations regarding patterns of integration and integration policies in the EU, as outlined above, following the division into three dimensions of integration: legal-political, socio-economic and socio-cultural. A distinction can further be made between inclusive and exclusive policies with regard to one or more of the three dimensions (Penninx 2004). This is the distinction whereby countries consider immigrants to be equal inhabitants or members of the political community or not.

Legal-political integration (policy)
With regards to the legal-political integration of immigrants, there is insufficient comparable data available to draw conclusions on the situation of immigrants in the EU-25. We will accordingly limit ourselves to conclusions drawn mainly on the basis of policies and legislation.

In general, a convergence regarding legal-political integration measures and legislation can be observed, partly due to EU policies and Directives in the field of non-discrimination and the legal position of third-country nationals (and because of conventions of the Council of Europe). Within some of the 'older' Member States, especially in countries with a history of a guest-worker system, the legal position of immigrants is still relatively weak, especially in

Austria. According to Penninx (2004:7), the Austrian (like the Swiss) guest-worker policies are still to a great extent typical examples of the exclusive type of policies, in the sense that they combine exclusion from the polity with unequal industrial and social rights for foreign workers and denial of access to the facilities of the welfare state. Policies in new immigration countries, such as Italy and Ireland, also approach this type of policy, by presupposing that most immigrants are only in the host country temporarily, either because they are in transit or because they will sooner or later return to their native countries. In these new immigration countries, the emphasis falls on measures relating to the legal position of immigrants, especially in the legalization of undocumented immigrants (Entzinger & Biezeveld 2003). The same applies to an even greater extent in the new Member States, but in this case many migrants are actually temporary workers or in transit. The north-western Member States, by acknowledging that labour migrants were actually settling permanently, have over the years moved from the exclusive policy type to an inclusive one.

In the legal and political domain, national integration policies in Europe (in the older immigration States in any case) are converging, although substantial differences in ideas about the membership of immigrants in the political community still remain (Penninx 2004). However, in the interests of further control of immigration, especially of family members and asylum seekers, there are also tendencies in some of the north-western countries (for example, Denmark, the Netherlands) towards additional requirements for family reunion and acquisition of secure status. In the new Member States, specific issues concerning the legal status of minorities (Russians in the Baltic States, citizens from former other regions of Yugoslavia in Slovenia) and the discrimination of minorities (especially Roma) are notable.

In countries with a more established immigration tradition, a trend towards a greater emphasis on reception and integration of newcomers can be observed. The development of integration programmes for newcomers goes hand in hand with a greater emphasis on obligations and mandatory measures, legitimated in terms of citizenship and 'give and take'. Civic integration, together with linguistic-communicative integration, is also the main element of integration policies in Estonia and Latvia, but in these cases they are elements in a strategy of nation-building with a focus on the Russian minorities in these countries.

Socio-economic integration (policy)
With regard to the socio-economic position and rights of immigrants, a notable observation is that employment participation rates for immigrants are in general below average in the majority of Member States, except in many of the more recent immigration countries in southern, central and eastern Europe. With regard to educational attainment, immigrants are in general underachieving and are over-represented in vocational training branches. In many of the Member States, especially the 'older' ones, because of the supposed effects on the opportunities of migrants and on social cohesion, issues of educational and residential segregation are of rising concern. In the southern Member States, the general shortage of housing also constitutes an obstacle to the capacity to integrate migrants.

Differences in the make-up of the immigrant population, in reasons for migrating and in circumstances of entry to the host country – combined with the national labour market structure, economic conjuncture, educational system and welfare provisions particular to the State - all impact on the socio-economic participation rates of migrants in the different Member States. The complex inter-relationships between the types of immigration and types of welfare systems also have a substantial impact on the extent to which immigrants make use of welfare entitlements and contribute to welfare systems.

Participation in the labour market and achievement of economic independence is seen by almost all Member States as crucial to the integration process (CEC 2003a). Most States with a history of immigration have developed measures and policies with regard to the socio-economic dimension of the integration of immigrants. Equal treatment and non-discrimination is the common point of departure for policies developed by the European liberal democracies. Moreover, the norm-setting laws, rules and directives of the European Commission in the field of equality and non-discrimination have contributed to more uniformity in this domain (Penninx 2004).

Traditional differences in approaches to socio-economic integration include the choice between mainstreaming immigrants within existing policies and developing specific policies. A tendency to mainstreaming can be observed, in favour of policies to support potentially marginalised groups in general – also in countries such as Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden, where previously specific policies were developed (Heckmann 1999). The increasing importance of urban policies is an example of this mainstreaming approach.

Two opposite lines of arguments have dominated the debate around the role of immigration in relation to European welfare states. On the one hand, there has been a fear that welfare provisions would act as a "pull" factor to attract immigrants - particularly asylum seekers but also family immigrants - who would then become an additional cost burden to the system. Because of this fear, in some countries there has been a tendency to reduce access to welfare provisions for migrants (Denmark, Netherlands, Austria). On the other hand, in view of demographic changes and the ageing population, (highly) skilled immigrants are regarded as a means to fill labour shortages and support welfare systems. In Germany particularly, but also in other countries, immigration measures for skilled immigrants are under development.

Socio-cultural integration (policy)
The greatest disparities between national policies can be found in the domain of socio-cultural integration policies. On the one hand there is the traditional assimilationist approach of France and the policies of Germany and Austria, which give little room for the cultural and religious manifestations of migrants in the public sphere. On the other, there are the British, Dutch and Swedish policy traditions, inspired by multiculturalist ideologies (Penninx 2004: 11). However, there are signs of convergence even here. Both in the UK and in the Netherlands, there is a shift from multiculturalism to civic integration and – in the Dutch case – even in some senses to assimilation. At the same time, at the local level in France, Germany and Austria, some allowance is now made for diversity.

Concerns about social cohesion in the context of immigration and integration have primarily been an issue of discussion in the older immigration countries in northern and western Europe. In the more recent immigration States, immigration has not yet been linked to issues of social cohesion to the same extent. Policy initiatives concerning both the social relations and the social inclusion strands of social cohesion can be found in most of the 'older' immigration countries - for example, policies for combating social and urban segregation and for promoting civic integration (integration programmes for newcomers) and inter-ethnic dialogue.

Summary conclusions

Overall, these conclusions confirm the observation of Penninx (2004) that the countries in Europe have developed or are developing integration policies in a rather *ad hoc* manner. This relates to the fact that all the countries are in essence reluctant immigration countries, in contrast to classical immigration countries like Canada and the USA.

An important factor in the development of integration policies appears to be the self-image of a country. For example, Italy (and other recent immigration countries, such as Greece) sees itself mainly as a country of emigration or transit, which partly explains why it has insufficient legal and institutional provisions to meet the needs of asylum seekers and migrants (Zetter et al 2002: 82). The myth of temporary stay also has implications for policies on immigrants; these implications can be seen in (former) guest-worker countries, especially in Austria, but also Luxembourg, where integration measures are very limited. And, of course, differences in the type and level of the welfare system can explain differences in national integration policies. In more centralised and interventionist northern European countries (Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Finland), more organised integration programmes have been and are being developed. The minimal welfare state in, for example, Italy has led to corresponding minimal assistance for refugees and asylum seekers (Zetter et al 2002). In the new Member States, another important obstacle to the development of integration policies is the lack of financial resources.

2.7 <u>Introducing the thematic research</u>

This Chapter has provided an outline of immigrant integration with regard to three different dimensions: legal-political, socio-economic and socio-cultural. The following chapters will focus on three specific themes: employment, social protection and social cohesion.

In the context of providing a rough outline of the issues, the overview provided in the current Chapter places social protection and employment under the specific heading of 'socio-economic integration'. However, it will become clear in Chapters 3 and 4 that developments with regards to employment and social protection of immigrants are not only related to the socio-economic dimension of integration, but also to both the socio-cultural dimension (e.g., culturally-biased selection tests, effects of work on cultural and social integration etc) and the legal-political dimension (e.g. legal position, entitlements, participation in trade unions). This multidimensionality applies even more to the theme of social cohesion (Chapter 5), which is not only related to the issue of social relations and shared norms and values, but also to legal-political aspects (e.g. to civic participation and citizenship) and to socio-economic developments, such as the fight against exclusion from the labour market.

In the case studies, we will describe, compare and analyse developments with regards to employment, social protection and social cohesion from a multi-dimensional perspective. Moreover, due to the interrelation between the various social domains, the three thematic studies will not be restricted to issues discussed under the specific headings of 'employment', 'social protection' and 'social cohesion' in the previous chapter. For example, the study on employment will inevitably also touch upon issues of education (e.g. school-to-work transit, vocational training), discrimination and exclusion, newcomer integration programmes, legal position (industrial and social rights), while there are also interrelations with the two themes of social protection and social cohesion.

3 EMPLOYMENT IN SOCIETIES OF IMMIGRATION

Introduction

In the first part of the study, we briefly outlined the situation of immigrants in the labour markets of the European Union. Overall, statistics show that immigrants continue to contribute greatly to the growth of employment across Europe. However, in many of the Member States, in particular in the western and northern part of the EU, immigrants are an underused resource, with weak connections to the labour market. Indicators such as the activity and unemployment rates, the salary scale and the sectorial split point to a lack of integration of immigrants in the mainstream labour market. Immigrants from outside the European Union and the western world are particularly vulnerable to the risk of exclusion, and in many cases the risks of exclusion persist, regardless of the education and skills of the migrants.

On average, the employment rate of immigrants is lower than that of the native population in most of the European countries, and they also stand a higher risk of experiencing unemployment. However, exceptions to this rule do exist, notably in southern Member States. Within this general pattern, the actual experiences of the immigrants vary greatly, depending both on the skills and experience they carry with them, and on the opportunities and barriers that are embedded in the political, cultural and institutional settings of the local labour market. The result in terms of employment opportunities is the outcome of the influences of various overlapping factors - such as, for example, country of origin (language and cultural differences), skills and education, reason for emigrating, the economic and labour market situation of the host country, sectoral differences in employment opportunities, expressions of direct or indirect discrimination, etc. (See Chapter 2.4)

In every Member State, the complex pattern of social, political and cultural factors as well as institutional settings blends with the characteristics and experiences of the immigrants to bring about particular challenges and solutions. However, despite this variety of situations, in many ways most countries are faced with the same challenge in terms of labour market integration. Put briefly, the challenge is twofold. From the perspective of the national and European labour markets, the objective is to enhance the employment outcome for immigrants in order to contribute to the growth of the economy (as emphasised for example in the context of the European Employment Strategy). From the perspective of the individuals, the objective of integration in the context of employment has been described as ensuring that comparable groups enjoy comparable outcomes in terms of economic and social status (Böhning 1995: 2). The challenge is therefore also to improve the economic and societal outcomes for the individual immigrants, both in terms of their finding and keeping employment, and in terms of providing possibilities for progression and upward mobility.

In order to investigate more closely the way EU Member States attempt to deal with these issues against the background of their past experiences and national context, a small number of states were selected for further case studies. The countries have been selected with a view to providing a demonstration of the way countries with different labour market systems and experiences of immigration deal with the same challenges. The three countries included in this comparison are Spain, Sweden and the UK.

3.1 <u>Situation and background in the three countries</u>

Sweden

As with most Northern and Western European countries, the Swedish labour market has in principle been closed for labour migration from non-EU countries since the late 1960s. There are few openings available, and most of them are for only temporary positions. The majority of the immigrants arriving in Sweden now request entry on the grounds of family reunification. Around 12% are refugees.(Swedish Government 2004: 32-33).

The competition on the open labour market has proven very difficult for these groups. In particular, the economic downturn of the 1990s had a devastating impact on the employment opportunities for immigrants. In the mid-1990s the unemployment rate among foreign-born residents and citizens was close to three times the rate for Swedish-born citizens (Swedish Government 2003a:29). The gap started to close in the late 1990s, but the differences in activity and unemployment rates are still some of the highest in Europe. In 2004, the overall employment rate was 75% compared with 59% for the foreign-born population. At the same time, unemployment figures among the foreign-born climbed to around twice the national average (Swedish Integration Board 2005:14, 21).

The overall objective established by the Swedish government with regards to labour market integration is an employment rate of 80% for the population between ages 20 and 64, across all categories. More specifically in relation to immigrants, the broad objective is to reduce the gap in unemployment rates between the foreign-born and the Swedish-born populations (Swedish Government 2003b:9, 41). In addition, employment has traditionally been seen as a key area for the general integration of immigrants into Swedish society, and there are thus wider integration issues at stake.

Recent research and official studies have tried to explain the rise in the employment gap in the 1990s and the persistence of inequalities. The multiple challenges mentioned in these reports include issues such as reducing the risk for long-term unemployment, promoting equal opportunities, ensuring rapid entry to the labour market for newcomers, language and skills training, the recognition of diplomas and unintended effects of labour laws. During the past few years the debate on the extent and expression of direct and indirect discriminations has intensified. Official research by the Swedish Integration Board has concluded that not only the differences in the employment rate but also general working conditions and the possibilities for progression for persons with an immigrant background cannot fully be accounted for without taking into consideration the existence of more or less subtle forms of discrimination (Swedish Integration Board 2004: 108-109).

United Kingdom

Unlike Sweden, the United Kingdom remains open to certain categories of labour immigrants (mostly high-skilled workers), as well as continuing to receive refugees and family members of established migrants.

The immigrant groups are very varied, both in terms of geographical background, reasons for migrating and length of stay. The challenges and barriers therefore differ markedly between the different groups. In common parlance, the term 'immigrants' has come to be defined as

people born outside the UK, which means that this group does not include the second generation. In order to better reflect the issues surrounding long-term integration of immigrants, and in particular the situation of second-generation immigrants, we will use the term 'ethnic minorities', which includes both foreign and UK-born residents of a non-British ethnic origin. This distinction is also helpful in distinguishing ethnic minority groups from other immigrants who are less exposed to disadvantages and discrimination, mainly those coming from EU or other western countries. The ethnic minorities constitute around 8% of the British population, although the proportion is significantly higher in major urban areas such as London, Manchester and Bradford/Leeds, where most of the ethnic minority communities have settled (Cabinet Office 2003:13).

Despite some progress since the end of the 1990s, the gap in employment rate between ethnic minorities and the population as a whole is still high: 59.4% compared to 74.7% in 2004 (TUC 2005). However, the activity and unemployment rates and related factors such as educational achievement vary greatly between different groups of ethnic minorities. Some groups outdo the white population in performance, while others lag significantly behind. Further to the publication of a strategy report on new approaches to improving the employment performance of ethnic minorities, a task force was created by the Government in 2003 to develop and implement programmes across different sectors. The strategy comprises four main areas of action: improving skills and educational attainment in order to enhance employability; "connecting people to work" through the reform of labour market programmes; providing equal opportunities in work (Cabinet Office 2003).

Spain

In contrast to Sweden and the UK, Spain has until recently mainly been a country of emigration. Mass immigration to the Spanish labour market is a relatively recent phenomenon which is still evolving. The number of immigrants registered in the formal labour market has tripled between 1999 and 2004, from 334,000 to over a million (Pumares Fernandez 2004: 1-2). Compared to other Member States the percentage of the population with an immigrant background is still quite low, but it is rapidly on the rise. The percentage of foreign nationals in the Spanish population rose from 1.8 to 3.3% between 1998 to 2002 (CES 2004: 8).

The Spanish labour market is characterised by a high level of unemployment in general. Paradoxically, the country is at the same time seeking to attract immigrant manpower to fill positions in certain sectors. This situation has arisen because of a mismatch between the skills, education and interests of the Spanish population and the needs of the labour market, where immigrants accept the often low status and poorly paid positions that the Spanish will not apply for (Carrasco Carpio 1999:9). Spain also has a relatively large underground economy that works as an additional pull factor, in particular for undocumented migrants. In view of the high unemployment rate in Spain, immigrants in general have a higher activity rate than the average; in 2001 the activity rate for nationals from non-EU countries was 78.2% compared to 68.3 % for Spanish nationals (CES 2004: 29).

The challenge of integration thus presents itself in a different manner in Spain as compared with the two other countries in this section. From the perspective of the labour market, immigrants enjoy a higher level of integration than average. However, in terms of the economic and social outcomes for immigrants, the same patterns of risk for exclusion can be seen in all three countries. The average risk of unemployment is higher for immigrants; more

immigrants occupy temporary and insecure positions, often below their skill level; and there is high sectorial segregation (CES 2004:32, 42-48).

Because of its immediate needs, Spanish labour market policy towards immigrants has since the 1990s mainly concentrated on regulating immigration, rather than promoting integration. However, the Spanish authorities are also aware of the need to deal with the factors of exclusion, and have started to take some action towards better inclusion of immigrants in employment.

Dealing with the challenges

The purpose of the rest of this section is to investigate how a selection of countries deal with the barriers to integration in the labour market. We will attempt to go beyond a mere description to a discussion of the relevant policies and programmes, picking out elements of good practice. It should be noted that, as many of the programmes are quite new, a more detailed evaluative comparison is not possible, since many of the effects of the programmes are yet to be seen and evaluated.

The literature on labour market integration lists a number of different barriers and opportunities. Some of the factors most often cited are briefly outlined in chapter 2.4. As already mentioned, most of these factors overlap and it is difficult to deal with them separately. However, because of the limited remit of this study, it is necessary to make a choice. The three areas dealt with in this chapter therefore have been chosen not because they are the only barriers to integration, but because they are areas dealt with at national and regional policy level in the three selected countries. The areas we have chosen to investigate are: human capital; employment services; combating discrimination and promoting equal opportunities

3.2 Human capital

The difference in skills is one of the most often cited causes for the disadvantages of immigrants in labour markets. International and European sources of statistics show that immigrants are over-represented in the groups of both high-skilled and low-skilled labour in the EU. A breakdown on the regions of origin show that immigrants from non-EU and non-western countries are more likely to be low-skilled than the population of the host country, whereas immigrants from EU and other western countries are generally high-skilled (Münz 2004:11).

Statistics show that the risk for unemployment and exclusion from the labour market is greater for immigrants from outside the European Union (see, for example, chapter 2.4). Several international studies argue that part of the reason for this disadvantage is the comparatively low level of education and skills within these groups. Low-skilled workers are supposed to be more vulnerable to changes in the labour market, in that they have more difficulties to adapt to new requirements, in particular in the context of economic downturns (Ederveen et al 2005:63).

The situation in the three countries in our comparison only partly confirms these general tendencies. In Spain, immigrants from European non-EU countries, Latin and South America and Asia/other parts of the world have a similar education level to that of the Spanish

population. Only the immigrants from Africa are significantly over-represented in the lower skilled segments (CES 2004: 23-24). In Sweden, the proportion of holders of university degrees is about the same in both the Swedish-born and the foreign-born populations. There are, however, more immigrants than Swedes with education below upper secondary school level, and thus a slight over-representation among the least skilled (Swedish Integration Board 2005: 26).

In the UK, the educational status and performance varies greatly between different groups of ethnic minorities. While some groups (such as Indians and Chinese) have a higher proportion of university graduates than the white population, other groups (such as West Indian and Pakistani) include fewer graduates than average and a higher number of people without any formal qualifications (Department for Education and Skills 2005, Cabinet Office 2003).

Commonly cited theories talk about the loss of human capital in the difficulties involved in translating experiences into the new host country and the impact of the lack of specific country-skills, such as language and socio-cultural knowledge. According to the main theories on human capital, the skills and education immigrants bring with them to their new country are not adapted to the specific situation and requirements of the local labour market. In consequence, in the short term it is more difficult for immigrants to enter and progress in the local labour market than it is for the native population. However, it is argued that, given time, these differences should become less, as the immigrants acquire country-specific skills such as language proficiency (Le Grand, Szulkin 2002: 3-7).

Sweden

In Sweden, several studies confirm that the foreign-born are in general much more likely than Swedish-born to work in a position below their level of educational qualification. In particular, foreign-born citizens and residents are highly under-represented in positions such as those requiring a university diploma, despite the fact that they are as likely as Swedish-born to have completed a degree. One recent study showed that 80% of Swedish-born graduates hold positions corresponding to their level of competence, whereas the figure for foreign-born graduates is only 60% (Swedish Integration Board 2004: 99). The mismatch of competencies was even greater during the economic recession in the 1990s. Based on these facts, the Swedish Government has drawn the conclusion that, while immigrants' education is not fully adapted to the needs of the Swedish labour market, it is also the case that the labour market has not been as efficient as it could be in utilising the potential of this group (Swedish Government 2003a: 32.).

Following the realisation that there exists a pool of highly educated immigrants who find themselves in less qualified positions or outside the labour market altogether, a series of pilot projects has been implemented at national and local level to enhance the labour market integration of highly skilled migrants. For example, a recent project implemented by the National Labour Market Administration 2001-2003 gave unemployed immigrants the opportunity to complement their foreign education at upper secondary school and university levels with relevant Swedish education and training while receiving unemployment support. The training and supplementary education has been particularly oriented towards professions where there is a lack of qualified staff, such as teaching and medical care. Indicative statistics from the first two years of the project show a satisfying success rate: 69% of the participants in courses oriented towards vocational training found employment

within 90 days of completion. During this period, 62% of the participants were women. The project also included support for validation of foreign diplomas and degrees (National Labour Market Administration 2003 a, 2004).

In addition to specific courses for updating and adapting their technical skills, high-skilled immigrants are able to participate in fast-track and more specialised language training at universities. A report from the National Agency for Education indicates that although the specialised courses are personalised and therefore more consuming of time and resources, the results are achieved much more quickly and in a more efficient manner than is the case with classical language programmes (National Agency for Education 2002).

United Kingdom

The education and skills of British ethnic minorities varies greatly dependent on their ethnic background. Some groups, such as Indian and Chinese, do better at school than white pupils, while African Caribbean groups tend to fall below the national average (Department for Education and Skills 2005:8). There is also a great polarisation in the level of education, in that more ethnic minorities than the national average obtain university degrees, but at the same time they are over-represented in the groups with low or no formal education. This is a particularly serious issue in that it continues into the second generation. There is a significantly higher percentage of people without qualifications amongst second-generation Pakistanis, especially women (Cabinet Office 2003: 28-29).

Improving the educational attainment of ethnic minorities is one of the main components of the new government strategy managed by the Ethnic Minority Task Force. The objectives include enhancing the data system for monitoring attainment, and improving the spread of best practices, as well as engaging the support of parents. There is also a focus on ethnic minorities in the Department for Educational & Skills 'Aim Higher' programme, which is designed to increase the number of people in higher education and to reach out mainly to under-represented groups (Cabinet Office 2003:51-73, EMETF 2004:21).

A study by the University College of London on behalf of the Home Office confirms that there is a strong connection between labour market opportunities and wages and language proficiency. Proficiency usually increases dependent on the length of residence, but for recently arrived immigrants, fluency in language makes a significant difference to short-term and medium-term prospects of employment. (Dustmann et al 2003: 54-58). Difficulties with language is by far the most important barrier for new refugees and asylum seekers (Working Group on ESOL 2000:11).

As with education levels, language fluency levels differ significantly between ethnic minority groups; the age of the immigrants in question is also an important factor. Bangladeshi and Pakistani groups - and in particular women in these groups - have the lowest rate of fluency (Modood, Berthoud et al 1997:61). The participants in the English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) courses are very diverse, and the courses therefore have to be adapted to the needs, expectations and capacities of those concerned. The providers of ESOL courses vary considerably, as do the content and quality of the courses (Working Group on ESOL 2000: 9-10). An overview paper commissioned by the Home Office in 2003 shows that, although language training is offered at different levels, in many cases the training has often not served the needs of refugees, and in particular the highly skilled, when it comes to labour market entry (Griffiths 2003: 6). According to a report by the National Employment

Panel, the ESOL has received much similar criticism. For example, it has been argued that the connection to opportunities for practical work experience in the UK is weak, and that the courses have not sufficiently taken into account the participants' individual skills and experience in terms of work and education. A new and improved qualification was put in place in 2004, but it is too early to see what effects it will have (National Employment Panel 2005: 28).

There is also a need to reach people with the lowest levels of literacy, and in particular to hard-to-reach groups, such as women from those communities with poor level of language proficiency. Several small-scale programmes have been implemented across the country targeting these groups. For example, in the context of a pilot programme on community outreach in the field of education established in 2002-2003, one project successfully trained Asian women as learning mentors for other students (EMETF 2004: 27). A local project in Leeds called the Skillzone has reached out to Bangladeshi and Pakistani women, not only to help them learn or improve their English but also to encourage them to have higher aspirations in terms of learning and employment. Individual learning plans were drawn up according to skills and aspirations, and the participants gained both in confidence and in the motivation to continue their learning. Some were also able to achieve other learning objectives, such as obtaining a driving licence (Literacytrust 2005).

3.3 Fighting discrimination and promoting equal opportunities

According to the human capital theory cited above, the disadvantages of immigrants should disappear over time as they adapt and acquire the skills – language, socio-cultural and practical - that are valued in the local labour market. Logically, labour market opportunities and integration should therefore be improved when it comes to the second generation who are born and raised in the country and have acquired the country-specific skills. But this is not always the case. As outlined above, in both Sweden and the UK, second-generation immigrants tend to occupy lower skilled positions to a higher degree than do natives, despite high levels of educational attainment and experience.

"Country-specific skills" are often intangible and can be used as an excuse by employers to justify discriminative behaviour. More or less direct forms of discrimination exist in all three of the countries investigated, including not only open prejudice (based, for example, on name or ethnicity), but also structural and statistical discrimination. As the latter forms of discrimination are subtler, they have proved more difficult to eliminate through policy and legislation.

Sweden

The latest annual report of the Swedish Integration Board concludes that there is now sufficient evidence to see that the high unemployment rates of immigrants and the gap in activity rate cannot be fully explained by barriers such as lack of education or skills. Factors of exclusion also include the demand-side of the labour market: that is, the employers. According to the report, discrimination is thought to be a significant factor, but there is not yet sufficient information on the extent of discrimination or the different forms and expressions it takes (Swedish Integration Board 2004: 108-109).

Many of the most recent efforts of the Swedish authorities in combating discrimination have therefore focused on collecting information and establishing the facts around the subtler forms of discrimination, as a preparation for taking action. In 2004, the Swedish Integration Board initiated a plan on structural discrimination in order to gather and disseminate information on the phenomenon. Moreover, two on-going official investigations commissioned by the Government have been tasked with analysing the existence and expressions of institutional and structural discrimination, and with presenting suggestions on how to tackle it. The interim report of one of these investigations has concluded that structural discrimination does indeed exist, and that it is expressed through higher rates of unemployment (independent of the economic situation of the country), insecure and temporary positions with lower salary and career prospects, etc (Swedish Government 2005: 312-313. One of the main indications that the disadvantage results in part from discrimination rather than purely a lack of language or other skills is that, according to the statistics, second-generation immigrants still have a considerable disadvantage. The risk of unemployment for people born in Sweden with one foreign parent is one-third higher than average (*Ibid* p.275).

In several ways, Swedish policy and practice for combating discrimination is already well developed. Swedish anti-discrimination laws and policies have traditionally provided strong protection, and have recently been further strengthened following the implementation of the European Directives. The ombudsman on ethnic minorities is a well-established position, and there are anti-discrimination bureaus at local level to assist victims of discrimination.

Another significant agent in the integration of immigrants and the fight against discrimination, the Swedish Integration Board, has a mission to investigate indications of discrimination and to provide the evidence which can act as a foundation for political decisions. The Board also provides subsidies to local and national organisations involved in fighting discrimination, as well as to specific projects. There are ongoing awareness-raising activities aimed at combating discriminatory attitudes and practices among key staff involved in labour market activities at regional and local levels. Since 2002, the National Labour Market Administration has been developing measures to stop discrimination in the work of placement agencies - for example, through awareness-raising and staff training. The training includes all aspects of diversity and has been developed in collaboration with the ombudsman (National Labour Market Administration 2003b).

The law on combating discrimination in employment on grounds of ethnicity (1999) requires that all employers, public as well as private, develop a strategic approach towards the promotion of diversity in working life (Law 1999 -130). Despite this, awareness of diversity and integration issues is spreading through the private sector only slowly. A key agent in this context is the Council for Integration in Working Life, which was founded in 1998 by the main trade unions and employer organisations in both public and private sectors. The objective of the Council is to promote integration and combat discrimination through an exchange of experiences, awareness-raising and a highlighting of examples of good practice. The Council also produces guides for leadership and diversity, and initiates pilot projects such as the mentoring of highly skilled immigrants and refugees.

United Kingdom

The United Kingdom has been a pioneer in Europe in terms of developing and implementing comprehensive legal and policy frameworks to combat ethnic and racial discrimination. The

developments have in recent years progressed from a mainly passive prohibitive framework to a more proactive approach to combating discrimination and promoting equality. The Race Relations Act of 1976 was enhanced in 2000, tasking public authorities with the duty of actively working towards combating discrimination and promoting equal opportunities and good relations between people of different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Certain authorities, such as the police and higher education institutions, were also given specific duties, including the preparation, implementation and monitoring of a comprehensive plan to promote race equality.

Despite the progress made in combating discriminations, significant inequalities still persist. The Cabinet Office Report on ethnic minorities and the labour market (2003) makes a clear statement that differences in levels of education cannot fully explain disadvantages in the labour market, and that discrimination is one of the most important factors influencing the situation. The legislation has been successful in combating more direct forms of discrimination such as harassment, but covert forms such as unintended effects of policies and practices still persist (Cabinet Office 2003: 5, 8).

The Cabinet Office report therefore highlights the necessity of encouraging employers to take a higher degree of responsibility in promoting equality and supporting ethnic minorities (*ibid*:99). As the legislation already provides an impetus and support for public employers to take action, recent efforts by the Government have concentrated on finding ways to engage the private sector. A new project initiated by the National Employment Panel within the framework of the Government Task Force on Ethnic Minorities attempts to encourage employers to engage in and lead projects to enhance employment opportunities for ethnic minorities. The main initiative in this context, the Fair Cities Programme, is based on good practice in regionally implemented, employer-led initiatives to promote the employment of ethnic minorities, and aims at encouraging local private sector employers to take similar action. Pilots are currently being developed in Bradford, Brent, Birmingham (EMETF 2004: 48). The Government hopes that the employer-led programmes can provide a new way of combating, for example, statistical discrimination, which occurs when employers choose not to employ a person because they are prejudiced against or unsure about the working experience or qualifications of people who may be inexperienced or who have foreign references or qualifications.

Prior to implementation of these pilot programmes, the Government produced a report on local best practice in employer-led initiatives, with both UK and international examples. The initiatives were all based on the view-point and requirements of the employer in question, depending on the local employment market, and took an individual approach to helping ethnic minorities overcome barriers to employment.

An example of the local good practices referred to in the report is that of Stansted Airport. The airport initiated a programme for the recruitment of long-term unemployed and disadvantaged people from the local communities through the provision of training and support. A key factor in the success of this programme was the establishment of a partnership with stakeholders from the public and private sectors, as well as NGOs, which allowed the partnership to make use of a broad and complementary set of skills. Partners included local employment centres, training and educational bodies, and local councils. Of the 230 people recruited at Stansted as a result of this project, 185 were from ethnic minorities (National Employment Panel 2004: 112- 117).

Spain

Because of the specific labour market situation in Spain, where immigrants mainly fill positions that are to a large part rejected by Spanish candidates, there is a great sectoral segregation between immigrants and Spanish workers. Immigrants are much more likely to hold positions below their level of qualification, and are over-represented in sectors such as domestic services, hotels and restaurants, industry, construction and agriculture. For the most part these are low-paid, low-status jobs, with insecurity of status (Solé C, Parella S 2003:123). In addition, as in other southern states, there is still an active underground economy in Spain. The underground economy acts as a pull factor for immigrants since it facilitates job opportunities for newcomers. However, in the long run, working in the underground economy is an impediment to integration, since it makes it difficult to achieve stability of employment and residence status (Carrasco Carpio 1999:15). Moreover, the fact that many immigrants work in the underground economy, and that the underground economy is highly active in those very sectors where many immigrants are employed, tends to have a negative impact on the image of immigrants among the Spanish population (Carrasco Carpio: 16). Immigrants are more likely than locals to be stigmatised if they work in the underground economy. Much of the useful and necessary work accomplished by immigrants is not very visible (agricultural work for example), whereas street-selling is very visible but not seen as very useful by the public (*Ibid*:17).

The inferior status and harsh working conditions associated with low-skilled jobs, together with the associations with the underground economy, have all been factors in the discrimination against and stigmatisation of immigrants. The fact that immigrants are prepared to take on low-status jobs which Spanish workers reject and to accept harsher conditions for the same jobs has arguably been a key factor in the development of new prejudices and the aggravation of racism (Solé C, Parella S 2003:122-127).

Anti-discrimination policy is still under development in Spain, and it has so far not figured among their official policy priorities. For example, anti-discrimination measures were not included in the 2001-2004 GRECO plan on immigration and integration, which is a sign that Spain is still coming to grips with the issues of immigration rather than integration. However, some examples of anti-discrimination efforts do exist, in particular in the context of programmes supported by the European Social Fund.

In 1995-96, several studies initiated by the ILO investigated the existence of discrimination in hiring practices in various European countries through situation testing – that is, sending mock applications from a diversity of candidates for job vacancies. The results of the studies have had a significant importance in raising awareness of the extent of discriminating practices (Zegers de Beijl 2000). One of the first Spanish projects under the EC Community Initiative Integra projects to tackle the issue of discrimination was developed in 1998-2000, building partly on the results and recommendations from the Spanish situation-testing study. The main purposes of the project were to raise awareness among social partners (as well as local, regional and national authorities) of the benefits of anti-discrimination training for employment agents, and to develop specific training modules for these target groups (Colectivo Ioé 1999).

A more recent EQUAL project builds on the experiences of the earlier Integra projects. The 2002-2004 RESEM-SENET project places a strong emphasis on the collaboration between

different agents and publics. The project involves the active participation of ethnic minority associations, and strongly emphasises coordination between public and private institutions. Key components of the project include information and awareness-raising for companies and the general population and the training of mediators and trainers. In parallel with its outreach activities, the project has a major research component, aimed at studying the situation of immigrants and the phenomena of discrimination and exclusion. A permanent body for observing discrimination and promoting best practice has been established in order to collect and disseminate best practices (in both public and private sectors) and to investigate and disclose bad practices. The observatory is particularly concerned with the situation of women and children and will act in partnership with public and private agents (Colectivo Ioé 2002: 37-41).

3.4 <u>Employment services</u>

United Kingdom

The most ambitious project in recent times for fighting unemployment in the UK has been the New Deal strategy, first implemented in 1997. The main objective of the strategy was to help people get off welfare benefits and into employment. Indicative evaluations show that the New Deal programme has not been as efficient for ethnic minority groups as it has for the population in general (National Employment Panel 2005: 24). The programme failed in particular to reach especially vulnerable groups (such as ethnic minorities) who are faced with both economic and social disadvantage as well as discrimination. Reports have shown that the employment services included in the strategy were not sufficiently personalised to help individuals with specific needs, and that its target system was not conducive to increased efforts on behalf of the most disadvantaged ethnic minorities (National Employment Panel 2005: 25). A major component of the New Deal strategy was the Jobcentre Plus, created in 2001 with the main objective of supporting the disadvantaged in their quest for employment. This agency is a key component of and contributor to the fulfilment of some of the Public Service Agreement targets undertaken by the UK Government in 2002, such as increasing employment rates in disadvantaged areas and among disadvantaged groups (Jobcentre Plus 2005:9). Ethnic minorities are mainstreamed as part of the target groups, and a specific objective of 2003-2004 was to work towards parity of outcomes for ethnic minorities (*ibid*:11).

In the New Deal Next Phase, which commenced in 2002, in an attempt to adjust the situation, a budget was set aside for the purpose of increasing the number of ethnic minorities reached and assisted by the Jobcentre Plus. In this context, a pilot programme on Ethnic Minority Outreach was set up for implementation in the five regions with the majority of the ethnic minority communities. 64% of the ethnic minority groups are concentrated in the urban areas of London, Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds/Bradford (*ibid*: 23). As in other European countries, ethnic minorities are often over-represented in deprived areas. These groups face the double disadvantages of their ethnicity and the socio-economic situation of their area, and are often difficult to reach through mainstream labour market programmes.
A major part of the initiative concentrated on engaging with and increasing participation from hard-to-reach groups through the use of media and events, and with the help of specially trained officers with relevant language skills. A recently completed evaluation of the project has shown that it had a very positive impact in reaching Indian and Pakistani women and raising awareness of employment and training opportunities. However, in terms of concrete

results, it has still proved difficult to help groups with multiple disadvantages, and those ethnic minorities who were helped into work were primarily people with short-term experience of unemployment (Barnes et al 2005).

The Ethnic Minority Outreach scheme was extended into further areas during 2003-2004 (*Ibid*: 38). In addition, a target system has recently been established within the Jobcentre Plus programme, in order to provide an incentive for local Jobcentre managers to focus resources on areas of specific needs. An indicative evaluation shows that, so far, the system seems to have been effective. Last year performance in the prioritised wards increased from 25% below target to 13% above the target for 2004 (National Employment Panel 2005: 23, Select Committee Report).

Spain

Spanish labour market policies have traditionally been less concentrated on activation policies and the National Action Plan on Employment 2004 includes a specific objective for Spain to continue modernisation of its employment services (Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs 2004:11). Over the past few years, the employment services have been devolved, and whereas their guidelines and objectives are set at national level, it is now the autonomous regional authorities that implement the policy (Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs 2003:6). Services for immigrants are therefore being developed in the context of employment services which are still themselves undergoing developments. Most of the programmes that do exist have been developed on a regional rather than a national basis, and many derive from European projects under the ESF programme, such as EQUAL and INTEGRA. One of the measures that was developed and tested in regional and ESF-based projects as from the late 1990s is personalised individual action plans – *itinerarios integradas de insercion*. These action plans have been put in place in different formats in several autonomous communities, and in recent years have been put forward at a national level through the 2001-2004 GRECO plan on immigration and integration (Colectivo Ioé 2002, Government Delegation for Foreigners and Immigration 2001).

The basic approach of the action plans comprises personalised coaching and follow-up for the individual, based on his or her own skills and situation. The starting-point is therefore the mapping of the individual capacity and skills of the immigrant. This is followed by skills training, including language training if necessary (Government Delegation for Foreigners and Immigration 2001). Although training is a key component of the action plans, the approach typically goes beyond general vocational and language training to include a more personalised approach and to empower the individual by tackling more intangible skills, such as cultural factors and interculturalism (Colectivo Ioé 2002). For example, in a local project that was part of the EC INTEGRA Programme 1998-2000, an important component of the individual action plans was the building up of the self-esteem of the participants, particularly the women (*Ibid*: 29-32).

The general objective is to prepare immigrants directly for the labour market, but in some cases they are redirected to mainstream vocational training or other measures. The approach has been refined and extended over the years, and some projects now take a holistic view of the situation of immigrants, going beyond the labour market situation to look at social factors of integration (*Ibid*: 37-40).

The difference between the personalised action plans and ordinary training lies not only in the personalised approach, but also in the holistic approach. In many cases, the action plans have been combined with awareness-raising on diversity and interculturalism for employers and other agents. In the third generation of INTEGRA/EQUAL projects, new features in the development of action plans include the establishment of direct contact with companies, and the continuation of coaching and mediation even after the individual has gained employment, in order to assist with cultural or other difficulties that could eventually arise (*Ibid*:68).

Sweden

The lack of a network of contacts has been identified as one of the main barriers for immigrants on the Swedish labour market. Studies indicate that it is very common for employers to use informal contacts to fill vacancies, rather than turning to employment services or open advertisements. This in turn means that immigrants are more dependent on the services of employment agencies to find employment opportunities (Swedish integration Board 2004: 111).

The key component of the Swedish approach to integration policy is mainstreaming, implying that the promotion of equal rights and opportunities should be an objective which is integrated into all policy areas. More concretely, in the case of labour policy, this means that the foreign-born are a prioritised group in employment services and activation policies, and that specific attention should be given to the situation of immigrants in the development and implementation of mainstream employment programmes such as vocational training and placement services (Swedish Government 2002:29).

However, in practice, this has not always been the case. For example, it has been shown that the most effective way for a job-seeker to find employment is through activities that most resemble real employment, such as workplace induction schemes, rather than through training. Studies have shown that foreign-born job-seekers are much more likely to receive general training than to participate in induction schemes. In addition, it has been argued that the employment services are not efficient enough in the assistance they provide to immigrants, and that a more personalised approach and a greater investment in time are necessary (Swedish Government Department of Finance 2004: 85-86, 108,149).

An investigation was commissioned by the Swedish Government in 2003 to provide an overview of how the private sector can be mobilised to participate in the promotion of employment opportunities for immigrants, and to make recommendations on ways of improving the cooperation between agencies. One of the main conclusions of the report was that the mainstream programmes are not adequate for assisting disadvantaged groups such as immigrants. Specific programmes are necessary for this target group, and these programmes should be directed towards gaining work experience rather than training. A second conclusion was that placement agencies need to start working more actively in partnership with other agencies (and in particular the private sector), in order to improve matching and access to available employment opportunities (Samverkan för arbetsmarknadsintroduktion 2004:89; 68). As a follow-up to this investigation, the Labour Market Administration has recently started several new initiatives on time-restricted work induction and employment opportunities, aimed at providing refugees and immigrants at risk of long-term unemployment with a first contact with the labour market. (*Ibid*:93).

In addition to the national policy, regional authorities have developed many pilot initiatives in this field, with or without support from the European Social Fund. The county of Uppsala included integration of immigrants as one of the objectives of its regional programme for economic growth, 2000-2003. A key component in developing and implementing the plan was to enhance cooperation between different public and private agencies in the region involved in integration policies and activities, and to develop a common vision and approach (Swedish Integration Board 2003:19-20). Within this context, several initiatives were developed to promote employment opportunities for immigrants. For example, one project successfully used specially trained employment agents to reach and assist immigrants who were outside the labour market and not registered as job-seekers. In comparison with mainstream employment services, the employment agents put in more time per individual and also made use of specific intercultural competencies gained through their training. During the two years of its implementation, the programme helped 140 immigrants to find jobs, 60% of whom were women (Swedish Integration Board 2003:71).

3.5 Conclusions

Despite differences in their labour market and immigration policies, as well as the types of immigration involved, Sweden and the UK both have similarly low employment rates for immigrants and their descendants. In the case of both countries, increased efforts to integrate these groups have been identified as a priority for attaining the national goals of labour market participation and sustainment of the economy. Spain is in a different situation, since sectoral segregation of immigrants and inequalities of opportunities and consequent economic outcomes have not yet emerged as a large-scale economic problem for the country. However, their social impact can be seen in the shape of rising prejudice and discrimination.

Since the comparison in this section focuses only on a limited number of variables, it is not possible to derive a complete picture of either the causes of the disadvantages or the ways they can be tackled. Nevertheless, the cases do throw some light on the different elements of analysis and useful practices.

In all three countries, language skills and country-specific knowledge or education are seen as crucial factors for labour market success. Basic skills and language training are available in different forms but have not always lived up to the expectations

Statistics from the UK and Sweden show that disadvantages persist even after long residence in the country, and also that to some extent they are passed on to the second generation. In the case of both countries, it has been concluded that the lack of human capital cannot fully explain the situation, and that discrimination of a more or less subtle form is in part responsible. In Spain, less research has been done on the long-term consequences of discrimination in employment opportunities, but it has been noted that current inequalities and segregation in the labour market do tend to give rise to prejudice and discriminatory attitudes in the population as a whole.

Another factor of exclusion here is the relationship of immigrants with the employment services, in terms both of accessing the services and of the shaping of the services. For example, in Spain, many immigrants are unaware of the possibility of getting help, and in

Sweden and the UK the mainstream programmes have been revealed to have been less efficient in reaching and assisting ethnic minorities.

Based on the on-going analysis of the situation of immigrants in the labour market and on the experience of previous programmes, new forms of assistance are being developed. Although it is probably too early to evaluate the impact of the programmes, here are some elements from the examples above of what seem to be effective practices.

Individual service: Personalised approaches taking account of the capacities, interests and specific situation of individual job-seekers have proven to be more successful in all three countries, both in the context of language training and in job placement. The main difficulty in developing such customised services is that it is highly demanding of resources, in terms both of time and of specialist knowledge and skills.

Adapting to the diversity of immigrants: Similarly, it is important to take into account the fact that the immigrant population is highly diverse with diverse sets of challenges, and that solutions cannot be provided through a single set of "immigrant-specific" services. Examples of individualised services are, in the UK, targeted education efforts aimed at specific groups, and, in Sweden, language courses for highly skilled immigrants.

Partnerships: Developing appropriate partnerships is a success factor relevant to all three of the themes mentioned in this report. This is particularly important in the local context. In the UK, the new pilot approach to engaging companies in the fight against discrimination sees private agencies working together with local authorities and NGOs, each bringing their own skills to the collaboration. In Sweden, local and regional projects have emphasised enhanced collaboration between different public agencies - for example, in the context of providing language training in conjunction with employment induction for those newly arrived. In Spain as well, a crucial component of successful Equal projects has been the development of partnerships.

Combating discrimination
It would seem from the cases presented in this section that discriminatory practices in the labour market are multifaceted and difficult to tackle through traditional anti-discrimination policies and legislative measures alone. The authorities should therefore remain vigilant to the changing expressions and effects of discrimination, whilst continuing to develop a framework of equal rights and opportunities for all. The development of partnerships and the involvement of all the agencies concerned with the labour market are also important. In this context, attempts have been made in all three countries to engage the private sector in the fight against discrimination.

4 SOCIAL PROTECTION IN SOCIETIES OF IMMIGRATION

4.1 Introduction: social protection and immigration

Concept of social protection

In this study, the concept of social protection is used primarily to refer to social security and assistance programmes. Social security programmes are intended to ensure social rights based on contributions, and therefore are usually employment-related. Examples are unemployment, old age, and disability benefits. Social assistance involves financial payments or services provided to cover the basic needs of the poorest - for example, welfare or social assistance in its narrow sense, but also other means-tested benefits and provisions, such as social housing and public health programmes. In addition, there are benefits universally awarded to broad categories of people, such as family and maternity allowances, as well as discretionary benefits, awarded at the discretion of officials in order to deal with urgent or exceptional needs. Unlike social security, all these benefits are commonly non-contributory.

Challenges

Notwithstanding the differences between the various Member States, two general challenges can be discerned with regard to social protection and immigration:

(1) The challenge of assuring social protection of immigrants within the perspective of integration. Guaranteeing a sufficient level of social protection for the population, including migrants, by attributing equal rights and protection can be interpreted as an indicator of integration as such. However, social protection may also be interpreted as something that supports (or sometimes hinders) the process of the integration of migrants and their participation in key sectors of society. Accordingly, there is an additional challenge to reform the social protection system so that it contributes to the integration of at-risk groups, including migrants, into mainstream society.

(2) The more general challenge for a welfare state confronted by immigration is to convert it into an asset. This involves the adaptation of the welfare system to the processes of immigration (and globalisation) and the transformation of the processes of immigration and integration so that they are beneficial to the welfare system and its sustainability.

Developments in Member States, on EU-level and in scientific research

The two challenges above are key issues at national and EU level in European societies. Attributing (equal) social entitlements and improving access to social services and provisions have for some time been a principal strategy of immigrant integration in European societies. More recently, the function of social provisions in relation to integration has become a major point of concern. Two opposite lines of arguments can be discerned regarding the relationship of immigration to integration. On the one hand, there is a fear that welfare provisions could act as a "pull" factor, attracting immigrants who would then become an additional burden to the system. On the other hand, there is the debate about attracting

(highly) skilled immigrants as a means of supplying labour shortages and thus in the longer run supporting welfare systems.

The policies and debates at EU level largely reflect these developments. Since the Tampere summit meeting of 1999, the rights of third-country nationals and long-term residents, traditionally an issue of the Council of Europe, has become an EU issue. Ideas about equal treatment and anti-discrimination are central here. According to the European Commission (CEC, 2003), integration policy for migrants should accord with the general principle that rights and obligations accrue over time. The attenuation of poverty and the promotion of social inclusion for vulnerable social groups, including immigrants, are focal issues in the co-ordination of actions between Member States within the EU Social Inclusion initiative. Also in the context of the Council of Europe, the importance of social rights, including rights to social security, is underlined as "the very basis for social cohesion".[13] The Commissions' Green Paper on Economic Migration (CEC, 2004) discusses another issue: immigration as a potential element of the solution both for the demographic decline and its impact on the European welfare states, and for fulfilling the Lisbon agenda objectives.

The relation between immigration and the welfare state is a topic of debate within scientific circles as well. Traditionally, social and political scientists have paid attention to the impact of welfare state institutions on the integration of immigrants. They have observed that, contrary to the evolutionary process of institutionalisation of citizenship (from civil and political to social rights) as described by T.H. Marshall, immigrants have mainly been granted social rights without political rights. As a consequence, a new form of membership, of "denizenship", has developed (Hammar 1990). However, at the same time, policies of stricter immigration control have developed, where forms of internal control often involve curtailing the rights of some categories of migrants (Brochman & Hammar 1999). So, a tension is observed to exist between welfare states and immigration (Bommes & Geddes 2000).

The attention given to the impact of globalisation, including international migration, on welfare states is of a more recent date. The deregularisation of labour markets due to international competition can have adverse effects on the most vulnerable categories, including migrants. But at the same time, new migration flows are generated, where migrants take advantage of emerging employment opportunities in deregulated labour markets (Baganha 2000). In the economist's perspective on the relation between immigration and welfare states, cost-benefit studies on immigration seems to dominate (see, for example, Boeri et al 2002).

4.2 Comparing Austria, Denmark, Italy and the UK

Introduction

The aim of the comparative study on social protection and immigration is to analyse trends, policies and discussions with regard to the social protection of immigrants in various Member States, against the background of different institutional and political systems. The impact of

---

[13] 8th Conference of European Ministers responsible for social cohesion; May 2002. "By protecting members of society against the effects of social and economic risks, the social security systems of European countries contribute to political stability, economic growth and social cohesion in Europe".

the policies will be evaluated in terms both of successful integration and of their effects on the social protection systems.

To this end, we have selected four Member States with significantly different welfare regimes, based on Esping-Andersen's classical typology. Esping-Andersen (1990) distinguished liberal (UK, Ireland), conservative (continental Europe) and social-democratic (Scandinavian) types of welfare regimes. [14] Others have added a southern European welfare regime, as a form of the conservative regime but which has marked differences which necessitate separate categorisation (Ferrera 1996, Baldwin Edwards 1997, 2002, Geddes 2003). On the basis of this extended typology, we have selected the UK (a liberal regime), Austria (conservative), Denmark (social-democratic) and Italy (southern European). These four Member States also illustrate significantly different histories and policies of immigration, as will become clear in the analysis.

We will examine the way these four Member States have coped with the challenges of immigration and immigrant integration. Before we look at the two main challenges indicated above, we will first outline as a background some major characteristics of the four Member States with regard to their welfare regime and immigration situation[15].

National settings

The UK
The UK is the typical European example of a liberal welfare state, emphasising individual self-reliance and the primacy of the market, and offering only relatively low levels of state welfare support. The Blair administration attempts to reform the welfare state by creating a New Contract on Welfare with prescribed rights and responsibilities for citizens, resulting in more overtly conditional public services.

The UK is also a country with a history of post-war immigration, predominantly from former colonies. As mentioned in the previous section on employment, the term "immigrants" refer to those born outside the UK, and the term "ethnic minorities" includes both foreign-born and UK-born residents of non-British origin. The foreign- born immigrant population comprises 7.9% of the total. About half of the ethic minority population have UK citizenship. The UK continues to attract immigrants at a high level, both because of its strong economic growth and the flexibility of the labour market (OECD 2005). Nowadays, the public and political debate on immigration is dominated by concern over illegal immigration and rising numbers of asylum-seekers. There are also growing fears about sharing the public purse with strangers. At the same time, the government strongly supports the principle of managed migration.

Austria

---

[14] "Welfare states", conceived narrowly as referring to a system of public programmes of social protection, are embedded in larger socio-economic "welfare regimes". The term "welfare regime" refers to "that larger constellation of socio-economic institutions, policies and programmes all oriented toward promoting people's welfare quite generally". (Goodin et al 1999: 5). The term "welfare state" will be used both in its narrow and its broad sense of "welfare regime". The broad interpretation is relevant for our analysis, for we will look not only at governmental policies but also at the role of NGOs.

[15] See Table 8 for public social expenditure on healthcare, pensions and unemployment in selected European countries

Austria is a conservative-corporatist type of welfare state, combining moderate levels of welfare support with legacies of corporatism (of bargaining between the social partners) and a system of income maintenance linked to occupational status (Geddes 2003). The gradual reforms of the welfare state over the last decades has resulted in the curbing of the strong political influence of the social partners and the disappearance of some other atypical features. However, the Austrian conservative welfare state is still marked by a status-preserving social security system linked to employment and family reliance (Unger & Heitzmann 2003).

Post-war immigration in Austria is predominantly associated with "guest-worker migration", which started in the early 1960s, and the "new immigration" of Eastern European, African and Asian migrants, which began in the late 1980s. In 2001, foreigners comprised 8.9% of the total population, and foreign-born 12.5%. The major groups of immigrants are from Turkey and the former Yugoslavia. The reform of the immigration policy in the 1990s, which aimed at a drastic reduction of immigration levels, introduced a system of annual admission quotas for immigrants, and another quota system for work permits. Since 2002, the scope for labour migration has expanded massively to accommodate temporary migrant workers, without providing them, however, with the possibility of gaining permanent residence rights and citizenship (Kraler & Sohler 2005). Today, immigration is to a great extent employment-related. In the federal republic, integration policies are mainly organised by municipal authorities. The main federal policy is the recently introduced mandatory integration courses for immigrants.

Denmark
Denmark is a social-democratic welfare state. It is traditionally a tax-based regime with high levels of coverage for all citizens, regardless of their contributions, based on social democratic principles of universal solidarity and redistribution. However, reforms since the 1990s have introduced insurance-type elements, with benefits aligned to direct contributions. The welfare-to-work reform of 1994 established obligations for the unemployed to participate in job training and education. Further reforms were undertaken in 2002, targeting immigrants and refugees in particular.

As in many other West European countries, in the 1960s and 1970s guest workers were recruited, especially from Turkey. Today, the main categories of migrants entering Denmark are family migrants, asylum-seekers and refugees. Today 8% of the population consists of immigrants and their offspring (OECD 2005). In the new millennium, "the failure of integration policy" has been publicly discussed (Goli & Rezaei 2005). The new Liberal-Conservative coalition that came into power in 2001 introduced a fundamentally different philosophy of integration: restricting immigration, setting up compulsory introduction courses, and increasing the emphasis on enhancing labour market integration and financial self-reliance of residents of immigrant origin.

Italy
Italy is classified by Esping-Andersen as a conservative type of welfare state, but there are reasons to categorize it as a southern European type (like Portugal and Greece), because of its specific characteristics: a low level of coverage; a sharp differentiation in benefits, with some privileged groups; a massive asymmetry of pensions expenditure, alongside under-developed unemployment benefits (Baldwin-Edwards 2002). While Italians are on average liable to a higher risk of poverty than is the population of the EU as a whole, poverty is still concentrated overwhelmingly in the South (Government Italy 2003). The increasing

participation of women in the labour market, especially in Northern Italy, has triggered a rising demand for domestic workers. This demand has traditionally been met by women from southern regions, but over the last decades, more and more foreign workers have been taking over these tasks (Sciortino 2004 a,b).

Italy, like other southern European countries, has witnessed a dramatic turn-round over the last three decades, from being a country of mass emigration to becoming one of mass immigration (Zetter et al 2002). Migration to Italy is characterised by rapid flows with substantial volumes, and by a high proportion of undocumented immigrants, who are attracted by the size of Italy's informal economy and its difficulties in controlling its extensive borders. It is estimated that for every legal entry into the country, there is one illegal one (Zincone 2004)[16]. Around 3.6% of the Italian population are foreign (2002); most of these arrived for purposes of employment and live in the northern regions. Combating undocumented immigration and the trafficking of human beings are government policy priorities (Kosic & Triandafyllidou 2005). Since the 1980s, five programmes of regulation have been implemented but have failed to solve the problem of undocumented migrants. "The overall strategy for implementing integration policy has been to pass responsibility to the regions, to the provinces and to municipalities, which receive funds earmarked for integration but which decide on their own priorities and the means in which the funds will be disbursed" (Chaloff 2003: 17-18).

4.3 Social protection rights of immigrants

The topic of the social rights of foreigners clearly demonstrates the twofold challenge of, on the one hand, promoting equal social rights and integration prospects for immigrants, and on the other hand, enhancing the long-term welfare of the population as a whole through the management of immigration. In all European countries there exist legislative arrangements and mechanisms that disentitle migrants from social security benefits and social assistance.[17]

Firstly, immigrant policies can restrict access to benefits. For example, they frequently restrict access for spouses. In the UK, public funds are in general not available to migrant spouses during a two-year probationary period. Moreover, relatives who have settled in the UK through sponsorship agreements are precluded from claiming public funds for a period of five years.

Secondly, there are nationality and residence conditions built into social security provisions. Many countries have at least some of their non-contributory benefits (which are generally means-tested) reserved for their nationals. And even more often, benefit entitlement conditions discriminate indirectly against third-country nationals by requiring a certain period of residence. This is never the case for contributory benefits. For example, since 2000 residents in Denmark, in order to qualify for social assistance benefit, have to have been established in the country for at least 7 out of the 8 preceding years. For those who do not comply with these rules, a "start help" has been introduced, a lower level benefit intended to act as an incentive for these groups to seek employment earlier.

---

[16] See Table 9 for numbers of authorised and unauthorised immigrants in Italy

[17] See the overview offered by Roberts (2000; Roberts & Bolderson 1999). This overview may be somewhat outdated. See also Groenendijk et al 2000.

So, while contribution-based benefits are commonly accessible to migrants on the same basis as they are for nationals, non-contributory benefits (such as social assistance or means-tested benefits) are in general less accessible. And it is precisely these benefits and their potential to provide some form of safety net which will effect those migrants at risk of poverty and exclusion. These kinds of entitlements (and disentitlements) are sometimes very ambiguous, for the reason that they are often localised and discretionary (Roberts 2000). This is to a great extent the case in Austria, partially because of its federal structure, as social support and welfare benefits are subject to the regulations of each individual federal state. This results in a situation that "remains highly complex and must be difficult to administer consistently" (Groenendijk et al 2000). It can only mean ambiguity and uncertainty for migrants.

The complexity of regulations on immigration, residence and social security produces a jumble of statuses and entitlements which differs from country to country.[18] On average they generate the same hierarchy, with asylum seekers at the bottom rung of the ladder and naturalised migrants at the top (Roberts 2000). There are possibilities for migrants to improve their status in this hierarchy, but in some countries (for example Italy, but also Austria) the route to stable status is long and difficult. The rationale for disentitlements, conditional access and restrictions is often related to migration control and the protection of the interests of the native population. But it can also be related to the simple fact that adjustments have not been made to accord with a change in status to becoming a country of immigration.

Some asylum policies clearly demonstrate the connection between disentitlement and migration control. Driven by the idea of a welfare state 'pull effect' for asylum-seeking migrants, the Governments of the UK and Denmark have reduced the social protection entitlements of asylum seekers (Geddes 2003). Asylum seekers in the UK are denied access to cash-paid benefits (Geddes 2000), as is also the case in Denmark. Furthermore, they are also not allowed to take up employment. As Banks (2000) observes in a broader European perspective, policies on the reception of asylum seekers can directly oppose those concerned with both state welfare and integration, in that they seek to prevent access to the welfare state and even the territory itself. Although in Italy the issue of asylum is less politicised, the social protection of asylum-seekers is very minimal. And in Austria even access to (free) healthcare is not guaranteed for asylum seekers (Picum n.d.).

Other categories (partially) excluded from social protection are seasonal workers and various categories of temporary migrants. Undocumented migrants are, of course, in an even worse position. Although it is easy to exclude them at the national level for reasons of immigration control, local governments and NGOs often take a more pragmatic approach, because it is at the local level that social and humanitarian problems resulting from their exclusion become manifest (see Schoukens 2004). In general, undocumented migrants have no access to basic social provisions, such as healthcare in, for example, Denmark and Austria. However, in Italy, some basic rights for undocumented migrants are legally guaranteed or provided in practice, such as basic healthcare and compulsory education (Sciortino et al 2000; Picum n.d.). The mass nature of illegal immigration in Italy has also encouraged the creation of alternative circuits providing services for illegal immigrants (Sciortino et al 2000).

---

[18] In some cases, international social security arrangements can mitigate the disentitlement to social protection benefits, but in general there are no such bilateral agreements with the "poorer" countries from which many third-country nationals arrive.

In a comparative European perspective, Austria is usually included in the group of countries that have the most exclusionary rules with regard to access to benefits. According to Roberts & Bolderson (1999: 208), Austria, together with Greece and Spain, had (at the end of the 1990s) benefit systems which were comparatively closed to migrants. Groenendijk et al (2000: 105-106) remarked that while the great majority of the States provide access to third-country nationals who are long-term residents on the same basis as they do for nationals, only a few (Austria, Greece and Luxembourg) seek to reserve economic benefits for their own nationals. In some cases, the courts of justice have judged such disentitlements to be incompatible with non-discrimination clauses.[19] In Austria, there are numerous social protection clauses explicitly discriminating against third-country nationals with regard to certain federal non-contributory benefits (child and family benefits). More important, third-country nationals are also discriminated against with respect to social insurance benefits provided by the provinces (Waldrauch 2003: 12-13; Förster & Heitzmann 2003; Groenendijk et al 2000). In general, the exclusionary regulations derive to a large extent from the former guest worker system (EMN & IOM Vienna 2004).

Although the other three countries in our comparison are less exclusionary, there is a trend towards conditional access and restrictions with regard to newly arrived immigrants (and refugees and asylum-seekers) in both Denmark and the UK. The recent changes whereby new immigrants in Denmark are now subjected to longer waiting periods for welfare provisions and family members entering the UK through sponsorship rules with restricted access to benefits have been mentioned above. They are intended to deter new immigrants, to reduce the costs to the welfare state, and to encourage the immigrants to qualify and search for work.

Restricting access to the welfare state for immigrants is less of an issue in Italy, given both the general low level of social assistance there and the large population of undocumented migrants. As Ruspini (2004) argues, the legislative process in Italy sought to draw lessons from the shortcomings of other models of integration adopted in European countries that had already experienced processes of immigration. The objective of full rights for legal immigrants and basic rights for illegal immigrants reflect this objective. However, migrants' access to social provisions tends to be hindered by obstacles connected with obtaining and maintaining stable legal status (Sciortino 2004 a, b). In general, it is difficult to obtain a long-term residence card, and newly regularised migrants are in a very precarious position, being easily liable to lose their legal status again (Ruspini 2004: 8-9; see also Sciortino 2004a).

4.4 Social protection, activation and integration

The promotion of social integration and the prevention and redressing of social exclusion by social protection schemes forms a complex issue. In the preceding section, we have interpreted social protection in a very narrow sense, predominantly in terms of cash transfers of social security and social assistance. But social protection also includes other provisions and services, such as public health, public housing and childcare. The provisions and support offered by NGOs are also relevant to the social protection offered to migrants. Additionally, help and gifts from relatives and others from "their" ethnic group can be of

---

[19] For example, in 1998, the Constitutional Court in Austria rejected the exclusion of third-country nationals from a special benefit for unemployment (Groenendijk et al 2000). This is an example of the role courts play in consolidating immigrants rights (Guiraudon 2000)

considerable importance to some categories of migrants, especially the undocumented ones. Last but not least, the access to the formal labour market and – as an inferior substitute – to the informal economy of irregular earnings represents a source for earning a living.[20] In this section we will briefly consider the effects of the welfare regimes of the countries of our comparison on poverty prevention in relation to activating objectives. In the next section we will look at healthcare services offered to migrants.

Social benefits (especially social assistance and means-tested benefits) are intended to function as a safety net to prevent poverty and exclusion, but long-term dependency on social benefits can prove to be a factor which impedes social inclusion. For this reason, many European states have tried to improve the activation function of social protection arrangements. This confronts them with the twofold challenge of improving the social inclusion and labour market participation of migrants (and other vulnerable categories) without increasing the risk of poverty and exclusion for certain sections of this population. As activating policies of welfare-to-work were discussed in the preceding chapter on employment; we will now focus on poverty reduction, including the effects of activating measures.

The tension between the aims of poverty prevention and activation can be illustrated by recent Danish policy on welfare reforms for foreigners. Its objective was to get refugees and newly arrived immigrants into employment as quickly as possible, by reducing benefits for newly arrived migrants (introduction and start help) and implementing compulsory programmes of immigrant integration (including sanctions). A recent evaluation study provides some evidence that this policy has not been effective in all cases. The policy of lowering benefits seems not to have affected certain groups, in particular refugees. Even though they may be motivated, such people need more active assistance to help them find jobs (Hansen & Hansen 2004:29-31). Although the integration programmes are intended to help immigrants in their labour market integration, an evaluation study demonstrates that not all municipalities actually propose job-seeking activities. Another finding of the study was that only a minority of the participants had found ordinary work within 3 years (Dansk flygtningehjaelp 2004). Effective and made-to-measure integration programmes seem to be difficult to develop and implement.

Activating policies such as the reduction of benefits as an incentive to find employment can, where they are not effective, lead to impoverishment. Critics of the new Danish integration policy have underlined this risk. Although Denmark has a rather extensive social protection system, there are signs that its performance with regard to poverty reduction among migrants is relatively poor. This is the conclusion of a recent comparative study by Morissens (2003), based on data from the Luxembourg income study. Her aim was to measure the capacity of countries to integrate immigrants into their labour markets on the one hand and to offer them an acceptable standard of living on the other hand. Comparing two of the countries from our own comparison, Denmark and the UK, with five others (Sweden, France, Canada, USA, Canada), Denmark scores rather poorly on many of Morissens inclusion/exclusion indicators.[21] At the end of the 1990s, the poverty rate among immigrants was particularly high in Denmark, and Danish immigrant households were about five times as likely to be poor as

---

[20] Engbersen et al 2000 discern four "economies of subsistence" that can help the poor to live a decent life: public welfare provisions, the formal labour market, the informal economy of irregular earnings, and the gift economy.

[21] Her results need to be interpreted with considerable caution, for the data do not always cover the same year (Denmark 1997, UK 1994) or derive from the same source.

their citizen counterparts. According to Morissens' analysis, Denmark's generally low rating is caused by the failure of the transfer and tax system to keep poverty rates among immigrants low, together with the weak connection to the labour market and the high proportion of immigrant households receiving social assistance benefits. In the meantime, following the recent reforms, the poverty-alleviating capacity of the Danish welfare state has become even worse.

The UK scores much more highly in Morissens' analysis with regard to effective poverty reduction among immigrants, although it has considerably lower transfer rates than Denmark. (However, in the UK the poverty rate in general is much higher.) These results may be due to the stronger connection to the labour market among immigrants in the UK in comparison with Denmark. But according to Morissen (2003), they also indicate that immigrants in the UK are more likely to have income sources other than transfers. In general, as a result of the multicultural policies of the last decades, the UK has a rather well-developed ethnic infrastructure of self-support. This contrasts with the Danish policy of individual integration. As Miss Wang of the Copenhagen City Council and the Danish Integration Council states: "Instead of sending people of ethnic descent to the social welfare system one could help the ethnic communities to help their members to be taken care of when they need it, and to move on when the managers can manage it".[22]

As far as Austria is concerned, there is evidence to suggest that poverty is also an urgent problem among certain sections of the immigrant population. According to Föster & Heitzmann (2003), in Austria third-country nationals have a higher relative risk of poverty (compared with the native population) than in most other EU Member States, and they are the social category at high risk of acute poverty. Migrants in the Austrian welfare state are at a disadvantage because of several factors, including the difficulty in accessing the labour market (the system of work permits coupled with a quota system), the many discriminating and restrictive regulations with regard to social assistance and other non-contributory benefits, and a social security system which is tied to employment (*Ibid*; EMN & IOM Vienna 2004; Bichl 2003). According to Bichl (2003), the poverty risk among migrants is twice as high as it is among citizens. Young migrants are an especially at-risk group, because they are more seriously affected by poverty due to insufficient family income than any other risk group mentioned by researchers on poverty (Appel et al 2005: 22). The low upward mobility rates of descendants of Turkish guest workers in Austria and their over-representation in less advanced types of education are interpreted by Herzog-Punzenberger (2003) as a legacy of the Austrian guest-worker policy, which laid down restrictive and highly complicated residence and work permissions that did not allow guest workers to consider more ambitious educational and professional careers. People of Turkish background tend to remain at the lowest occupational levels. However, unemployment figures are low in comparison with other European states (*ibid*).

In the case of Italy, as would be expected, the situation is even worse. In the field of welfare arrangements Italy displays "little activity other than pensions expenditure" (Baldwin-Edwards 2002). It lacks a real unemployment benefit scheme (Sciortino 2004a), and a considerable proportion of the immigrants are undocumented. The extensive informal economy offers some opportunities for subsistence[23]. NGOs and other associations play a leading part in assisting immigrants in Italy by providing social services such as legal assistance, temporary

---

[22] Personal interview of country expert with Miss Wang

[23] See Table 10 for the size of informal or shadow economy in Italy and other selected OECD countries

accommodation facilities and even assistance in job seeking. However, according to Ruspini (2004: 13-14), the great majority of immigrants – including especially the poorest among them - have not benefited from any help. "On the one hand, they have often relied upon their own resources or small groups formed through local networks or chains of support, mainly along ethnic or national lines. On the other hand, the 'less fortunate' immigrants with fewer resources have ended up by slipping into the ranks of social exclusion."

The prevention of poverty and the promotion of social inclusion form the main rationale behind the National Action Plans (NAP) on Poverty and Social Exclusion of the EU Member States. A comparison of the National Action Plans of four Member States shows that migrants are among the most vulnerable or at-risk groups in all the countries. All of the National Action Plans pay some attention to the specific problems of social exclusion that migrants have to cope with. The Austrian Government (2003: 49) attributes "a lack of linguistic proficiency and cultural barriers" as the primary causes for the problems of integration; its main specific approach towards encouraging integration is a policy of mandatory immigrant integration courses. The Danish Government (2003) shares the same diagnosis and strategy. The Italian Government (2003) states that its priority has been to legalise the immigration flow and the presence of non-EU immigrants, but adds that it does intend to broaden its integration activities. The policy of the UK government (2003) towards ethnic minorities is more diverse and encompassing, aiming at going beyond its non-discrimination policy. In addition, all kind of general policies for the vulnerable - such as labour market, housing and educational policies - include migrants as a target group.

4.5 <u>Health services for migrants</u>

Equal entitlements do not guarantee equal access to and equal quality of social and healthcare provisions. In this sub-section, we will briefly consider the question of access to healthcare. In general, the health of migrants and their access to healthcare provisions is below average. Access to healthcare is an important condition for the well-being and thus the integration of migrants. The cyclical relation between poor health, poverty and social exclusion is well documented (Tamsma & Berman 2004). Although in general National Action Plans on social inclusion acknowledge the relevance of healthcare services to social inclusion, the healthcare needs of migrants and ethic minorities are seldom taken into account.

While migrants and the poorer classes tend to suffer from similar health risks, migrants are in addition confronted with specific migration-related factors, such as language, communication and cultural barriers with healthcare personnel and services in the host country. Differences in patients' religious and cultural beliefs may influence the way they seek help and address their needs and health complaints (Tamsma & Berman 2004). As Appel et al (2005) remarks for Austria (and it is equally true for the other countries), female migrants are a specific risk group because of general factors such as migration experience (language problems and the loss of community, etc.) and difficulties in overcoming social isolation. Women of all ages and children also suffer disproportionately from family-based violence, and young migrants in particular are affected by health problems and psychosomatic illnesses because of their housing situation (Appel et al 2005: 25-26). Other risk groups are those who are wholly or partly excluded from health services, such as undocumented migrants and asylum-seekers.

In the four countries of comparison, governments and NGOs have developed various initiatives to tackle the problems of access, quality, and effectiveness of healthcare for migrants. In general, immigrants have formal rights to healthcare (with the exception of categories such as asylum-seekers and undocumented migrants). However, different approaches can be distinguished, depending not only on the phase of immigration but also on the national philosophy of the "desirability" of specific services as an instrument to achieving equality. The mainstreaming approach where everyone is treated equally (as in Sweden, for example) contrasts with that in which the delivery of culturally specific services stays on the foreground, as is the case in the UK where many specific initiatives in health and social services for various groups exist (Tamsma & Berman 2004 32-33). Denmark's general approach is neither a mainstreaming nor a specific one, but a generic service system with an emphasis on the adaptation of immigrants to the Danish health system (Nielsen 2002). In Austria there are important differences between the various federal states. In Italy, the rapid growth of the migrant population in northern regions has resulted in emergency measures of a diverse and often specific nature.

Notwithstanding the differences in national approaches, the initiatives taken by the four countries take similar starting-points in the development of culturally sensitive services which are responsive to a great variety of clients. One example is that of health services for female migrants.

In Italy, the national health system is run on a regional basis. However, in general the great majority of the people involved in services for immigrants, including health services, are volunteers, with NGOs playing a major role. In the northern region of Emilia Romagna, the rapidly growth of the population of migrants (both undocumented and legal) over the last decade has had an impact on the provision of health services. Examples include the tendency to resort only to accident & emergency services rather than to primary care, and difficulties in communication and understanding. However, more structural responses to the presence of immigrants are gradually being developed. What began as emergency services in the first phase of the migratory process have crystallised over time into standard services for immigrants, often going beyond the purpose for which they were initially created (Municipality of Forlì et al 2003).

One example is that of the women's intercultural centre Trama di Terre in Imola, which is an NGO providing healthcare and other services to female migrants (Municipality of Forlì et al 2003). The forms of intervention relevant to health issues include accompanying women to medical treatments and acting as their mediators, and providing support to undocumented female migrants in need of medical treatment. Trama di Terre also offers a range of other social services to female migrants and their children. It is a common phenomenon in Italy that 'migrants are often sent to the services which, regardless of the specific purpose for which they are intended, in the end become known as those that help immigrants. Although understandable in the first phases of the migratory phenomenon, this is liable to lead to the compartmentalizing or even segregating of migrants, with the result that migrants would be seen (and stigmatised) as a "need category" distinct from Italian citizens (Municipality of Forlì et al 2003: 52).

In many health initiatives for female migrants in Italy, cultural mediation is a central element. This is also the case with Trama di Terre. The research report of the IWHA project (Access to Health Services for Immigrant Women) evaluates amongst other considerations the role of the mediator at Trama di Terra. The findings show that these mediators serve both to

improve access to services and thereby guarantee female immigrants more success in obtaining treatment. Since many of the problems of access are connected with the poverty and isolation of female migrants and their generally precarious position (often including a lack of rights), this is particularly important. At the same time, however, it is clear that this approach is also vulnerable to limitations, such as the risk of segregation should the mediator become a figure who separates "problematic" subjects from the rest of society. It has also proved difficult to find mediators who are neutral and trusted by both the institutions and the community (Municipality of Forlì et al 2003: 75-76).

The other three countries of our comparison have had longer experience with large-scale migration. Although they have moved beyond the phase of emergency response, little systematic structural attention has been paid to the specific problems of migrants and ethnic minorities in the healthcare sector. However, various often small-scale local initiatives have been developed in various fields, often focusing on particular groups, such as female refugees.

While various culturally sensitive methods and measures are under development, integrated approaches and more structural and comprehensive policies are often lacking.[24] However, the city of Vienna (one of the 9 federal states of Austria) has developed a health policy for women of which the objectives are both to ensure that female migrants obtain equal access to existing healthcare services and to provide special services for the particular needs of this target group (Eckhart 2002). The definition of "migrant women" is very broad, including both migrant workers and top executives of international groups. The cooperation and support of women's organizations plays an important role in the policy, particularly in relation to topics where a change in the attitudes and opinions of the communities in question is required, such as female genital mutilation. They also act as a bridge between the female migrants and the providers of regular social services.

The two main strategies of this community-based diversity policy are intercultural mainstreaming with respect to city services and empowerment and capacity-building strategies to support migrant women and their self-organization. Examples of the former are information and awareness-raising campaigns adapted to the target groups; the development of a manual for non-German speaking patients and clients; and the qualification of members of the migrant communities as multiplicators (training them to teach other migrants). Another example is the setting up of a women's health centre with an intercultural focus within a Vienna hospital, as a supplement to traditional healthcare operations. Illustrations of the empowerment and capacity-building strategy include the funding of projects of the African Women's Organisation on Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) (including FGM awareness campaigns) and the development of a low-threshold, anonymous, medical and psychosocial counselling service (Eckhart 2002).

A good illustration of an integrated approach is the "Migrant-Friendly Hospital" (MFH) project, an idea initiated by the Health Authority of Reggio Emilia in Italy and coordinated from a scientific perspective by the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for the Sociology of Health and Medicine at the University of Vienna. From 2002 to 2005, hospitals in 12 EU countries (from the EU-15 without Portugal, Belgium and Luxembourg) cooperated in a project which identified, implemented and evaluated models of good practice to improve the quality of care

---

[24] See "Promoting social inclusion and tackling health inequalities in Europe: an overview of good practices from the health field" (2004) of EuroHealthNet for more good practice examples.

for migrants in hospital services. The main costs of the European co-operation were covered by EU funding. Interventions with regard to communication, responsiveness, empowerment and monitoring were implemented by the partners in three sub-projects: (1) improving interpreting services, (2) migrant-friendly information and training for mother and child care, and (3) staff competence training (MFH Project 2005). At a final conference in December 2004 in Amsterdam, the "Amsterdam Declaration Towards Migrant-Friendly Hospitals in Ethno-cultural Diverse Europe" was launched. This declaration, with its recommendations, underlined the fact that improving the quality of healthcare for migrants and ethnic minorities by making hospitals more responsive to ethnic, cultural and other social differences of patients and staff would also serve the general interest of all patients in more personalised services (MFH Project 2005; Tamsma & Berman 2004). After the conference, a task force on Migrant-Friendly Hospitals has been established in the framework of the WHO Network on Health-Promoting Hospitals.

4.6 Immigration as an asset to welfare states

Debates

The more general challenge for a welfare state confronted by immigration is to transform immigration into an asset. This is also the idea behind the recent discussions on how EU welfare states might benefit from increased migration as counteracting the effects of the anticipated demographic decline. The European Commission played an important role in this discussion - for instance, by publishing the Green Paper on immigration (2005). While some public discussion on this issue can be observed to have taken place (in Italy, for example), it has not been used as an argument for justifying certain migration policies in the political debates of the four Member States of our comparison. As Chaloff (2003: 4) remarks for Italy, public opinion is too opposed to increased immigration for such an argument to be politically acceptable. Besides, long-term visions of the future do not generally play a role in public or parliamentary policy debate. The same applies to the three other Member States.

Debates and justifications for policies are increasingly concentrating on the negative impact of immigration on welfare states, and on ways to reverse this trend by stricter immigration control and more effective integration policies. In some countries, migrants are portrayed as being a burden to the welfare state. For example in Denmark, recent changes in welfare provisions for immigrants and stricter immigration policies have been introduced out of concern for the viability of a welfare state faced with very high figures of unemployment among the migrant population[25]. The rationale for the welfare reforms partly derives from an influential paper by the Think Tank on Integration in Denmark (2002), which pointed to the increased share of immigrants in combination with the ageing populations as being the two major sources for the increased burden on the state. Actually, Denmark has one of the highest unemployment rates and lowest employment rate for foreigners in Europe (OECD 2005:59-63). Similarly, an econometrist study (Boeri et al 2002) cautiously concludes that there is some evidence for the thesis that some of the generous welfare states (Denmark, Austria, but also Belgium, the Netherlands and France) are acting as "welfare magnets", attracting more people who can claim benefits.

---

[25] See Table 7 for welfare dependency of EU citizens and non-EU migrants

However, in the UK the think-tank the Institute of Public Policy Research recently published a report on this issue: "Paying their way: The fiscal contribution of immigrants in the UK" (Sriskandarajah 2005). It was concluded that the immigrant population of the UK overall makes a higher contribution to the public purse than do their UK-born counterparts (*ibid*: 14-15). Does this mean that the UK system is performing better, or that the way the cost-benefit was calculated was different? This is an example of the difficulties inherent in comparative cost-benefits calculations.

In Italy, dependency of immigrants on welfare is not an issue of public debate, partly because Italy lacks a real unemployment benefit scheme, but also because there is a high demand for workers in the relative extended informal economy (Sciortino 2004a).

Policies

In response to the fact that immigration is often perceived as burdensome both in politics and by the public, a common European policy approach is control of immigration in combination with improved integration. However, some initial steps have been taken towards selective immigration policies, mostly with a view to attracting highly-skilled immigrants.

In Denmark, changes in immigration and integration policies have been introduced in order to influence the impact of immigration on the welfare state in a more beneficial direction. Since 2002, Danish policy on the one hand has been directed at restricting immigration by making coming to Denmark less attractive (especially for asylum-seekers and family migrants), while on the other hand, for those immigrants already admitted and resident in the country, it has emphasised improvement of integration by encouraging their rapid entry into the labour market and therefore their own contribution to the welfare system. In this respect, incentives towards employment have increased (lower benefits, sanctions) and obligatory and extended programmes of immigrant integration have been introduced. The tone of the debate has been quite negative and migrant-unfriendly. As Miss Wang of the Copenhagen City Council and the Danish Integration Council remarked: "The Danish society needs people to work because of the demographic problems. But the tone in which the strategy is announced is that 'you are the burden, that's why we need you to work', instead of 'we need these people because they contribute to the work force'. The Danes have a sort of fear; and what that fear does is that strategies that are good are announced so wrong. If the tone of their voice just changed and if they said 'we need everybody to contribute'…[26]

Austria has developed similar policies because of similar concerns. Migration gradually moved to the centre of political debate in the 1990s, because of rising inflows of migrants due to the fall of the Iron Curtain and the wars in former Yugoslavia. At the same time the populist Freedom Party (FPÖ) rose to prominence, a party which made use of immigration as an issue which would raise its profile (Kraler & Sohler 2005). Reducing immigration flows has become a dominant objective, and asylum regulations have been tightened. In the 1990s a complex system of yearly quantitative and qualitative quotas for immigrants and for work permits was also introduced. Even family migration falls under the quota restrictions. Every year the Austrian Economic Research Institute (WIFO) compiles a report on the labour market, the education and health systems, the housing market and the general demographic developments of the previous year, with a view to assessing the need to recruit migrant workers in the following year. Provincial authorities have considerable power in setting the

---

[26] Personal interview of country expert with Miss Wang.

annual quotas for their provinces, which should not exceed the annual federal maximum quotas. Since 2002 the scope for temporary labour migration has been expanded massively. In contrast to "guest-workers" who were also regarded as temporary migrants, new temporary migrants are permanently excluded from the secure status of long-term migrants and also from citizenship (Kraler & Sohler 2005). Blocking the way towards integration for these temporary migrants would seem to incur the risk of future marginalisation of these migrants, should they in fact remain for a longer period than was intended originally.

With regard to foreign citizens living in Austria "integration before (new) immigration" has become the guiding principle. Improving the integration of already admitted immigrants is a key element of federal policy. Since 2002, under the conditions of the so-called "integration contract", all third-country nationals newly immigrating, or those who have been living on Austrian territory since 1998, are obliged to sign a so-called "integration agreement" which stipulates mandatory attendance at language courses. Access to long-term residence status is conditional upon having fulfilled the conditions of the "integration agreement".

The context for UK immigration policy is quite different. It is set by New Labour's agenda for modernising Britain, with its aim of creating a competitive economy capable of surviving global economic integration. One area where the modernisation process is most apparent is immigration. The Government has developed a three-pillar approach: encouraging economic migration, combating illegal immigration and reducing asylum migration (Düvell 2005). Recent media debate on illegal immigration and asylum-seekers has led to a revision of the positive perception of economic migration towards the view that liberal migration policies require firm control (*Ibid* 2005). The UK government has already since 1998 been actively engaged in reviewing its policies towards labour-migration, in order to deal with labour and skill shortages in the labour market (OECD 2005). To this end, the Highly Skilled Migrant Programme (HSMP) was announced in October 2003, whereby foreign labour is attracted, for example, to fill vacancies for medical personnel.

Recently, the UK has also started to develop policies on immigrant integration. However, in contrast to Austria and Denmark, integration courses are perceived as being solely an instrument of integration policy and not of immigration policy. Integration courses are mainly seen from the perspective of acquiring British citizenship, and attendance is voluntary (Entzinger 2004). Programmes have also been developed for newly arrived migrants - for example, for refugee integration. One example is the Sunrise (Strategic Upgrade of National Refugee Integration Services) Programme, which is a key delivery mechanism for the Home Office's refugee integration strategy "Integration Matters" published on 9 March 2005. The scheme's objective is to facilitate the integration of refugees in their new life in the UK, so enabling them to meet their full potential and contribute to the community as soon as possible. Pilots commence in October 2005. Furthermore, the importance of encouraging refugees with health professional skills to continue their careers in the National Health Service has been recognised by the Department of Health. In 2001 the Department established a high-profile Refugee Health Professional Steering Group to promote the needs of refugee health professionals and to allocate funding to local projects and initiatives aimed at supporting refugees training and entering employment in the National Health Service. The British Medical Association, Royal College of Nursing and British Dental Association have all built on the work of the steering group and put in place their own systems and initiatives for supporting refugee doctors, nurses and dentists respectively.

The Italian context is again quite different. The strong demand for foreign labour (from the informal economies, small- and medium-sized companies and families) in Italy – combined with the lack of real opportunities for legal entry - has resulted in irregular entry being an endemic in Italian immigration history (Ruspini 2004: 7). The quota system, introduced in 1998, has not solved this problem, because quotas are set too low. Consequently, amnesties remain the main mechanism for legal entry. This – together with the limited social protection system - has served to put immigrants into a very precarious position, which is clearly far from an appropriate reception structure for new immigrants (Baldwin-Edwards 2002). Social integration activities, such as Italian language courses, are in general not well developed. They are delegated by the state to local organisations in collaboration with private and voluntary sector organisations (EMN & IDOS 2004).

As mentioned previously, in Italy immigration is not a topic for discussion when it comes to unemployment and welfare benefits. The areas where a foreign presence in the welfare state has become noticeable, sometimes triggering conflicts, are essentially housing and, in part, healthcare. These are, however, minor sectors of the Italian welfare state (Sciortino 2004a). In contrast, immigrants, both legal and illegal, are an important resource for upholding the Italian welfare regime. The structural tension within the Italian welfare system – which was originally designed according to the male breadwinner model and with families playing a key role - and the rising participation of women in the labour market have triggered the need for domestic workers. Since the 1960s, foreign domestic workers have been recruited mostly from former Italian colonies (often managed by the Catholic mission network). The role of foreign domestic labour in the maintenance of the Italian welfare regime is also acknowledged in political debate. For example, the Government initially intended the amnesty of 2002 to apply to domestic and personal care workers only (Sciortino 2004a).

According to Sciortino, this provides evidence for the thesis that the configuration of many western European welfare regimes is actually a major structural factor behind the continuing demand for unskilled foreign labour. The ongoing demand for foreign labour at the lower end of the labour market, especially from the southern EU Member States but also to some degree from the northern ones, seems to confirm this thesis. However, in northern countries there is also a demand for foreign labour to fill higher vacancies in, for instance, welfare sectors such as the medical profession. In the UK, a disproportionate number of immigrants are employed in sectors that involve public service provision and the building of new infrastructure. In 2003, 29.4% of the total number of doctors employed in the NHS were foreign-born, and since 1999, 43.5 per cent of nurses recruited have originated from outside the UK (see Kelly, Morrell and Sriskandarajah 2005).

A more positive perspective on immigration as a possible resource for the countries of settlement inspired the RESOURCE project on refugees' contribution to Europe. (Jonker 2004). Its research illustrates how in several countries (including Italy, Austria and the UK), the skills, qualifications and work experiences that refugees and recognized asylum-seekers bring with them into exile are being utilised (or prevented from being utilised) and how the conditions for capitalizing on their potential could be enhanced.

4.7 Conclusion

This comparative analysis of developments and policies with regard to immigration and the welfare state has revealed some of the many complexities of the issue. In general, the four

countries of comparison are confronted with the same twofold challenge of both guaranteeing the social protection of immigrants within the perspective of integration, and of transforming immigration in general into an asset. However, the specific forms these challenges take and the responses of the Governments in question vary widely.

The topic of social protection rights for foreigners clearly demonstrates the tension in the challenge, and even more so, the tension between the promotion of immigrant integration and immigration control. In all European countries this has resulted in legislative arrangements and mechanisms which disentitle migrants from social security benefits and social assistance. The disentitlements and conditional access to those benefits most likely to provide a safety net can have negative consequences for the integration of immigrants. There are signs of immigrants in Denmark and Austria being at high risk of poverty - precisely those countries where recent reforms of social policy and integration legislation have been motivated by the desire for both immigration control and limiting the (perceived) negative impact of immigration on the welfare state. This demonstrates the importance of considering at all times the effects that measures intended to control immigration may have on the immigrant integration. It is also important to keep an eye on the interrelations between different legal frameworks (regarding residence status, nationality law, social security legislation etc), and their effects in practice on the entitlements accessible to the different categories of migrants. The case of Italy shows that difficulties in obtaining a stable legal status can constitute a major obstacle to access to social entitlements. Not only may insecure status and disentitlements conflict with non-discrimination norms, but they also tend to reinforce tendencies towards marginalisation and social exclusion. The relatively large undocumented migrant population in Italy illustrates this.

In some of the Member States included in the comparison, migrants are overrepresented among those receiving social benefits. For that reason they are one of the target groups for activating policies. However, such policies generally are geared towards limiting and lowering benefits as an incentive to enter employment, which may have detrimental socio-economic effects on unskilled parts of the population, including migrants. Thus Governments are confronted with the twofold challenge of improving the social inclusion and labour market participation of migrants (and other vulnerable categories) but without increasing the risk of poverty and exclusion. The success of different countries in keeping poverty rates low among vulnerable categories in general and migrants in particular varies considerably, depending on differences in transfer systems, labour markets, informal economies, support available by NGOs and the degree of self-help available within ethnic communities. The Danish case shows that activating policies which include lower benefits as an incentive towards labour market integration are dependent on the successful implementation of integration policies. However, a multifaceted approach is required to prevent poverty and promote inclusion, such as one which will create conditions favourable for self- help and empowerment.

Equal entitlements do not guarantee equal access to and equal quality of social services and provisions. This is an important point, for these services and provisions are often of crucial importance to successful integration. This issue has been examined with particular reference to health services for migrants. Access to healthcare is an important consideration with regard to the well-being and thus the integration of migrants. Both social deprivation in certain sectors of the migrant population as well as migration-related factors such as language, cultural and religious differences can hinder access to health services. In the countries of our comparison, different approaches towards the issue have been distinguished. The case of Italy shows that, during the first phases of migration, the rapid

growth of the migrant population often resulted in emergency measures gradually developing into "services for immigrants", a process liable in itself to segregate and stigmatise migrants. In all the countries of our comparison, various often small-scale local initiatives, methods and procedures relating to the provision of healthcare for migrants have been developed in different fields. Only rarely are more integrative policies developed. Vienna's health policy for women is an example of a more comprehensive policy of both intercultural mainstreaming and empowerment and capacity-building among migrant women. An example of an integrated approach which has been implemented in various European hospitals is the "Migrant-Friendly Hospital" project. It has shown that improving the quality of health services for migrants by making hospitals more responsive to ethnic, cultural and other social differences in patients and staff will also serve the general interest of all patients by providing more personalised services. More responsive and culturally-sensitive services are often also more effective.

The more general challenge for a welfare state confronted by immigration is to transform immigration into an asset. However, in debates in many European states immigration is often considered to be a burden to the welfare system. A common European policy approach is to combine control of immigration with improved immigrant integration. While the tone is at times rather negative, viewing immigration as a burden rather than a potential asset, some initial steps have been undertaken towards policies promoting selective immigration, mostly with a view to attracting highly-skilled immigrants. In this respect, the more liberal approach of the UK contrasts with the more restrictive immigration and mandatory integration policies of Denmark and Austria. Quotas are often set too low, which means that the demand for foreign labour tends to attract illegal forms of migration, as is the case in Italy. Immigrants, both legal and illegal, can also constitute an important resource for upholding welfare regimes. This is the case for domestic workers in Italy and for medical personnel in the UK. The relationship between immigration and the welfare system proves to be complex and multi-faceted, in contrast to the often one-sided public debates on immigration, which focus on "problematic" categories such as undocumented migrants and asylum-seekers while overlooking other categories. A more positive approach which would view immigrants as potential contributors to the economy and the welfare system and create conditions and policies favourable to capitalising on their potential would be beneficial both to the individual immigrants themselves and to the countries of reception.

5 SOCIAL COHESION IN SOCIETIES OF IMMIGRATION

5.1 Introduction

Social cohesion is a concept often used in relation to the impact of immigration on European societies, but it is seldom defined in this context. In general, social cohesion can be described as a quality of a national community that may be threatened because of dividing lines between class, religious, linguistic, cultural or ethnic groups. There can be little doubt that immigration has led to a significant diversification of European societies and has led to new dividing lines, in terms of social exclusion and cultural, ethnic, and religious diversity. For the purposes of this study we will focus on two main strands of the concept of social cohesion, which they relate to two public policy objectives: (1) strengthening the social relations and the mutual recognition and acceptance between inhabitants belonging to different groups, and (2) reducing social exclusion of certain at-risk groups in society and diminishing the disparities between groups. In order to be able to feel a belonging to a society, migrants and their descendants need to be accepted as equals by the host society and have the chance to benefit from (at least a basic) security, in terms of for instance jobs, decent housing, and social security. These two elements of social cohesion often also constitute indicators of real integration.

In order to gain more insight in the way in which EU Member States define and deal with issues of social cohesion against the background of different institutional and political systems, we have selected four case studies for further investigation: France, Germany, the Netherlands and Portugal. We have opted for France and Germany, because traditionally these two countries have very different, almost opposing views on membership and belonging. In Germany such notions are or were most often interpreted in ethnic terms, whilst the dominant interpretation in France is in civic terms. The Netherlands is traditionally classified among the countries with a multicultural approach, however there are signs of a shift towards more coercive forms of integration policy. Portugal is chosen as an example of a county that only recently has started to recognise itself as a country of immigration and begun to develop policies dealing with the challenges of exclusion and diversity.

In the following we will first portrait the dominant approaches and recent shifts in national debates and policies around immigration, integration and social cohesion. Subsequently, in section three, we will look at different examples of efforts taking place around social cohesion on local level, through urban policies. These are innovative policies that attempt to tackle the multiple disadvantages faced by socially excluded people. The fourth section considers the issue of social capital, as a central element of vital civil societies. The section presents local policy measures to enhance social capital and increase participation of immigrants to counter the development of dividing lines in local society.

5.2 Developments in social cohesion and immigration policies and debates

Netherlands

Since 1945, the Netherlands has received various immigrant groups: returning Dutch colonials and people form former colonies Indonesia and Surinam, guest-workers, later followed by family-migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers, and migrants from the

Netherlands' Antilles. In 2002, 700,000 non-Dutch residents lived in the Netherlands, 4,3% of the total population of 16.2 millions. In that year, 10,6% of the population is foreign-born (1,714,200); about a quarter are from EU countries and 56% from non-Western countries. Statistics Netherlands also records the "allochtonous" population: persons who have at least one parent who is born abroad. 19% (3 million) of the population was considered "allochtonous" in 2002. Main "allochtonous" populations are: the Indonesian (400,600), German (392,200), Turkish (341,400), Moroccans (295,300) and people from the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba (129,300) (OECD 2005). Immigration flows to the Netherlands decreased in almost all categories of entry in 2002, except for inflows of foreign workers on temporary work permits (OECD 2005).[27]

Traditionally, the Dutch approach towards integrating migrants fitted the multicultural model, much like the British approach. Integration policy in the 1980s was targeted at ethnic minority groups, and aiming at integration with maintenance of their own cultural identity. Multiculturalism was promoted by policy measures such as mother-tongue language teaching, subsidising minority associations and consulting migrant organisations on relevant policy developments. In addition, the Dutch law and institutional structures – due to its history of pillarisation - offered many opportunities for immigrants to institutionalise their religion and culture. The Muslims in particular, have seized these opportunities to establish institutions such as Islamic schools and Muslim broadcasting organisations, both with public support.

Due to the disappointing results of the integration policy of the 1980s with regard to socio-economic integration, the focus of the policy gradually shifted in the 1990s, towards an emphasis on education and individual integration in the labour market. Public policies focussed on the integration of newcomers and migrant youth, to prevent the development of new dividing lines. Active citizenship became the guiding principle of the policy, most notably reflected in the mandatory newcomer integration policy. But concerns about cohesion also influenced the development of policies to tackle problems in urban areas where the immigrant population increased. The relatively levels of youth delinquency among migrants motivated the start of a programme to combat and prevent criminality among ethnic minorities.

Immigration control and immigrant integration have become pivotal issues in the Netherlands of the 21st century, owing to a series of events, such as the terrorist attacks of 9/11, the turbulent elections of 2002 and the murder on the filmmaker Theo van Gogh in the fall of 2004. In 2002, for the first time in Dutch history, issues of immigration and integration played a dominant role in the electoral debate. The elections were dominated by the rise and assassination of the populist politician Pim Fortuyn. As a result of the elections, a right-wing government was installed, proclaiming a shift in integration policy towards an emphasis on issues of law and order. For example, the task of co-ordinating integration policy was transferred to the Ministry of Justice. After this Balkenende I government fell, it was replaced in 2003 by the centre-rightwing coalition Balkenende II. A temporary Parliamentary Committee was set up by the Parliament to investigate the Integration Policy of the past 30 years. Its final report was published in 2004, and argued that integration had succeeded for a large segment of the immigrant population, however this was often in spite of rather than because of governmental policy (Blok Committee 2004). The lessons and recommendations of the report did not seriously become a subject of political debate as the new Cabinet

---

[27] See Annex II, Table 3 – Immigration flows in selected European countries for some recent data on flows to the Netherlands.

Balkenende II had already determined the contours of its New Style Integration Policy in 2003 (Dutch Ministry of Aliens Affairs and Integration 2003) and was determined to keep to it. In their view, integration was largely unsuccessful because the economic, social and cultural distance between immigrants and natives was still too great.

The cabinet's motto, "Join in", constitutes an appeal to the immigrant and the non-immigrant population to take active part in a society that is truly shared (Dutch Government 2004). The previous governments were criticised for the neglecting the issue of basic values and for seemingly limitless tolerance. This criticism and the shift to a mandatory policy of individual integration and adaptation to the basic values of Dutch society has been characterised as a farewell to multiculturalism as the cornerstone of Dutch integration policy (Snel et al 2005: 2). Active citizenship is the leading principle of the new policy, reflected for instance in the nationality policy. The government wants to ban dual nationalities, it promotes citizenship ceremonies, while at the same time stricter rules for naturalisation are introduced. The decline in the number of persons naturalised since 1996 (83 000 in 1996 against 45 000 in 2002) is strongly correlated to changes in Dutch naturalisation policy since 1997 (OECD 2005:240). New laws and regulations are being prepared to make integration policy more effective and mandatory, by obliging both newcomers and settled migrants to train for a sufficient level of command of the Dutch language. The emancipation of immigrant women, and especially Muslim women, is seen as a keystone for the process of immigrant (Muslim) integration (Dutch Government 2004). Unemployment among migrant youth is another issue of concern. A Youth Unemployment Task Force has been set up and is active in fighting unemployment among youth in general. More in particular, Muslim youth is a category of concern, and a policy to prevent radicalisation among Muslim youth has been developed (Dutch Ministry of Aliens Affairs and Integration 2005b). Furthermore, the government intends to reform the national dialogue-structure on minority policy (LOM) to gradually transform it into an Integration Council, in which also indigenous organisations would participate (Dutch Ministry of Aliens Affairs and Integration 2005a).

The Minister of Aliens Affairs and Integration beams out decisiveness, but her centralist and top-down approach and her plans inspired by a vision of law and order increasingly meet opposition and criticism not only from NGOs and migrant organisations but also from local governments. For example, one of the major NGOs in this field, FORUM, the Institute of Multicultural Society, pleads for a more balanced government policy and a leadership that links different groups together, instead of the policy of putting the burden primarily on the shoulders of the immigrants and the current polarising and stigmatising discourse in politics.[28] However, consultation with migrant organisations and NGOs remain a vital aspect of the Minister's functions. This is in particular notable in times of crisis, for instance after the filmmaker Van Gogh was murdered by a Muslim fundamentalist, in the autumn 2004. In January 2005, the Government initiated the Broad Initiative on Social Cohesion (BIMB), to improve the social climate and to combat what seemed to be fragmentation in the Dutch society (Dutch Ministry of Aliens Affairs and Integration 2005a). The BIMB was comprised of civil society organisations, including migrant associations, and members of the public. The members of the initiative have met twice and the main result of the initiative are a range of agreements between organisations, municipalities and ministries to develop action points in the fields of labour market participation, entrepreneurship, education, neighbourhood, and participation. The most visible effect of this initiative is probably that the recent turn to a confrontational top-down policy has been softened up and that a new national dialogue has

---

[28] Personal interview with a FORUM staff member. See also FORUM 2004

started about inclusion and social cohesion, encouraging and inspiring civil society to take part in the discussions.

Germany

Germany has significant migrant communities that entered as guest workers, such as Turks, ex-Yugoslavians and Italian. Today, there is still a significant influx of ethnic Germans ('late repatriates'), family migrants, and refugees and asylum-seekers. Immigration flows to Germany substantially decreased in almost all categories of entry in 2002, including the inflows of ethnic Germans.[29] In 2002, over 7.3 million foreigners resided in Germany, corresponding to 8.9% of the total population. Nationals of the EU Member States amounted to one-fourth of the total of foreigners. Over half of the foreign populations consisted of nationals of Turkey (26%), the former Yugoslavia (8%), Italy (8%), Greece (5%) and Poland (4%). Approximately 95% of all foreigners lived in West Germany. Nearly two-thirds of the foreigners had lived in Germany for more than 10 years. (OECD 2005: 195-197)

Germany was until recently the paradigmatic case of an ethnic nation state with an exclusionist policy, defining immigrants from non-German descent as aliens and deterring naturalisation by tough regulations. However, the new Nationality law of 1999 radically changed Germany's longstanding preference of *jus sanguinis* over *ius soli.* The public and political discussion on Germany as an "immigration country" has recently intensified and taken a new turn. Stirred on by the revelation of labour shortages in some sectors, especially IT, and the impact of two demographic studies showing rising ageing and shrinking birth rates, the Social Democratic-Green Federal Government started to pay more attention to the immigration policy. A Green Card system was introduced to attract talented immigrants. An independent commission for immigration reform, installed in 2000 and headed by Rita Süssmuth, published a report in 2001 on the idea of a new integration policy. Subsequently, the main political parties (CDU,CSU, SPD, FDP) all published their own position papers. In April 2003 an immigration council (Zuwanderungsrat) was installed on federal level, headed by Süssmuth. Both the Zuwanderungsrat and the independent commission strongly pleaded in favour of a "modern" approach to immigration and integration. However, there is still dissent within Germany about whether it is appropriate to term Germany an "immigration country".

The new Immigration Act, which came into force in January 2005, created the first statutory minimum framework for federal integration policy, co-ordinated by the ministry of Interior, and brought together the integration of foreigners and of late repatriates in a uniform concept. A newly established Federal Office for Migration and Refugees is in charge of the co-ordination of migration-related activities of the Government. The new Act reduced the complex structure of residence permits to two, i.e. to a temporary and a permanent permit. It also established the legal right (and obligation) to participate in language or integration courses for new immigrants; foreigners already residing in Germany may also be obliged to participate in integration courses under certain circumstances (OECD 2005: 198-199).

According to some scholars these political developments at the beginning of the 21st century are signs of a process to fundamentally redefine the situation of immigration, from seeing it as a burden to recognising immigrants as a resource, and from focussing on nationality

---

[29] See Annex II, Table 3 – Immigration flows in selected European countries for some recent data on flows to Germany.

(aliens) to an approach structured according to the purpose of stay. (Heckmann 2003). However, other scholars interpret the recent changes as elements of a process of incremental policy change (Green 2004), a more ambiguous process characterised by the two poles of "pragmatic integration" and "appellative denial" (Bade & Bommes 2000). For instance, the new citizenship law of 1999 only marks the end of a process, which began already by the implementation of the new Aliens act of 1991. And the material effects of the new Immigration Act and the German Green Card are often exaggerated. [30]

Social Cohesion is not a central term in German political discourse. Instead, "integration" and "disintegration" are the central concepts. Traditionally, integration of immigrants is promoted in Germany by social-economic inclusion in the institutions of the welfare state. In a political sense, immigrants of non-German descent ('aliens') were excluded from the nation-state. As a kind of substitute for the lack of local voting rights for foreigners, the "Foreign Advisory Councils" (Ausländerbeiräte) were installed in municipalities and in some federal states. These elected bodies are devised to represent the foreign residents' interests and to advise the local and regional politics and administration. (Heckmann 2003). They serve as the link between immigrant associations and German institutions (Cyrus & Vogel 2003).

In practice, a policy of acculturation still prevails in Federal Germany. The mainstream society is the benchmark with regard to indicators of integration. From the viewpoint of the official policy goals on Federal State levels, the picture is more nuanced. Within the federal German state there are considerable differences between the approaches of federal states and city-states towards immigrant integration. The role of politics in promoting dialogue and tolerance – and for example with regard to headscarves - differs between the states. There are several large cities that claim to follow a "multicultural policy". Despite the fact that Germany is defining itself as a secular state, the Christian churches and Jewish institutions play a significant role in public life (including in the education system), which is defined legally and by tradition. Islam has not yet obtained this status (Heckmann 2003). The process of institutionalisation of Islam is under way, but is "hindered" by a fragmentation of the Islamic community, and an aversion of the German society against mobilisations of migrants along religious and ethnic lines (Koopmans 2004).

Social cohesion in terms of normative and cultural standards has received more attention recently. After the murder of van Gogh in the Netherlands, the discussion of "Parallelgesellschaften" ("parallel societies") has grown in importance particularly in relation to Muslim immigrants. Berlin and Duisburg are now identified as examples of emerging "Parallelgesellschaften"

The discussions on the definition of Germany as an immigration country has also led to increased interest in the issue of immigrants' participation and civic engagement of immigrants. However, still, as in the past, engagement in immigrant associations, especially those of religious and ethnic origin, is met with suspicion. (Cyrus & Vogel 2003: 5).

---

[30] This is the interpretation of the German in-country experts, dr. Holger Kolb and Michael Bommes. Another critical opinion comes from the chairman of the Ausländerbeirat of Munich: the recent changes are small steps in the right direction, however rather half-hardy and ineffective (personal interview with the chairman).

France

The main immigrant groups in France stem from immigration from former colonies and guestworkers, and the subsequent influx of familiy migrants, and refugees and asylum-seekers. Between 1999 and 2002, permanent immigration and the inflow of asylum seekers has been rising at a rate of 10% a year; there was also an increase in the inflow of asylum seekers in the same period (OECD 2005: 189-191).[31] At the end of 2002, the total number of foreigners with a valid residence permit amounted to 3.35 million, of whom 83,6% held a ten year permit. Africans accounted for 45% of the adult foreign population, EU nationals (EU-15) 35%, and Asian 12% (OECD 2005: 192).

The key feature of integration and diversity policies in France has been its emphasis on individual engagement rather than integration of different groups. The republican concept of citizenship presupposes that anyone who wants to acceed to French citizenship can do so, bu only on the premise that he or she will also adopt the French values (Freedman 2004:9). The republican contract between the state and the citizens includes the principle of equality between its citizens, regardless of other individual characteristics. In other words, public display and recognition of the diversity of cultures and ethnicity has traditionally been seen as a hinder to guaranteeing equal treatment of all citizens. (Rufin 2004: 170-171). In concrete terms, this means that the specific situation of ethnic minorities is rarely discussed publically for fear of stigmatisation. The only recognised categories are the legal ones of "French" and "foreigner".

The French citizenship model has often been contrasted with the multicultural British, Dutch and Swedish model of policies towards citizenship and immigrant integration. The recognition of different communities is in the French republican model perceived as a danger to the national cohesion and a barrier to integration. (Cour des comptes 2004: 60-61) In later years, the discourse has started to shift. On a semantic level, the official definition established by the High Council on Integration in 1991 describes integration as a "process to stimulate the active participation in national society of all elements (groups), while recognising the cultural, social and moral specificities and acknowledging that these differences are a benefit to society" (HCI 2003:13).

On a practical level, there are some signs of increased recognition that people from a diversity of cultures makes a significant contribution to French society. In 2004 plans of a new "museum" of immigration were published. The museum of immigration is scheduled to open in 2007, but an internet site with a virtual exposition has been set up as from 2005. (Toubon 2004: 10-13) Authorities have high expectations of the museum and present it as a solution to address the double dilemma that is seen facing the French model of integration, that is "communitarianism" at one side, and discrimination at the other. The importance of the museum is partly symbolic – for instance showing that immigrants and the history of immigration is a significant part of French culture and history. More importantly though, the museum is expected to have a practical effect on national cohesion, in that it should help everyone to be proud of being French and give increased recognition to the immigrant population.

---

[31] See Annex II, Table 3 – Immigration flows in selected European countries for some recent data on flows to France.

The French republican model presupposes that as soon as individuals are granted French citizenship, they are set on an equal footing with all other citizens. This "egalitarian myth" was broken by the socialist government of 1997-2002 by recogising the factual discrimination against immigrants and their children (Maurer 2003a). In 2004 the government developed a new comprehensive programme to fight social exclusion and discrimination, called the Plan for Social Cohesion. According to the state Council of Social and Economic Affairs (CES), the main advantage of the plan is that it simultaneously tackles a series of social disadvantages which are all inter-related. (CES 2004: 20) The Plan consists of 20 programmes organised under 3 main pillars: employment, housing and equality. Although the social cohesion plan does not include many specific references to integration of immigrants, the themes included in the plan are highly relevant to enhancing social cohesion through combating social exclusion among these groups. In this context, immigrant groups are particularly vulnerable to social exclusion in many of the fields outlined in the Social cohesion plan.

In a similar initiative to step up the fight against discrimination and increase the possibilities for foreign-born French citizens and non-citizens to access their rights, the regional network of CODAC – Commission for access to citizenship - is now being remodeled. Originally, the main mission of the CODAC, set up in 2000, was to assist victims of discrimination through the running of a free number to denounce discriminations (114). It also had the mission of planning and implementing local actions on awareness-raising together with local associations and actors. However, the evaluations from the first years of its existance have been rather disappointing. (Stasi 2004; ECRI 2003). In line with the new initiative to establish an equality body competent for all the different grounds of discrimination, the CODACs are in 2005 becoming COPEC, Commission for the promotion of equal chances and citizenship, and will cover all grounds of discrimination. The COPEC will no longer have the mission to assist victims of discrimination, since this will be one of the primary functions of the new equality body HALDE. Instead the two priorities for the local action in COPEC will be firstly to fight discrimination in employment, and in particular work with the private sector, and secondly to fight racism and anti-Semitism in a similar way of what the CODAC has done until now, through awareness-raising and local projects. (French Ministry of Interior 2004)

The adjustment of the republican model has as a consequence, that it is now possible to initiatiate policies aimed at reducing disadvantages of immigrants or their children in general, but it is not possible to develop specific programmes for the benefit of members of ethnic groups that are particularly disadvantaged. Along the same lines, ethnic organisations encounter major obstacles, especially in securing public funds. Public institutions systematically favour intercultural associations and initiatives, such as 'relay women' (see next section) (Maurer 2003b). Thus, social cohesion in relation to immigrants is mainly portrayed in terms of civic inclusion by granting French citizenship, and in terms of combatting social exclusion by general mainstream measures.

Portugal

Like other Southern European countries, Portugal has until recently mainly been a country of emigration rather than immigration. Immigration first made its appearance as a phenomenon in the 1970s, after the transition to democracy and as the Portuguese colonies in Africa gained independence. However, immigration did not seriously become an issue on the political agenda until the 1990s, as the numbers of immigrants, started to grow significantly by the end of the 1980s. (Caldeira et al:222). Net migration has been positive since 1993. In

2002, 13,833 foreigners applied for a residence permit. The number of asylum applications is low compared to other EU countries: between 200 and 250 applications per year over the 1997-2002 period. The government introduced an amnesty programme for undocumented foreigners with employment contracts; between January 2001 and March 2003, 179,165 one-year residence permits were issued, most of them to nationals from Eastern Europe, Russia and Brazil (OECD 2005: 254-256). A large part of the immigrants come from the Portuguese ex-colonies in Africa – the so-called PALOP countries, from Brazil and recently from Eastern European countries, mainly from Ukraine Moldova and Russia. By the end of 2002, the foreign population amounted to 413 000 persons, corresponding to 4% of the resident population (OECD 2005).

The increase of immigrants led to a higher visibility of problems faced by these groups, such as poverty, and difficult social conditions regarding for example housing and employment. It also led to some racist incidents and inter-ethnic tensions. Organisations promoting the rights of immigrants started to put pressure on both the government and the civil society to take action. (*Ibid*:223) A first initiative to improve the situation of ethnic minorities was implemented in the field of education in 1991, through the Co-ordinating Secretariat of the Projects of Multicultural Education. Further initiatives followed in fields such as employment, training, housing and social actions, and were mentioned in the Cabinet Resolution in 1993 on a programme to prevent the social exclusion of immigrants and to reinforce their insertion in Portuguese society. (*Ibid*)

In 1996 the High Commissioner for Immigration and Ethnic Minorities (Alto Comissariado para a Imigração e Minorias Étnicas– ACIME) was established, within the scope of the Presidency of the Council of Ministers. The current structure of the organisation was put in place in 2002 and since then the ACIME has become the most proactive and influential institution in developing projects and approaches to the integration of immigrants. The ACIME is now an interdepartmental government body with the specific mission to promote the integration of ethnic minorities and immigrants. The remits of its authority includes both issues of social inclusion as well as combating racism and discrimination (Decree-law no 251/2002)

There are currently two main strands of activities managed by the ACIME (Fonseca et al 2004; Esteves et al 2003). A National Immigrant Information System has been set up to provide information for immigrants. In addition to the publication of information bulletins, leaflets and brochures, the system also includes a new hotline, SOS immigrant, to give advice and support for immigrants, and a website (www.acime.gov.pt). Secondly, a National System of Support for Immigrants has been established. One of the main priorities of this system is to facilitate the immigrants' relations with public administration bodies and to provide support to resolve their problems regarding integration. Accordingly, the National Immigration Support Services (Centros Nacionais de Apoio ao Imigrante - CNAI) were set up in 2004, to provide an integrated response to problems of integration posed by immigrants. The support system consists of a network of centers of assistance at national (Lisbon and Porto), regional and local level (Centro Local de Apoio ao Imigrante - CLAI).

The creation of these centres where the outcome of the analysis of the 2001 legalisation process of undocumented immigrants. This analysis demonstrated the complexity, dispersion and lack of integration of the services, frequently mentioned by immigrants as a factor of serious inefficiency hindering the process of their social integration and a reason for giving up the processing of legalisation. In response to this study, an attempt was made to integrate

the various services with regard to immigration, social security, work, health and education, by a conception of management of space, a common way of working, and a common and shared ICT information management. Social-cultural mediators facilitate the service encounters, in a public-third sector partnership. The centres assist immigrants by providing information on regularisation procedures, employment, healthcare, education, social assistance, and other issues.

Since 2002 the ACIME also manages the Advisory Board for Immigrant Affairs (COCAI, Conselho Consultivo para os Assuntos da Imigração, created in 1998, Decree-Law 39/98). The Advisory Board includes representatives from immigrant organisations, social partners and relevant NGOs and institutions that work with welfare who discusses and presents their opinion on planned policies and projects in relation to social integration of immigrants (Decree-law 251/2002).

Conclusion

To sum up, there are considerable differences between the Member States regarding their models of immigrant integration and their interpretation of social cohesion. There are clear differences between the traditional national philosophies of integration. However, there are also signs of convergence. This includes a higher recognition of difference in France, more emphasis on adaptation in the Netherlands, and a more inclusive German policy approach. Issues of social cohesion in relation to immigration gain in importance in all Member States, although the interpretation of the concept and policy measures developed differ considerably. In France and Germany, social cohesion is predominantly interpreted in terms of social inclusion, while in the Netherlands the social relations element gains in weight. In Portugal, social cohesion appears less prominent on the agenda as there are more basic issues that have to be resolved, such as setting up sufficient social services for immigrants and the issue of undocumented migrants. Differences between national models remain, however these are not always clear-cut. In Germany for instance, the national policy and discussion can be described as fluctuating between two poles, of "pragmatic integration" and "appellative denial". Such ambiguities can also be observed in other Member States. For instance in the Netherlands the civil society and migrant organisations are at times actively involved in a national dialogue about social cohesion, while at the same time the law and order philosophy of the government stereotypes migrants as a burden and a problem.

The record with regard to furthering social cohesion is multifarious. For instance, with regard to the social inclusion strand of social cohesion the national policies of the Member States all have their strong and weak points. There is some evidence that differences in generic policies and institutions have more impact on the integration outcomes, than have any specifically targeted government policies for immigrants (Crul & Vermeulen 2003). While the French (and to a lesser extent, Dutch) relatively open education systems results in higher education rates of some migrant groups, the German (and Austrian) apprenticeship system deliver more successful transitions of migrant young people to the job market than in France and the Netherlands (*ibid*).

5.3 Urban Policies

Urban metropolitan areas were chosen for further study because they are increasingly becoming prominent arenas of integration due to factors such as the increasing

concentration of migrants, the establishment of international immigration networks, and the governmental trend in contemporary Western Europe towards the decentralisation of integration policies. Research in all of the countries included in this study has shown that migrants and ethnic minorities lag behind native citizens in education, job training, and economic opportunities. Although urban policies do not always make specific reference to issues directly related to immigration, they remain highly relevant for improving the situation of migrants.

Below we will present the policies of four urban areas in the Member States of comparison. After indicating the national urban policy context in a few words, we will briefly outline some elements of the local policy. We will focus on one or two elements of the local policy relevant for strengthening the social relations and/or promoting social inclusion of marginal groups, including migrants.

Germany, Stuttgart: intercultural interaction and mainstreaming

In the federal German state, housing policy comes under the authority of the 16 individual federal states (Länder) and city-states, and the municipalities. This means that urban regeneration policy is formulated and implemented differently in the different parts of the country. Although there is no federal urban policy, some urban development programmes have been developed by the Federal Government. One example is the Socially Integrated City ("Die soziale Stadt"), launched in 1999. The programme involves an integrated approach to combat the widening social-spatial rifts in the cities that are caused by segregation, social polarisation, unemployment and poverty (Dornette 2004). Immigration both from the eastern parts of Germany and from outside the country is seen as an important source for these problems. However, from an international comparative perspective, there are rather low levels of ethnic housing segregation in Germany (Heckmann 2003).

Stuttgart was the first German city to develop an integration strategy for immigrants, called a "Pact for Integration", in 2001. The city is the capital of the southern German federal state Baden-Württemberg. The percentage of foreigners (22.6%) is the second highest among German cities, but Stuttgart has the lowest crime rate, the lowest unemployment rate of immigrants and relatively few ghettoes. (City of Stuttgart 2003: 13).

The "Pact for integration" was motivated by the national process of redefining the situation of immigration and immigrant integration around the turn of the century. Stuttgart has become a model for major cities in Germany, awarded a prize by the Federal Home Office and the Bertelsmann Stiftung in the 2005 contest "Successful integration is not coincidence: strategies of communal integration policy". The integration policy goes beyond the traditional German approach (involving a dichotomy between citizens and foreigners) to focus both on fighting social exclusion of immigrants and their children, and on strengthening the social relations between citizens of all different backgrounds. The integration policy is one of the elements of the social pillar of the urban policy. The integrated urban policy of Stuttgart aims at social, economic and physical development, including urban renewal of problem areas. the policy is coherent with the national programme "Soziale Stadt" ("Stadtentwicklungskonzept Stuttgart. Entwurf 2004").

The Stuttgart integration policy aims at supporting equal rights, opportunities and participation, reinforcing social cohesion and harmony between all population groups, and promoting cultural diversity. (City of Stuttgart 2004) The approach to integration is

characterised by seeing integration as a two-way process and engaging all parties to take their responsibilities. The policy has a high priority, and is one of the special competences ("Chefsache") of the Lord Mayor of Stuttgart. The Department of Integration (Stabsabteilung für Integrationspolitik) steers and coordinates the policy. In a spirit of engaging all relevant actors, the Pact for Integration involves the public sector (politics and administration), the private sector (special interest groups and businesses), and civil society (associations, sport clubs, community groups, and NGOs).

One notable feature of the policy is the cultural mainstreaming approach. According to the city government, it is necessary to establish a cultural mainstreaming approach to policy-making, in order to secure equal changes for immigrants and minorities. For this reason, the main responsibility for development of integration policy lies within the various departments of the administration and other parties involved, while the lord mayor has the general responsibility to supervise the process (City of Stuttgart 2004). The city administration has adopted a policy of diversity management and many departments have recruited bi- and multilingual experts and persons with an experience of migration, in order to improve the services to migrants. The city also encourages NGOs to open up their services to migrants and to adopt intercultural approaches. This policy has resulted in an increase of the personnel of migrant background within the city administration as well as a higher share of multilingual and intercultural experienced personnel.

Integration is defined in terms of social cohesion among a city population of increased heterogeneity. In this context, the policy supports the participation and involvement of migrants. People who do not have a German passport can vote for an "International Committee" which is a local consultative body made up of elected migrants, appointed experts, and city councillors. Furthermore, migrants are involved as members of the city council include, and have leading positions in the city administration. The city government also values and supports alternative methods of political participation of migrants, mainly through the channels of organisations with no genuine political aims, such as religious groups, non-profit social organisations, and sport clubs. These forms of participation can help to develop social capital, in particular when migrant organisations co-operate with public institutions (City of Stuttgart 2003).

Recent initiatives aim at furthering social cohesion through promoting a permanent intercultural and interreligious dialogue. This involves supporting and facilitating contact and interactions between people belonging to and identifying with different cultural backgrounds and supporting various cultural activities. Important private and public initiatives in this context include intercultural associations, mentor projects, community centres and a team of trained intercultural mediators to help settle conflicts between inhabitants outside courts. The initiatives aim at encouraging the native population to become interested in the theme of integration. Cultural diversity is valued positively by the city council and administration, as an element of the international identity of the city and as a social and economic asset.

The Netherlands, Rotterdam: desegregation and debate

In the Netherlands, the Dutch urban policy ("Grote Steden Beleid" (GSB)) has matured since its start in 1994. It is a joint policy of the national Dutch government and the major cities. The third Covenant (GSB III) between the government and the larger cities, for the period 2005-2009, is characterised by a simplified administration system as the many special grants have now been combined in 3 broadly based grant schemes with regard to 3 pillars of the Dutch

Urban Policy: "Physical", "Economy", and "Social, Integration, and Security". Integration of immigrants is one of the elements of the third pillar. This covenant reflects the political desire to decentralise more responsibilities to the cities, and takes into account the shift in the Dutch climate since the first years of the 21st century. Urban safety and integration of ethnic minorities now have the highest priority. (Van den Berg et al 2004: 81).

Rotterdam, a city with a long tradition of immigration, has often taken the lead in developing integration and urban policies. Since the late 1970s, the integration policy has gone through various phases (ISEO & COS 2003): recognition of the permanent residence of guest-workers (since 1978), preference for generic measures (1980s), newcomer integration policy and an emphasis on migrants responsibilities as citizens (1990s), and a policy of diversity (1998-2002). The diversity policy aimed at developing intercultural competence within the city administration and services, and at adapting the city environment to the heterogeneous population. Although it has led to a more diverse city administration, it produced disappointing results in some other areas. Since 2002 the city policy has changed radically, as the "Leefbaar Rotterdam" (Liveable Rotterdam) entered the city council to occupy more than a third of the seats. Immigrant integration was one of the five priorities of the 2002 programme of the new coalition, besides safety, housing, education & youth, and economic development (City of Rotterdam 2002a). The new coalitions approach is characterised by a focus on implementation and 'measurable targets'.

The new city council intends to strengthen social cohesion by intensifying existing projects, such as "Opzoomeren" (activation of residents), as well as developing new projects. One of the new projects is the Urban etiquette project which focuses on enhancing social relations by helping people to find and maintain rules for social interaction appropriate to the changing, multicultural society (City of Rotterdam 2002c). Likewise to the national discourse, active citizenship, engagement and citizen qualification are central concepts of the new policy in Rotterdam. However, the "multicultural society" is defined as a further complication in the quest to increase social cohesion. As stated in the Delta plan for integration" (City of Rotterdam 2002b): "many citizens, immigrant and native alike, can hardly get a grip on this notion of 'multicultural society'".

The call for more adaptation and active responsibility of migrants has been even stronger after the publication of the Population Prognosis 2003-2017. The prognosis shows that the influx of immigrants will be the main source of increase in the Rotterdam population up to 2017. The proportion of the autochthonous population will decrease from 53,9 % in 2002 to 42,1% in 2017 (on a total city population of 598.467 in 2002 and 635.382 in 2017)[32]. (COS 2003) Following the publication of the prognosis, the debate on population trends has intensified. It is being pointed out from different quarters that the city has reached the limits of its capacity to absorb socially and economically underprivileged inhabitants, and that in some locations these limits have been exceeded. (City of Rotterdam 2003b)

The response of the City council has been the development of a new Action Programme - "Rotterdam continues, on the pathway to a balanced city" (City of Rotterdam 2003b). The programme consists of action plans in five sub-sectors, including "immigration, integration

---

[32] Autochthonous people are defined as those with both parents born in the Netherlands; the complement are the "allochtonous" or immigrant people. This is a customary definition in the Netherlands, but it can be used in a misleading way because in everyday language "allochtonous" is incorrectly narrowed to "migrants from non-Western countries".

and citizenship". One of the most controversial elements of the programme is the intention to limit the influx of low-income groups into the city of Rotterdam and to promote residential desegregation. This has triggered a national debate and in reaction to the Rotterdam plan, the Dutch government introduced a bill in April 2005 on "special measures for urban problems". The bill will empower the municipal authorities to improve their economic climate, improve the social quality of the environment by closing buildings that causes inconvenience (esp. overcrowded buildings housing undocumented migrants, owned by slum landlords), and to regulate more effectively the housing patterns of specific income groups. The Rotterdam policy (and the bill) has been criticised by the Equal Treatment Commission as indirectly discriminating against single mothers and (underprivileged) migrants (Equal Treatment Commission 2005).

The new Rotterdam policy is based on a decisive top-down approach, as is the national integration policy. However, as mentioned earlier, promoting discussion is an equally important element of the policy. Promoting and facilitating discussion within the city and within neighbourhoods is intended as a strategy both to restore the trust of the population into the government and politics and to involve the population and civil society in tackling problems and developing rules of social interaction. Debates on various issues are organised on street and city levels. A series of debate on Islam attracted much attention, including on national level. In February and March 2005, 6 debates on city-level and 16 small-scale debates on district-level were organised.[33] The debates aimed at making explicit unarticulated fears and dissatisfaction and to openly discuss issues related to the multicultural society and to the role of the Islam therein. The City council intended the discussions to improve the social cohesion by combating prejudices and misunderstandings, improving social relations between citizens of various backgrounds. However, according to some observers, the debates have had stigmatising and polarising effects.

France, Marseille: urban regeneration and mediators

France has developed urban policy programmes since the 1970s, and is probably one of the European nations with most experience in this field. In the beginning the programmes were mostly oriented towards improving housing and in particular in regenerating the multi-storey blocks that were beginning to get rundown by the end of the 1970s. As from the beginning of the 1980s, the programmes were widened to deal with the more complex problems and multiple disadvantages that were faced by people and neighbourhoods in city areas with high levels of unemployment and low socio-economic status. (Espinasse 1998:91-94; Conseil d'Analyse Economique 2004:86)

French urban policy is built on the development of targeted actions for predefined urban zones with difficulties such as high unemployment, high number of school drop-outs, low socio-economic status. In these Zones Urbaines sensibles (ZUS) or sensitive urban zones the household poverty rate is 21% (on average) and is almost twice the average in France. AT the same time, the poverty rate of foreign households is also above the average.(French Ministry of Employment: 2003: 5, 32). In general, immigrants (both those with foreign citizenship, but also French of immigrant origin) are still over-represented in these urban areas. Integration has only become part of official, transversal objective of the urban policy since 2000, but has been an implicit part of the programme for some time due to the high representation of immigrants in the concerned city areas.

---

[33] http://www.rotterdam.nl/smartsite2042605.dws?Menu=267127&MainMenu=267127

A positive point about the urban policy programmes is their holistic approach, trying to tackle multiple disadvantages with comprehensive policies. There is a growing recognition that disparities are not reduced by simply increasing employment, education and the offer of housing, but that this needs to be combined with a strategy to tackle discrimination in access to jobs, housing, etc. It is also increasingly being acknowledged that the foreign born residents and French citizens of foreign origin are particularly vulnerable to social exclusion, and discrimination, but so far the progress in this field is slow. There has been and is still a reluctance to developing specific initiatives for minorities. Most of the programmes to promote social inclusion, but also to fight discrimination are still territorially based, that is targeted to all inhabitants of a certain area, rather than to immigrants and minorities

An example of a good practice is that of improving access to social rights and enhancing social relations by means of adults-relays or mediators. Though they do not exclusively serve the minority population, most people who take part in and benefit from the programmes are first or second generation immigrants. During the last decades, the function of social mediatior emerged in several French cities within the framework of urban regeneration policies to improve relations between the inhabitants of backward disctricts, and public services and local facilities. For example, in Marseille where immigrants make up some seven per cent of the city's population, in the 1980s and 1990s a small group of mediators emerged from the community organisations of North African migrants. One of the reasons was the growing difficulties faced by social workers to deal with social violence in working class districts predominantly inhabited by migrants. As in other cities, for example Toulouse, crisis and violence in urban contexts acted as a catalyst, attracting the attention of authorities to the dysfunctioning of social services (Moore 2004). In a comparative study on ethnic social mediators in Marseille and Toulouse, and in a British city, Manchester, Moore (2004) observed remarkable similarities in their functioning and strategic positions. However, an important difference revealed was that the strategic advantage of ethnic origin and community networks of the mediator was officially recognised in the British city while it remained informal and unofficial in the French cities. It follows that the ethnic mediators in France had a more marginalised and vulnerable and less influentual position.

The situation has changed in recent years. In 2000, the Minister of Urban Affairs launched a programme aiming at the creation of 10,000 positions of adult-relays or mediators by 2003 "to improve social relations between inhabitants, public services and local facilities. The objective is to create social cohesion in the districts, to prevent and to treat the minor conflicts of daily life and to facilitate the action of local facilities and associations" (Ministère délégué à la ville, 2000; Maurer 2003b). The adult-relays is a common label for a vast number of functions of mediation including the social, judicial and family spheres. The relays mediate between a variety of actors including local residents and administrations, schools, doctors, social organisations, etc. (DARES 2003) Three quarters of them are women. With the new policy, the relays have been given an institutional position as auxiliary agents of the public services. This fits within the recent reorientation of French urban policy towards reliance on persons outside the state or local public institutions to reach the underprivilieged, who have come to mistrust everyone related to the public authorities (Maurer 2003b: 17).

The key contribution of mediators in enhancing social cohesion to a large extent consists of reconnecting with groups at risk of social exclusion that have a difficulty in interacting with social institutions, or in the case of street mediators to help prevent and minimise social conflicts. The actions of the mediators prove to be especially more effective concerning

adminstrative and school problems, than with regard to problems of residence permits, housing and unemployment (Maurer 2003b: 20). Through their culturally sensistive approach mediators fill up a blind spot of the "cultural neutral" French institutions. This is at the same time a weakness of the mediator function in that it provides an easy way out for these institutions. However, there are signs that some institutions are changing, because mediators promote a better knowledge of the cultures of the migrant communities. A recurrent weakness of the position of mediators is that they are sometimes viewed as illegitimate by some institutions and social workers. (Maurer 2003b: 20) The only requirement for the position of mediator are "communication skills, legitimacy and ability to gain the respect and recognition of the inhabitants of the district" (Ministère délégué à la ville, 2000; Maurer 2003b: 17). The Ministry of Urban Affairs wants to promote the development of an official mediation training course and curriculum. But professionalisation of the statute clashes with another important aspect of adult-relays: the fact that they do not belong to any institution. Another problematic point of the mediation function within the French system is, that it (unofficially) operates on the basis of similar (ethnic, language) backgrounds. But attempts to operate in mixed pairs to stimulate intercultural interactions did not work. (Maurer 2003b: 20-21). Bicultural and bilingual expertise are necessary for the fulfillment of the function.

Portugal, Quinta do Mocho: Rehousing and social inclusion

One of the most urgent social inclusion and cohesion problems in urban areas in Portugal has been the lack of decent housing for ethnic minorities and for new immigrants arriving. A particular problem is the development of shantytowns characterised by a complete lack of basic facilities and infrastructure, that are to a large part inhabited by immigrants with no other choice of housing. Since the beginning of the 1990s, special re-housing programmes (PER) have been put in place nationally to deal with the problem. Similarly to the French urban programmes, PER projects are not specifically targeted at immigrant communities, but have a great impact on these groups because of the size of the immigrant population in the targeted areas. (Esteves et al 2003:4) Rehousing programmes are part of the Portuguese National Action Plan for Social Inclusion 2003-2005. Considerable efforts have been made in the past few years, in particular in the suburban areas of Lisbon and Porto (High Commissioner for Immigration and Ethnic Minorities 2003:49)

Local municipalities in Portugal have only limited obligations when it comes to developing policy for immigrants' integration. However, many municipalities are developing various programmes, in particular those in the area of Lisbon, where there is a high representation of immigrant communities. A study on the content of the policies developed by municipalities in the Lisbon Metropolitan Area shows that housing is still the main priority, before issues of social support and education (Caldeira et al: 231-232) Some local authorities (Lisbon, Amadora) have set up municipal councils or other structures to involve immigrants in local life and politics. Other local structures provide support to immigrant organisations and acts as a mediator between immigrant communities and local authorities. Examples of these are the Cabinet for Religious and Social Issues in the City Council of Loures, and the Cabinet for the Support of Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities in the city Council of Santarém (Teixeira & Alburquerque 2005: 17)

A project implemented in the community of Quinta do Mocho provides an example of recent attempts to deal simultaneously with the housing problems and other issues of social exclusion. In Quinta do Mocho outside Lisbon, an immigrant shanty-town developed where

many immigrants illegally occupied buildings that were in unsafe conditions without any facilities such as electricity or water. Social disadvantages were accumulated as the neighbourhood had a high unemployment rate. Many of the inhabitants lacked basic rights, because they were either illegal immigrants or illegal workers or both. In addition, the neighbourhood suffered from conflicts between the different ethnic groups. Because of all these issues, the neighbourhood became disconnected from the surrounding suburbs and even from society.

However, by the end of the 1990s the problem finally gained enough visibility and publicity for the local authorities and associations to begin to take action. A first project to improve the situation, both in terms of housing and with regards to social inclusion, was implemented under the National Programme of Fight against Poverty 1996-1999. The project mainly consisted of preparation for further action. Activities included needs assessment, and the building of relationships between the inhabitants and the local organisations and authorities in order to build up trust between the parties. A second phase between 1999-2001 went further to develop a more accomplished collaboration between the inhabitants and the actors involved. The objective of the activities was to increase the social and economic participation and integration of the inhabitants, in terms of education, labour market, and the rehousing programme.

A key component of the programme was to empower the inhabitants to take control over their situation and to enable them to take action themselves to improve social integration and cohesion. In this context, a community centre was established, and courses were set up to train inhabitants as cultural mediators to act as intermediaries between the authorities and the population, and to act as change agents. Local school teachers were also given training in intercultural education to help improve their contact with the children from the immigrant families in Quinta do Mocho, in order to be able to prevent school drop-out. (ILO 2004: 119-130)

Not only in this project, but also in general, the role of the figure of the mediator is being developed. For example, the cultural mediator is of particular relevance in the procedure of the support centres for immigrants (CNAI) in Portugal. The mediators mostly come from the immigrant communities resident in Portugal. Their function of reception and welcoming of newcomers has shown itself to be of great strategic value. The service of SOS Immigrant mentioned earlier is also operated by socio-cultural mediators, who can respond in different languages to questions concerning immigration.

Conclusion

Most urban policy programmes include a mixture of policy measures in the physical, economic and social domains, and more or less explicitly include objectives of integration. The national contexts have without doubt an important impact on the development of integration policies on local level. However, ideological arguments and models play often a less important role in the more practical and pragmatic approach on local level than on national level. The problems the local authorities are confronted with are often of the same nature, irrespective of national contexts, although they can differ according to the type of immigrant population, the quality and quantity of the housing supply and the public housing system, the urban economy, etc. For example, the difference between the more "positive" intercultural policy of Stuttgart and the more "negative" desegregation policy of Rotterdam may well be related to the higher level of deprivation and concentration, and less favourable

economic conditions of Rotterdam. Because of the differences between concrete challenges on local level, it is difficult to compare the urban policies of our four cities.

A commonality in all four cases is the development of integrated approaches to tackle complex, concrete problems in deprived districts. Similar measures and instruments are being developed, such as immigrant integration courses, social mediators and forms of involving the (migrant) population. Generic policy measures and general institutions tend not to be sensitive enough to be able to bridge the gap between institutions and deprived segments of the migrant population. Inner city riots as in Marseille, and increased visibility of severe problems such as in Quinta do Mocho, can trigger the development of local policies. Urban policies are dominantly focussing on fighting social exclusion, but the social relations element of social cohesion appears to become more prominent, as exemplified by the encouragement and facilitation of city-wide debates and the promotion of interactions between people of various backgrounds by ways of community centres in both Stuttgart and Rotterdam. As we have seen, cities may even have a pioneering role within national contexts in redefining urban and integration policy.

5.4 <u>Social capital, participation and empowerment</u>

Social cohesion, as defined in the context in this study, is strengthened by processes that reduce social exclusion and by developments that reinforce social relations and social capital within and between various groups within a society. In this section we will take a thematic approach focussing on social capital and networks, in contrast with the spatial-organisational focus of the urban policies section. Social capital is a central concept in the discussion on the vitality of civil societies. There is considerable confusion over what constitutes social capital, but one way to characterise it is as networks and participation in public life on basis of shared norms, values, practices and understanding that facilitate co-operation within or among social groups to pursue shared objectives (CEC 2004: 115). In other terms, social capital refers to the networks of social relations that may provide individuals, groups, or organisations with access to resources and support they can use to get by and ahead (PRI 2005 1). From a social cohesion perspective it is important to note that benefits from social capital can be both private and public. For example, regular contact between members of a neighbourhood may have a positive impact on the mutual help and well-being of its members. Above all, social cohesion is primarily a product of the activities of citizens and organisations in the civil society, and in this process social networks and social capital are of vital importance.

The social capital perspective can provide a valuable supplementary perspective on issues of immigrant integration and management of diversity. Successful integration does not only depend on the human capital (skills, education, language abilities etc.) of immigrants, but also on the social capital and social networks they build up in the host society. Writers commonly differentiate between bonding, bridging and linking social networks and social capital. Bonding capital refers to relations within relatively homogeneous groups, bridging capital to more heterogeneous connections, and linking capital to relations between different strata in a hierarchy of power, status and wealth (PRI & OECD 2003). Some have suggested that whilst bonding capital may be relative high amongst minority communities, deficiencies of bridging and linking social capital leaves them exposed to continuing marginalisation and disempowerment. However, research has showed that the relation is more complex and that

participation in ethnic and religious organisations can have a positive effect on the trust and capabilities to participate in the wider society (Tillie 2004).

Social capital is a resource that can produce both positive and negative outcomes. Ethnic communities with strong social capital may restrict individual freedom of its members. And a cohesive society with strong in-group loyalty of bonding social capital tends to exclude outsiders (PRI & OECD 2003). Thus, social capital has to be considered in relation to a number of other resources and factors that may make a difference to achieve particular goals (PRI & OECD 2004: 10).

From a policy perspective, the social capital perspective is of particularly value in three areas of policy: helping populations at risk of social exclusion; supporting key life-course transitions; and promoting community development efforts (PRI 2005: 2). We will look briefly at these three social policy areas from a comparative perspective.

Helping populations at risk of social exclusion

Migrants are overrepresented among the at-risk groups in the Member States. Some of them have relatively high risks of exclusion and poverty, such as unskilled newcomers, recognised asylum-seekers, undocumented migrants, long-term unemployed migrants, aged migrant women and certain parts of the migrant youth. Their precarious situation may be caused by lack of education, training or affordable housing, but can also be attributed to social isolation or the lack of a diversity of social ties (PRI 2005). In both cases, sensitivity to existing social capital and networks, or the lack of it, will produce a better diagnosis and more effective policies.

The social capital approach can be a useful complement to the human capital approach for newcomer integration policies. Tools such as language training and foreign language credential assessment are often not enough for newcomers to support their integration, due to their lack of networks in the host society. For example, the Rotterdam immigrant integration policy includes a compulsory social traineeship for newcomers. During the course, newcomers gain practical experience by active participation in a Rotterdam organisation, business or club during a certain period, helping them to improve their language skills, to learn the norms of interaction and to build up contacts with organisations and the local society. In Stuttgart, a mentoring programme for adults learning German has been developed, thus offering them the opportunity to test their German in daily environments.

Women migrants are another group at risk of exclusion, in particular female family migrants, unemployed and unskilled, lone parents, housewives, and older people among them, in addition to victims of trafficking. As mentioned earlier, in several Member States, governmental organisations and NGOs pay special attention to women migrants and their often rather isolated social position. As mentioned earlier, in many Member States, including the four in our comparison, social and cultural mediators have emerged. Most of the mediators are migrant women, as they also constitute one of the most important client groups in domains such as health, schooling, education and care. The mediators can fulfil a positive function in terms of bridging and linking capital, both for the clients and themselves. Organisations can also play a mediating role. To give an example, the Committee for Participation of Women from Ethnic Minorities (PaVEM) set up in July 2003 for a two-year long period by the Dutch government, installed among other things a Participation team of

successful women from different ethnic backgrounds, as well as the local Participation teams in 14 municipalities. The objective of the Participation team is to advise local governments, to act as role models and to mediate between migrant women and local, regional and national authorities and employers. The team's activities are now taken forward by a recently established foundation. (PaVEM 2005).

Supporting key life-course transitions

The importance of having networks and developing new contacts become most urgent during moments of uncertainty and instability caused by key-life transitions, such as the passage from school to work, loss of employment, marriage, divorce and retirement (PRI 2005). Although these are common to most people, they can even be more critical to groups in precarious situation who lack of social capital. Migrants are among these groups. For example, older migrant women are particularly vulnerable to processes of social exclusion and poverty, due to their inferior labour market position and insufficient pensions because of their limited period of residence.[34]

Another vulnerable category consists of migrant children and youth, of both first and second generation. In general they are more vulnerable than native youth to risks of unemployment, exclusion, and discrimination during their adolescence. Social capital, both of the youth and their parents, can play an important role in their processes of integration or marginalisation.

The social capital perspective can be of value by developing and implementing initiatives and programmes to support the integration and inclusion of migrant children and youth. An example is the project of neighbourhood tutors for youth in the Quinta da Princesa district of Lisbon.[35] The project has won the European Crime Prevention Award. This district high has a large population of Africans from the former Portuguese colonies, and a very high percentage of young people (66% under 35). Children drifted easily into crime, following the example set by the elder generation. The "Choices Programme" brought national and local partners into the project, but also the young people themselves and their parents were invited to help thinking about possible solutions. The approach for the group of 9-15 year old children was particularly innovative. One of the primary aims of the project was to counteract the high drop-out rates at the transition from the local primary school to the high school which is located outside the neighbourhood. With the involvement of both pupils and parents, collaboration between the two schools was established. Five children with a positive leadership profile were put to work as volunteer "neighbourhood tutors", and received training from social workers in interpersonal skills, conflict mediation and social animation. The neighbourhood tutors organised social and educational activities for other young people, and became a sounding board for problem families in the district. To facilitate the reaching out, the tutors chosen had the same cultural background as the children with problems. As a result of the project, school drop-out rates have fallen from 32% to 11%.

Examples of mentor- or tutor projects can also be found in other countries. These can be initiated by migrant organisations and/or public institutions such as schools, welfare institutions and city councils. An example are initiatives of immigrant students providing guidance and counselling to younger co-ethnics during their secondary education. Dutch

---

[34] See information on the AGE+ project on the website of the NPOE and the 2005 report on "Older Migrant Women: Facts, Figures, Personal Stories. An inventory in five EU countries".

[35] See the KCGS website: http://www.kcgsi.nl/dossiers/Sociaal/Veiligheid/preventie/4027_1068.html

research has demonstrated that mentoring works, and helps to improve the school performance of participating immigrant children (Kraal 2003a: 34). Sometimes migrant organisations fail to set up such projects successfully, for example in Amsterdam, due to the city policy to move away from group-specific policies in order to avoid their potential stigmatising effects (Kraal 2003a). However, Dutch research demonstrated that ethnic pairing in the mentoring projects appears to be advantageous, because of the familiarity of the mentor with the cultural background and obstacles of the student and with his or her home language (*Ibid*). A possible solution to this dilemma is, according to Kraal (2003), to combine ethnic pairing in the tutoring process, but to provide these pairs opportunities to interact with their counterparts in other ethnic groups on a regular basis.

Promoting community development efforts

Finally, the focus on social capital may be of particular relevance for the social and economic development of deprived areas, including improving the living conditions of its inhabitants by mobilisation, participation and involvement of these people. This can be done by utilising and expanding bonding, bridging as well as linking social capital for example by making use of the social capital of ethnic groups, expanding inter-ethnic relations and increasing involvement in local policies and in activities of schools and other institutions.

Several of the cases in this section on social capital and the one on urban policies are also examples of mobilising immigrant groups to help solving community problems. In all countries we have observed numerous projects of neighbourhood dialogue, social work activities, minority volunteering, etc, to promote empowerment and community development in heterogeneous districts. For example, in Stuttgart numerous events are supported that stimulate the participation of citizens in communal life, bringing cultural groups closer together. This can be illustrated by the community centre "House 49" in district Stuttgart North, a heterogeneous district with an accumulation of problems. House 49 has grown into a community centre for all age groups, religions and nationalities. "The community centre has succeeded in mobilising social capital in one of the most disadvantaged areas of the city." (City of Stuttgart 2003: 27) Social capital is engendered by the support of the volunteers (migrants and Germans, older and younger people) and the fact that the centre and its activities are frequented by a diverse public (including all age groups, cultures, classes and nationalities). According to the city of Stuttgart (2003: 28) "The fact, that many formerly disadvantaged but talented youngsters who sought help with homework at House 49 years ago are now studying at prestigious universities and come back to the House as volunteers, is enough prove of the idea House 49 is based upon."

Social cohesion and empowerment cannot be implemented from above. Governments and welfare organisations ought to be sensitive to the range of bottom-up initiatives of citizens in deprived neighbourhoods to tackle problems and organise self-help. An example is the above-mentioned cases of the 'Choice programme' with neighbourhood tutors in a Lisbon district. However, there are many barriers for locally active people when they ask for support of their initiatives by local governments, in form of for example subsidies and a venue for their activities. A Dutch research on local initiatives of Antilleans in deprived neighbourhoods showed that many local initiatives of self-help and community development from low or unskilled Antilleans did not receive suitable support because of distrust and the absence of bureaucratic competencies at the side of the citizens and an unresponsive and bureaucratic attitude of the representatives of the local governments and welfare organisations (Fermin et al 2003). Again, knowledge of the background, culture and language of the clients and a

responsive and proactive attitude proved to be decisive factors in fitting support. Often, successful support for civil society initiatives from marginal groups depended on the presence of mediators and mediating organisations. On the other hand, conflicts between migrant organisations and city councils can have positive effects both on mutual trust and cohesion, and on the development of social capital within migrant organisations. This can be illustrated by the conflict and subsequent collaboration of the religious Milli Görüs organisation with the Amsterdam city district council on the issue of establishing a Turkish mosque (Kraal 2003). Conflicts can generate mutual respect and provide a platform for confidence-building (Zolberg & Clarking 2003)

5.5 **Conclusion**

This section has showed that Member States differ considerably in their interpretation of the notion of social cohesion and in their policies that aim at promoting it. Even if the term social cohesion as such is not commonly used in all Member States, all Member States are concerned about ways of promoting and maintaining social order and feelings of togetherness among their populations. There are clear differences between the traditional national philosophies of integration, for example between the republican and assimilationist French, the multiculturalist Dutch and the ethnic and exclusive German philosophies. However, there are signs of convergence, towards more recognition of difference in France, more emphasis on adaptation and even assimilation in the Netherlands, and a more inclusive German policy. In general, the issues of social inclusion and of inter-ethnic relations and shared standards gain in importance in all the Member States included in our comparison, although the shifts in national discourses remain ambiguous.

When it comes to promoting social relations and social participation, much of the practical work often takes place close to the citizens, on the local rather than the national level. Although urban policies do not always make specific reference to issues directly related to immigration, they remain highly relevant for improving the situation of migrants. The comparative analyses showed that there are both similarities and differences in the urban policies within the four Member States. These differences partly relate to differences in national contexts. National legislation, immigration and integration policies, and urban policy programmes constitute an important framework for local policies, especially in countries with significant national urban programmes such as France and the Netherlands. National discourse on social cohesion and immigration also left its traces on local level. The turn in Dutch policy towards more adaptation and shared citizenship is reflected in the Rotterdam urban policy. In contrast, the Stuttgart approach of immigration as an economic and cultural asset fits with the recent shift in German policy towards regulating economic integration. However, ideological differences that may play a role on national level are not always reflected in the more practical and pragmatic approach on local level. For instance, in all of the local contexts, the positive role of social or community mediators is recognised as a means of improving social relations between ethnic minorities and authorities. This is also the case in France despite the official discourse that ignores cultural and ethnic differences.

The issues treated in urban policies vary according to the local situations and the responsibilities of the city governments. For example, in the recent immigration country of Portugal the main problems cities are confronted with are those of unsafe housing conditions, shantytowns, and housing of irregular immigrants lacking basic rights. In cities

with a longer history of immigration settlement, such as Rotterdam and Stuttgart, the priorities are set on quite different issues: social relations, participation and desegregation. A general trend is exemplified by policies to improve the involvement of migrants in processes of defining and implementing policies (for example the International Committee in Stuttgart), and to encourage contacts and debates between citizens with various backgrounds (for example the city-wide debates on Islam in Rotterdam).

Successful integration does not only depend on the human capital of immigrants, but also on the social capital and social networks they build up by participation in the new society. The social capital perspective can be a valuable supplementary perspective on issues of immigrant integration and management of diversity. From a policy perspective, the social capital perspective is of particularly value in three areas of policy: helping populations at risk of social exclusion, such as newcomers and women migrants, supporting key life-course transitions, such as school-to-work transitions of migrant youth, and promoting community development efforts, for example initiatives to improve contacts between inhabitants of multi-ethnic neighbourhoods and crime prevention. There are many initiatives in these fields, both public and private, top-down as well as bottom-up.

Within the various examples and policies, some common dilemmas and issues with regard to challenges of promoting social inclusion and strengthening social relations and cohesion have come up. One example is the dilemma of generic versus group-specific policies. In many successful projects, mediators and go-betweeners, who are preferably of immigrant origin, proved to be crucial to bridge the gap between official institutions and marginalised groups. However, in many of the Member States generic measures and multi-ethnic teams are preferred. In more general terms, it appears to be difficult to establish in some formal way an appropriate balance between "assimilation" and "multiculturalism" (Zolberg & Clarking 2003). An example of this is the Dutch and Rotterdam policy, that have been moving from one extreme to another as it has gone from multiculturalism to a more assimilationist policy.
Although integration and social cohesion certainly demands adaptation of migrants, and for example proficiency in the language of the receiving society, integration is a two-way process. Social cohesion in particular cannot be imposed from above by governments, since it is a process and product of activities of citizens and organisations in the civil society. This demands an open and responsive attitude from governments to facilitate initiatives from below and consult and keep a dialogue with migrants and other citizens and civil society organisations.

6 SITUATION REGARDING THREE THEMES IN NEW MEMBER STATES

6.1 Introduction

The Member States which entered the European Union in May 2004 (also referred to as the "EU-10") were not included in the comparative thematic studies on employment, social protection and social cohesion of the preceding sections. The main reason for this is the lack of information relating to the integration of immigrants in these States. This is because immigrant communities in most of the new Member States are relatively small and only recently established, and so policies relating to these immigrants have hardly developed until now. However, the three challenges described in the three themes are relevant for future developments in the new Member States. In this section, we will outline some general trends in employment, social protection and social cohesion in the new Member States in relation to the integration of immigrants. This will be followed by a discussion of some points of interest in the development and implementation of integration policies in the light of the experiences of the pre-2004 Member States (the "EU-15").

Overview of trends in the new Member States

The 10 Member States which joined the EU in May 2004 are very diverse but share some core characteristics in terms of patterns of migration. In the region of Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), migration systems were radically changed after the fall of the Iron Curtain and the dissolution of the former USSR and the former Yugoslavia. The different migration flows that can be identified now include temporary labour migration towards the West, intra-regional flows of workers, flows of workers from some developing countries, high-skill migration from Western countries, return migration, ethnic migration and short-term movements of 'labour tourism' and petty trading (Giudici & Guarneri 2004).

In short, migration patterns are dominated by short-term, circulatory movements which are often employment-related. With regard to crude migration rates, some of the countries have a rather recent positive net migration (Czech Republic, Slovenia, Hungary and Slovak Republic), others have greater outflow than inflow (Latvia, Lithuania and Poland), while in some countries the net migration is practically zero (Estonia). The two non-CEE new Member States, Malta and Cyprus, have much higher net migration rates, even above the EU average. (Giudici & Guarneri 2004).

Thus, all the new Member States have relatively recently become countries of immigration or transit migration, or are still mainly countries of emigration. Accession to the EU has strongly influenced the developments of migration policies in these countries (e.g. by acceptance of the acquis). However, although there is a general acknowledgement of the need for integration policies, these are still absent or underdeveloped.[36] The few existing policies include measures targeted at refugees and asylum-seekers. These countries also tend to suffer from inadequate data and research on immigration and immigrants.

---

[36] See for example "Active civic participation of immigrants in Europe: Overview" (2005) and the country reports of the EU-25 for the POLITIS project on which this overview is based.

6.2 <u>Employment</u>

Migration to (and from) the Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries is mainly employment-related. Labour migration to the CEE countries varies considerably dependent on the skills and origins of the migrants and the duration of their stay (Salt 2003). Migrants are more likely to work in the private sector and in small firms, often in insecure positions. In some countries, such as Estonia, labour migration is negligible and foreigners, mainly from the West, are employed as professionals. In other countries, such as Poland, while there are substantial migration movements, much of it consists of temporary or transit migration. Here, migrants (with or without legal status of employment) constitute an important element of the workforce. Finally, some CEE countries (Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia) are emerging as immigration countries, where labour migrants form a substantial proportion of the total workforce and/or of the group of long-term residents (Kraler & Iglicka 2002; Salt 2003). There are also substantial informal labour markets in the CEE countries which are attracting immigrants, although it is impossible to estimate the extent of these markets (*Ibid*).

Because migration is generally employment-related, unemployment does not seem to be an important issue, except among certain groups such as refugees and asylum-seekers. However, there are groups of labour-migrants which are vulnerable to exclusion, because of their weak legal position (undocumented migrants or temporary workers) and weak labour market position (dirty, dangerous and insecure jobs, work in the informal economy). Several National Action Plans on social inclusion 2004-2006 identify migrants as a group which is particularly at risk of social exclusion, along with national and ethnic minorities, the elderly and the disabled. But the more general term of "vulnerable groups" is preferred, and the National Action Plans contain little data on the specific position of immigrants (CEC 2005).

Czech Republic
In order to outline some more concrete trends, issues and challenges regarding employment, we will focus on one of the new Member States: the Czech Republic. This is one of those CEE countries which are now becoming countries of immigration rather than emigration. In 2003, the migration flow comprised 60,000 immigrants and 34,200 emigrants (OECD 2005). The main groups of immigrants originate from the Slovak Republic (30%), Ukraine (24%), Vietnam (13%) and the Russian Federation (6%). By the end of 2003, the number of foreigners had reached 237,700, representing 2.3% of the total population. One-third of these were permanent residents, while two-thirds were holders of long-term visas (visas issued for a maximum of 12 months). In 2002, foreigners accounted for 1.9% of the labour force, consisting of three major groups: work-permit holders, Slovak nationals working on the basis of a bilateral agreement, and foreign entrepreneurs (OECD 2005). The majority of the migrants settle in Prague and other major towns (Czech Republic 2004).

Two-thirds of the immigrants are typical economic migrants (Cernik 2005). Many of the immigrant groups have found specific niches on the Czech labour market. (Drbohlav 2003). Ukrainian men work mainly in the construction industry, and Ukrainian women in manufacturing and agriculture. Those Vietnamese who arrived during the former socialist regime mainly work as vendors of cheap clothes, electronics, vegetables etc. The Chinese are active in the same areas, as well as in international trade and as restaurant owners (Cernik 2005; Drbohlav 2004). Migrants from Bulgaria and the former Yugoslavia are often

involved in international trade, while Russians are active in establishing companies (IT, international trade) and investing in hotel facilities (Cernik 2005).

There is a lack of data on the employment and working conditions of migrants in the Czech Republic. Some insight was provided by a qualitative study of 1998, which built on interviews with officers at regional job and trade centres. According to Drbohlav (2004:64), the results of the study are still valid today. It shows that foreigners tend to fill vacancies (skilled and unskilled) for which Czech candidates cannot be found, including those which Czech workers are unwilling to take up. Foreign workers are willing to work harder and longer than average, and under conditions that would "normally" be considered as unacceptable. They are also prone to exploitation by their employers (Drbohlav 2004: 64-68). Illegal foreign workers can be found in sectors such as construction, agriculture and forestry (Salt 2003). The difficult living conditions of temporary workers in the Czech Republic have received some attention in the media (Cernik 2005:18).

In 2003, the Czech Republic introduced a points system whereby migrants are selected according to their skills and qualifications (OECD 2005; Cernik 2005). This pilot project, "Programme of Active Selection of a Qualified Foreign Labour Force", was initially introduced for three selected countries (Bulgaria, Croatia and Kazakhstan), but the range of countries included in the programme has gradually been increased. Candidates may apply either from their home countries or from within the Czech Republic, if they already have legal status of residence - for example, as students enrolled in institutions of higher education. The quota for 2003 was fixed at 300, and for 2004 at 1400. The programme is a recruitment instrument similar to the so-called Quebec System. It supports young, educated and qualified foreign workers by offering them the opportunity of obtaining a permanent residence permit in the Czech Republic much more quickly than through the normal system (after 2½ years of residence instead of 5 years). The pilot project has triggered public debate on whether a decline in population growth can be countered by increased immigration. "One of the most common answers to this question is the complaint that due to the highly discriminatory legal and institutional environment inhibiting migration in the Czech Republic, any plans to offset population decline by attracting new immigrants is wishful thinking" (Cernik 2005: 18).

Integration policies are still in their infancy, although some measures have been taken in support of refugees and asylum seekers (OECD 2004). In 2000, an inter-ministerial committee laid down some principles for developing policy on a number of integration-related issues, including language skills, education and housing (the "Conception of the Integration of Foreigners"). The Minister of the Interior was initially entrusted with coordinating and supervising activities aimed at achieving these aims, but since February 2004 the task has been taken over by the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (MLSA) (Drbohlav et al 2005). However, according to the OECD (2004), apart for refugees and asylum seekers, few concrete steps have been taken so far.

Integration policies have been somewhat more developed for the small number of refugees (1,465 at the end of 2002), who are provided with free language courses, housing assistance, and assistance in finding work (through a special programme run by the Government). Asylum seekers (about 8,500 in 2002) also have access to language courses and some legal and counselling assistance from state-supported NGOs (OECD 2004). Many of these programmes are in fact implemented by NGOs. One of the few programmes targeting groups other than asylum-seekers and refugees, "Job Market and Foreigners",

aims at supporting innovative and active training to enhance the employability of unemployed foreigners with permanent residence status.[37]

In March 2004, amendments to the Labour Code came into force to bring protection into line with the employment requirements of the two EC Directives (CEC 2004). However, there are indications of discrimination against foreigners in the labour market. For example, a (limited) field experiment showed that employers in the Czech Republic tend to discriminate against foreigners in accordance with the supposed reputations of different countries and nationalities (Popov 2004). The discriminations reflect an overall low acceptance of foreigners in the Czech Republic. According to Drbohlav (2004), international comparative studies show that xenophobia is more apparent in the Czech Republic than it is in other Central and East European countries. Negative attitudes and prejudices against old and new ethnic (immigrant) groups are widespread amongst the Czech population. As opinion polls show, most Czechs oppose immigration and models of multiculturalism. (Drbohlav 2005). It is probable that the fact that many foreigners are working in rather segregated niches has a detrimental impact on attitudes towards these groups. Another factor is that issues of criminality and illegality are often associated – by the public and in the media - with international migration (Cernik 2005: 17).

6.3 Social Protection

Given their transition from centrally planned to market-oriented economies and the challenges they face (such as high and increasing unemployment and gradually increasing poverty), the countries of Central and East Europe have been forced to restructure their social protection systems (CEC 2005: 46). In the 2005 joint report on social inclusion, the European Commission remarked that for many of these countries, the National Action Plan on Social Inclusion 2004-2006 was their first attempt at developing a comprehensive strategy for fighting poverty and promoting social inclusion. According to the Commission, this explains the lack of indicators and data (for example, on immigrants). Poverty and exclusion are major problems in the EU-10, though the urgency and severity of the challenges vary significantly. The existence of pockets of persistent and deep-seated poverty is recognized in several National Action Plans on Social Inclusion, especially with regard to disadvantaged groups such as the Roma, people with disabilities, the homeless, and victims of trafficking. The levels of expenditure on social protection as a proportion of the GDP are in general significantly below the EU average, and the delivery systems are still under development. This limited capacity for the provision of key social services aggravates the impact of poverty and social exclusion, although the resources spent on social protection do contribute significantly to the reduction of the risk of poverty (CEC 2005: 5-6).

Because of the underdeveloped social protection system, and because migration is often employment related, immigration is in general not perceived to be a burden to the welfare state. As mentioned above, in the Czech Republic there have in fact been discussions on immigration as a potential remedy to the decline in population (Cernik 2005: 18). Although the populations in most of the new Member States are shrinking, immigration is not commonly related to the issue of the economic sustainability of the welfare state.

---

[37] http://www.cicpraha.org/projekty_en.html

Poland

Poland is still a country of emigration, and yet it has recently experienced several types of immigration, including movement of transit migrants and inflows of asylum seekers (repatriates from the former USSR) and long-term immigrants from both the East and the West. The inflows include everything from illegal entry, temporary stay and arranged marriages through to the setting-up of businesses and permanent settlements (Iglicka 2005). According to the National Census [NC] of 2002, the ethnic and national minorities only represent 3.3% of the total population of Poland. According to the Polish Government (2004), of these groups it is mainly the Roma who are affected by social problems. According to the National Census 2002, there were 34,100 immigrants in Poland, two-thirds of whom had been residing in the country for 12 months or longer (Government of Poland 2004). According to the census data, the total number of foreigners was 49,221; that is, 0.1% of the total population (Korys 2005). However, in recent years the number of immigrants and refugees has been increasing. The Polish Ministry of Economy and Labour estimates that about 100,000-500,000 foreigners are working illegally each year in Poland, most of them from the East (especially the former Soviet Union) (Iglicka 2005).

The most important groups of immigrants residing in Poland are citizens of Ukraine, Belarus and the Russian Federation; migrants from the Asian countries (mainly Vietnam and China); and highly-skilled professionals from Western countries, among whom many are return migrants with dual citizenship or the children of Polish emigrants. The number of asylum seekers applying for refugee status in Poland is also growing; at present the majority are from Chechnya (Korys 2004). The main motivation for immigration seems to be the labour market; this assumption is confirmed by the fact that the majority of immigrants fall within the most economically productive age bracket (Korys 2004: 25-55). The foreigners are concentrated in a few regions, especially in the Warsaw area and the Mazowieckie voivodship, where there are more employment opportunities and a better infrastructure, including migrant networks and better access to institutions such as embassies, international schools and places of worship (Korys 2005).

The growth of immigration has confronted Poland with new challenges. The country has been working on developing immigration policies including the setting up of infrastructures and procedures for asylum-seekers, tightening border controls, curbing the trafficking of human beings, and harmonising its laws with EU regulations. However, in view of the relatively small scale of settlement among migrants, the issue of integration is still treated as one of limited urgency which can be postponed to a later date. "Most migrants treat their stay in Poland as temporary, their main goals being economic (i.e. the immediate gathering of financial resources and their subsequent transfer back to the country of origin); alternatively, Poland is seen as a stepping stone on the way to further migration into Western European countries. Rarely is the country perceived as a final destination, which means that immigrants tend to avoid making 'unnecessary' investments (for example, through the acquisition of language) into their stay in Poland" (Korys 2005: 14).

Poland has the lowest employment rate and the highest unemployment rate of the countries that recently joined the EU (CEC 2005). Compared to the more developed countries of Western Europe, Poland is able to offer only a relatively modest range of benefits and resources to both Polish citizens and resident foreigners. Immigrants are not a category to which particular attention has been paid in Polish social policy, and the National Action Plan

on Social Inclusion 2004 only mentions some specific measures with regard to refugee inclusion (Government of Poland 2004: 35).

Some issues concerning the social protection of foreigners are as follows:

- Housing constitutes a serious problem for migrants. "The Polish welfare state's rarest and most desirable prize is the council-owned flat, something that is difficult even for Poles to obtain; thus, in the great majority of cases, citizens and foreigners alike are forced to compete for housing in the free market."
- The right to health insurance and free medical care is extended to refugees, asylum-seekers, legally employed migrants and migrants who are entitled to register as unemployed and receive welfare benefits.
- Unemployment benefits are set aside for repatriates, refugees, "permanent residents", EU nationals, and foreign relatives of Poles, on condition that they have worked for at least 18 months prior to application at an income level equal to or above the minimum wage, and that they have made the necessary payments to the Labour Fund.
- Welfare benefits are very meagre and only barely sufficient to cover basic needs. They are quite often the only livelihood resources available to refugees, repatriates, or individuals on "tolerated stay" who have not found employment.

(Korys 2005: 160, 64)

Although employment is the main motive for most immigrants' arrival in Poland, legal employment is very hard to find. Not only is the unemployment rate very high, but also "access to the labour market is one of the most highly protected and regulated privileges, and, for most immigrants, an essential means for legalising their residence status and for obtaining assistance from the social services (for education, health insurance, etc.)" (Korys 2005: 160). A foreigner wishing to work in Poland is obliged to obtain a work permit. These are issued for a set period of time, to a particular individual foreigner, for a defined post and type of work. (Korys 2005: 161). A common strategy for overcoming these barriers is circular migration: entering on short-term visas to find temporary employment in the informal economy. This is particularly prevalent among major immigrant groups from neighbouring countries such as Ukraine, Russia and Belarus (Korys 2004: 30).

As the social protection system is underdeveloped and unemployment rates are very high, refugees and migrants without work (permits) are in danger of marginalisation. In addition, the situation for young people (including young migrants) entering the labour market is exceptionally difficult, and often leads them to look for alternative solutions, such as employment in the informal economy or other illegal activities. In this context it should be noted that almost a fifth of the citizens of the Republic of Poland live in very similar conditions of structural unemployment, chronic poverty and related lack of prospects, (Iglicka 2005, Korys 2004).

6.4 Social Cohesion

Immigration has not attracted much attention in either public or political debates in the new Member States. One notable exception is Malta, where the fight against irregular migration is considered a priority issue, not only because of the belief that such migration patterns undermine national stability and pose challenges to the labour market but also because of the increase in illegal migration. In the other new Member State with a significant recent

pattern of immigration, Cyprus, issues of immigration have been overshadowed by the question of the relations between the two constitutionally recognised communities, Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots.

In many of the new Member States from Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), there are other, more urgent problems related to social cohesion and stability, such as the presence of substantial national and ethnic minorities (especial Russian and Roma minorities) and structural unemployment and poverty. Some of these Member States are newly established states in a process of nation-building (the Baltic States, Slovenia, Slovakia and the Czech Republic). The social inclusion and civic participation of immigrants is hardly an issue in these States, because immigration is a relatively recent phenomenon and involves largely temporary and transitory migration.

Slovenia
Slovenia is an example of a CEE country in the process of nation-building which is confronted by various immigration flows. In the period 1997-2001 the net migration flow was positive, except for the year 1998. At the end of 2004, 21 998 foreigners with permanent residence permits and 22 287 immigrants with temporary permits resided in Slovenia. The total population was at the time 1 997 590 inhabitants[38]. The majority of the immigrants are from European countries (around 96%), most of them from the republics of former Yugoslavia (Zavratnic Zimic 2004)

When it formed part of Yugoslavia, Slovenia already experienced immigration of workers from the other former Yugoslav Republics from the 1960s onward, and especially in the second half of the 1970s, because of its favourable economic conditions. Migrants to Slovenia were mostly young people from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia with relatively high educational backgrounds. No integration programmes existed at that time, as social and cultural integration was not an issue in a communist state. At the same time many Slovenians emigrated as "guest workers" to western countries, mainly Germany and Austria.

In the 1990s the situation changed drastically. Slovenia gained independence in 1991. Because of the conflict in former Yugoslavia, Slovenia received a lot of refugees from Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, and from the province of Kosovo. Slovenia faced for the first time questions of forced migration, refugee policy and asylum protection. The social impact of these inflows was tremendous. It triggered public and media reactions on "the refugee crisis" - generally in the "we" and "them" rhetoric, presenting Slovenia as a state of openness and tolerance and "them" (refugees) as endangering the new democracy.

The official reaction was pragmatic and similar to that of other European countries: a policy of group protection of refugees was established, combined with a tendency to emphasise the fact that they would be resident only for a limited period of time. It was not until 1997 that the Law on Temporary Refuge defined the rights and obligations of refugees. However, the restrictions and limited rights linked to their status hindered the integration of temporary refugees into society. For example, they were not permitted to work, and were not entitled to the same rights and welfare provisions as the Slovenians. The idea of the repatriation of refugees was the starting point of the policy, but since 2000, there has been a shift towards integration, supported by NGOs, civil initiatives and experts. The Amendments to the Law on

---

[38] Data from the Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia, http://www.stat.si/

Temporary Refuge (2002) for the first time introduced the possibility of temporary refugees acquiring a permanent residence permit (after 8 years of stay). The law also defined what was meant by assistance in the integration process (language courses and further education and training, mainly implemented by NGOs) (Zavratnik Zimic 2003, Andreev 2005).

In 2000 and the beginning of 2001, Slovenia faced a different type of immigration challenge - namely the arrival of mainly undocumented migrants from non-European countries (from south-east Europe, Africa and Asia) who were attempting to enter the EU and the Schengen Zone through Slovenia. The rise of irregular migration is also a consequence of an increasingly restrictive immigration policy. The numbers of irregular migrants (noted as illegal border crossings) increased from 7 093 in 1997 to 35 892 in 2000. And in the same period, the number of asylum seekers increased from 72 to 9 244 (Zavratnik Zimic 2004). In general, the first reaction of politicians and the media was quite negative. In public discourse, especially in the media, the "otherness" of immigrants was emphasised, and they were pictured as being a "threat to the emerging national identity," not least because of their "high numbers". The reaction of the Slovenian population was initially quite aggressive and xenophobic. But a counter-trend emerged as groups of citizens and NGOs, joined by prominent individuals, made appeals to stop the hostility towards immigrants. Gradually the media also shifted in this direction. This response from the civil society also created a durable network of different NGOs working in the field of migration and human right protection. This so-called "illegal immigration crisis" was also the start of a more general public and political debate around migration policies, triggered also by the approaching accession of Slovenia to the EU and the accompanying obligations. During this period, the legal framework for immigration policy was shaped, heavily influenced by EU criteria in this field (Zavratnik Zimic 2004, Andreev 2005).

The "moral panics" can be interpreted as a stage in the process whereby the Slovenian community have been attempting to create a new national identity while at the same time endeavouring to cope with their history and future (Erjavec 2003).

The legal framework for immigration developed at the beginning of the new century also defines rights, obligations and conditions for integration. However, "integration is an open field in which programmes and initiatives of including immigrants still have to be established" (Zavratnik Zimic 2004: 74). The problem is not so much in the regulations themselves as in their implementation. The field has been mainly left to humanitarian organisations and civic initiatives, and the absence of integration policies has led to the emergence of parallel societies (Zavratnik Zimic 2004). A new topic of public discussion is the status of ethnic minorities from the republics of former Yugoslavia who came to Slovenia as immigrants mainly in the 1970s. The Croatian, Serbian, Bosnian and Macedonian ethnic groups have created some cultural organisations. Until recently they were not very active politically, but there are now first signs of increased civic and political participation. The representatives of these ethnic groups recently issued a common statement, asking the Government to regulate their status constitutionally. In the Slovenian Constitution, there are special rights granted to members of the Italian and Hungarian autochthonous minorities, as well as to the Roma community, although they are not considered to be an indigenous minority. The other minorities are not subject of collective rights.[39]

---

[39] According to the 2002 population census, the country consists of 83% ethnic Slovenians, 0.11% Italians, 0.32% Hungarians, 0.17% Roma people, 1.98% Serbs, 1.81% Croats and other national minorities.

6.5 Relevant experiences from "older" Member States

Employment

Employment is the major motive behind much of the immigration into the new Member States, although there is also a rise in the number of asylum-seekers. Regulation of employment related to immigration is thus one of the key issues at stake in these States. With regard to this issue, there are not so many lessons to be learned from the pre-2004 Member States, for many of them are also making the first moves in developing new frameworks for immigration policies to better meet the requirements of the labour market. However, one clear lesson from the past is that temporary workers often tend to stay on. It is also the case that there is a great risk that disadvantages (those due, for example, to inadequate facilities for integration and learning the language of the society of residence) may persist or be partially passed on to the second generation. For that reason, it is important to demand of migrants with the intention to settle that they learn the language of their host country, and to offer sufficient and affordable language and civics classes. At the same time, a flexible approach is required because of the dominance of short-term circulatory movements and transit migration.

Anti-discrimination measures and policies are another point at issue. Discrimination continues to be an important barrier to the participation of immigrants in the labour market throughout the EU. As the European Commission states (CEC 2005: 7), one of the key challenges faced by the new Member States is to "intensify efforts to overcome the particularly high levels of exclusion and discrimination experienced by some ethnic groups, especially the Roma, and other groups at high risk." In some of the new Member States, immigrants are included in the at-risk groups.

There are also other barriers to labour market participation, such as legal ones. For example, obstacles to the acquisition of work permits drive many migrants in Poland towards the informal economy and illegal activities. A Slovenian policy forbidding refugees from former Yugoslavia from working has resulted in failed labour market integration, with the consequent detrimental impact on their integration in the wider society. A more realistic and pragmatic approach with regard to permission to work would be beneficial both for the integration process and for the economy.

Social protection

The situation with regard to the social protection of immigrants is closely related to the general level and range of social protection rights and provisions in the host society. It is also determined, however, by the support of NGOs and the availability of other "economies of subsistence", such as support from within the ethnic group and the opportunities offered by the informal economy. Because of the wide variety of welfare regimes, both in the EU-15 and EU-10, it is difficult to formulate general recommendations.

However, a general "lesson" from the "older" countries of immigration in Europe is that equal social entitlements and provisions for resident foreigners have proven to be of enormous importance in their social integration and the prevention of marginalisation, as well in the reduction of social tensions. Sections of the immigrant population are among the groups at risk of poverty and social inclusion in the new Member States as well (CEC 2005), and a

general "lesson" from the EU-15 is the importance of awareness of specific problems around access to social and health services because of language and cultural problems. In the absence of adequate facilities, specific services tend to develop, mostly through NGOs. However, this poses the risk of compartmentalisation or even segregation. Mainstreaming can offer a solution, but only if sufficient attention is paid to the specific needs of the diverse groups of clients, including migrants.

Many temporary labour migrants often stay for good (see, for example, the refugees from former Yugoslavia in Slovenia), but many other forms of temporary, seasonal and circular migration and 'labour tourism' can be observed, especially in the new Member States. These pose quite different challenges to social protection systems. There are EU standards which apply to movements between EU Member States, but countries at the periphery of the EU are particularly confronted with temporary forms of migration from the East, outside the EU borders.

A general lesson from western welfare systems is that social protection should not only function as a safety net but should also contribute to the (re-)integration of the unemployed in the labour market. The over-representation of migrants among the recipients of unemployment and welfare benefits in some of the western States has underscored the claim of public opinion that migration is a burden to their welfare systems. It should be borne in mind, however, that the relationship between immigration and welfare systems is completely different in many of the new Member States. Most migrants contribute economically to their host country, and in any case social assistance for the unemployed is generally non-existent or at a very low level. Moreover, activating policies in countries with very high unemployment levels, such as Poland, tend generally to be ineffective. In the absence of decent levels of social assistance, the competition with the native poor for scarce resources concentrates on other sectors of the welfare state, especially public housing (as can be seen in the case of Poland).

Social cohesion

Challenges with regard to social cohesion in the new Member States differ substantially from those in the pre-2004 Member States: there are sizeable national minorities and higher levels of unemployment, poverty and distress. In addition, these States are still involved in the processes of state formation and transformation following the fall of the Iron Curtain and resulting from integration processes within the EU. Immigration and immigrant integration are usually issues of lesser importance, except in situations involving large influxes of immigrants.

The history of immigration in the "older" European countries shows that immigration and integration policies tend to lag behind current developments and are often overtaken by events. To remedy the marginalisation of certain sections of the immigrant population and the development of "separate societies" is more difficult to accomplish than preventing their formation in the first place. It involves formulating and implementing integration policies and legal frameworks which define the rights of foreign residents who are already in the early stages of immigration.

Some other relevant points of note have been compiled by Will Kymlicka (2000) on the basis of a comparison of Estonian and Western policies of integration. Although the recommendations in the Estonian context mainly refer to the integration of the large Russian

minority, they are also relevant (with adaptations) to the formulation of immigrant integration policies. The points he makes are of crucial importance in the creation of mutual trust and understanding as an indispensable pre-condition for integration and inclusion in the new society of settlement.

Kymlicka formulates five "lessons from the West" which are interrelated pre-conditions for the success of integration policies. Firstly, the rules regarding integration ought to be clear: "immigrants need to know what precisely is required of them in order to be able to integrate, and need to know that these rules will not be changed to create new barriers to integrate" (Kymlicka 2000). Secondly, the terms of integration should be "thin". In accordance with the liberal-democratic foundations of European society, integration can be demanded of immigrants primarily as a matter of linguistic and institutional integration and the sharing of basic political principles. Thirdly, strong protection against discrimination is crucial, to assure immigrants that their efforts to integrate will not be frustrated by exclusion from the host society. Fourthly, if the state expects immigrants to learn the state language and to acquire civic education, state support for the necessary facilities is also required. For example, the state should guarantee that adequate language and citizenship classes are not only provided but also affordable. Finally, the minorities should themselves play a part in the formulation and administration of the integration policy, in order to overcome suspicion and to promote their active participation.

7 IMMIGRATION, INTEGRATION AND SOCIAL COHESION AT EU LEVEL

7.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to explore, analyse and evaluate current European Union (EU) policies in the areas of employment, social cohesion and social protection insofar as they relate to the integration of immigrants.

These are not straightforward issues because of the diversity of migration flows, differing immigration histories and varying national approaches to the integration of immigrant populations in the 25 EU member states. It is also worth noting from the outset that all EU member states are some combination of sending, receiving and transit countries of migration so these are clearly issues that affect all member states and that will be high on the EU agenda in the coming years. There are clear links between immigration policies and integration policies. Immigration will be an important component of population change in EU member states. This is why member states and EU institutions need to consider their immigrant integration policies.

The discussion of immigrant integration and social cohesion is linked to the development of new forms of governance (CEC, 2001a). At EU level these are particularly associated with the 'post-modern' form of state organisation where power is shared between sub-national, national and supranational actors in a system without a centre, in the sense of a clearly defined central source of power (Caporaso, 1996). Rather the EU is a multi-level system within which power is shared and where new types of policy instrument such as the Open Method of Co-ordination (OMC) have been developed. This challenges traditional understandings of immigrant integration that tend to postulate a relationship between individuals and/or groups of migrants and the national state. The development of EU measures in the area of immigrant integration and social inclusion requires that some kind of new balance be struck between individuals and/or groups of migrants and the authorities responsible for their 'integration' (however this is defined). The responsible authorities may be local, regional, national or supranational (or a combination of these). They are also likely to include agencies responsible for delivering government services and market organisations. At a basic level, therefore, it is necessary to consider both the diversity of responses to immigrant integration that are evident in the 25 member states while also considering the ways in which new forms of governance and the development of new EU instruments such as the OMC mean that traditional understandings of immigrant integration are challenged. Of particular relevance here are 'soft law' mechanisms such as indicators, benchmarking and the sharing of best practice (as will be discussed more fully when the EU handbook on immigrant integration is considered). As Scharpf (2001) has noted 'By requiring national governments to focus on a common problem, and to consider their own policy choices in relation to this problem and in a comparative perspective and, even more important, by exposing their performance to peer review and public scrutiny, open co-ordination should not only provide favourable conditions for 'learning through monitoring' but it may even provide mechanisms for shaming governments out of 'beggar thy neighbour' practices'.

Emerging elements of a common EU approach can be identified. These draw from EU action in the areas of economic policy, social inclusion, and from the creation of an area of 'freedom, security and justice'. In order to analyse these developments the next section (2) provides a brief introduction to the key issues. A central issue is obviously the meaning of 'integration'. If the EU is to develop a common approach then we have to consider the underlying conceptualisation of integration in EU measures and its relation to the kinds of policies pursued in EU member states. The second is the ways in which we can understand the impacts of European integration on immigrant integration. This is not to suggest that there is some ideal approach that can be adopted or that one Member State's policies are superior to others. Drawing from the academic literature on Europeanisation, a distinction is made between 'direct', 'indirect' and 'framing' effects. The third issue is the crucial relationship between migration, labour markets and welfare states. There are many different types of migration, of labour markets and of welfare arrangements across the EU. It is important to understand the debate about migration and immigrant integration as nested within a broader discussion about the future shape of the European economy and the welfare systems of the Member States. These play an important part in any discussion of lesson-drawing and the dissemination of good practice.

On the basis of the analysis in Section 2 we have a sounder basis to proceed to Section 3 analyses, which explores the existing legal framework and its implementation. This means looking at the content and implementation of EU measures such as the anti-discrimination, long-term residence and family reunification directives. Section 4 analyses existing initiatives such as the EQUAL programme, and outlines co-ordination mechanisms that have developed in the areas of employment, social protection and social inclusion. Section 5 is a concluding section that brings together the key themes and provides targeted recommendations.

7.2 <u>Key concepts</u>

It would, of course, be very difficult to explore EU approaches to the integration of migrants and their impact on member states without considering (i) the underlying meaning of 'integration' in EU action (ii) the ways in which EU effects could be understood and (iii) the relationship between migration, labour markets and welfare states in the EU of 25.

(i) There are diverse patterns of migration to Europe and highly diverse national responses. There is also a complex debate about integration that tends to centre on different national approaches, or as Favell (2001) puts it, different 'public philosophies' of integration. Recent work on immigrant integration has also identified a 'return to assimilation' with the argument that there is less influence in public policy on multiculturalism and more emphasis on adaptation by immigrant newcomers (see, for example, Brubaker, 2001; Joppke and Morawska, 2003). While this distinction between 'multiculturalism' and 'assimilation' is over-stylised in the sense that it neglects continued competition between these ideas in national and EU-wide policies and practices, there is an increased and observable emphasis on 'making migrants similar' in terms of their participation in key economic and social institutions in the society to which they move, as will become clear as we explore EU actions throughout the rest of this chapter. This is an important element of national responses with a clear echo in EU measures. In order to understand the scope, extent, form and content of EU action (as well as to better prepare ourselves to understand it effects) we also need to examine the underlying concept of integration in EU action. Groenendijk (2004) distinguishes between three elements of integration policies.

- Equal treatment and non-discrimination
- Citizenship and nationality
- Linkages between admission policies and integration policies

Groenendijk argues that it is the first of these – equal treatment and non-discrimination – that has been most evident in EU action grounded in provisions of the Treaty of Rome that prohibited discrimination on the grounds of nationality and gender as well as the 1976 Equal Treatment directive.[40] We could also say that this understanding of integration is very closely linked to the core economic purposes of the EU and allows us to see very clearly the link between integration policies as pursued at EU level and the sources of legal, political and social power created by the Treaty framework. This argument could then be extended to link the debate about the integration of immigrants to the 'Lisbon process' of economic reform and the quest for sustainable social development (European Council, 2000; CEC, 2005). The second element – citizenship and nationality – remains largely a matter for the Member States. The third element – linkage between admission and perceived integration capacities of new migrants – is identified as an important recent element of national approaches in Austria, Germany and the Netherlands and may be a development with EU-wide implications.

(ii) If the underlying conceptualisation of immigrant integration in EU action can be linked to economic integration and the principles of equal treatment and non-discrimination, then we also need to think about how these effects can be seen in EU member states. A useful distinction can be made between direct, indirect and framing effects (adapted from Knill and Lehmkuhl, 1999):

- *Direct effects* are where EU legislation creates obligations for member states. The emphasis here is on the implementation of agreed measures such as the anti-discrimination directives[41], the family reunion directive[42] and the directive on the rights of long-term residents[43].
- *Indirect effects* are where EU action can change structures of social and political opportunity in member states. An example of this could be the EQUAL programme which, as will be seen, is a highly innovative scheme offering funding for projects designed to tackle discrimination in the labour market.[44]
- *Framing effects* are where EU action can help shift thinking about immigrant integration. This could arise as a consequence of developing habits of consultation and co-operation such as the application of the Open Method of Co-ordination. It could be reinforced by standards-setting, targeting and benchmarking. It could also be influenced by new thinking on immigrant integration, such as the discussion of 'civic citizenship' in the Commission communication on immigration policy and subsequent documents (CEC, 2001b).

---

[40] Directive 76/207/EEC on equal treatment for men and women as regards access to employment, vocational training and promotion and working conditions.

[41] Racial Equality Directive 2000/43/EC, June 200; Employment Equality Directive 2000/78/EC, November 2000. These directives are supported by an action programme (Council Decision 2000/750/EC which promotes practical measures to combat discrimination prohibited by the directives. This can mean making people aware of their rights and obligations and trying to change attitudes.

[42] Family Reunification Directive 2003/86/EC, March 2003.

[43] Directive on the Rights of Long-Term Residents 2003/109/EC, November 2003.

[44] Commission Decision C/2000/1221 of 12.05.2000 establishing an indicative distribution by Member State of the commitment appropriations under the Community initiative EQUAL for 2000-2006.

These three categories are not mutually exclusive. They can and do co-exist and reinforce each other. For example, direct effects of integration may lead to changes in structures of opportunity (indirect effects). Framing effects may create common perceptions of issues and facilitate future development of a common legislative response (direct effects)

(iii) The relationship between migration, immigrant integration, labour markets and welfare states is crucial. Indeed, debates about migration and immigrant integration are nested within broader debates about European labour markets and welfare state arrangements (Kok, 2004). An additional factor that can also be considered is the 'incompleteness' of European integration. Economic and political integration is well-advanced in areas such as free movement for EU citizens, but welfare states retain a strong national organisational basis while labour markets can be highly diverse.[45] If we are to extract a key point from this with relevance to the discussion of immigrant integration policies at EU level then it is that there are a wide variety of institutions and actors (for example, employers, welfare state institutions, local community organisations, migrant organisations) that mediate the relationship between migrant newcomers and host societies. The traditional reference point in integration debates tends to be the relationship between the newcomer and the state to which they move. In a multi-level EU operating within the international economy, the extent to which this frame captures the complexity of migration to Europe can be questioned.

7.3 <u>Existing frameworks and implementation</u>

As already noted, EU action in the area of immigrant integration is linked to the creation of an area of freedom, security and justice and to core economic objectives and to the principles of equal treatment and non-discrimination. Each of these links can be considered in turn.

Title IV of the Amsterdam Treaty (1997) conferred new powers on the Community with regards to migration, asylum, visas and free movement. The Tampere Declaration of the EU heads of government in October 1999 established the political parameters of a common approach to migration and asylum. One of the four Tampere objectives was the fair treatment of third country nationals.

> The EU must ensure fair treatment of third-country nationals who reside legally on the territory of its member states. A more vigorous integration policy should aim a granting these individuals rights and obligations comparable to those of EU citizens. It should also enhance non-discrimination in economic, social and cultural life and develop measures against racism and xenophobia (European Council, 1999).

In 2001, the Commission proposed the application of the OMC in the area of immigration based on multi-annual programmes with long-, medium- and short-term objectives (CEC, 2001c). This would include developing a coherent and transparent policy and procedures for opening EU labour markets to third country nationals in a way that was commensurate with EU employment objectives accompanied by the development of integration policies for third country nationals (Caviedes, 2004).

---

[45] Research for the European Commission has shown how the ICT, construction and health care sectors all display rather distinct patterns of recruitment and migration. The sectoral dimension is central to any discussion of labour migration.

Linkages between economic integration and non-discrimination were very evident in the debate prior to the insertion on Article 13 covering anti-discrimination in the Treaty of Amsterdam and the subsequent agreements in the Council in June 2000 on the Racial Equality Directive and in November 2000 on the 2000 Employment Equality Directive.

This mix of intergovernmental impetus combined with ideas about equal treatment and anti-discrimination that had been incubated at EU level during the 1990s was to come together in a series of developments with important implications for the current EU framework concerning immigrant integration. Key measures so far are:

- The Anti-discrimination Directives of June and November 2000
- The Family Reunification Directive of March 2003
- The Directive on the Rights of Long-Term Residents of November 2003

Following the distinction between direct, indirect and framing effects of European integration, these measures can be labelled as direct effects although they may well also have indirect and framing effects because of their broader impact. Indeed, some indirect and framing effects can be seen in attempts to flesh out the meaning of immigrant integration and the scope for EU action. The June 2003 Thessaloniki summit emphasised co-operation and information exchange (European Council, 2003). At the same time, the European Commission DGs dealing with Freedom, Security and Justice and Employment and Social Affairs presented a joint Communication on Immigration, Integration and Employment (CEC, 2003) calling for a pro-active immigration policy and an holistic integration policy that would comprise the following elements:

- Integration would be understood as a two way process involving adaptation by migrants and the host society
- A holistic approach to integration should be adopted that takes into account a range of factors that can affect integration such as employment, education, housing and anti-discrimination
- Policy needs to be coherent and fit with other EU objectives in areas of social and economic integration
- Integration policy for migrants should accord with the general principle that rights and obligations accrue over time. The key cut-off date here is after 5-years legal residence when long-term residents acquire legal and social rights akin to those of EU citizens which entitles them to move freely within the EU.[46]

In June 2003 the Revised Employment Guidelines called for better integration of migrants and reducing the unemployment gap between nationals and non-EU nationals. A European Job Mobility Portal was launched to provide information on jobs and living conditions.[47] In its first Annual Report on Migration and Integration (CEC, 2004a) the Commission surveyed the migration and immigrant integration picture across the EU and called for:

> The development of comprehensive integration policies requires effectively mainstreaming immigration concerns in all relevant policy fields as well as action to combat discrimination while at the same time developing specific measures and instruments to tackle the needs of immigrants.

The Hague Programme sketching priorities within the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice for the period 2005-2010 called for greater co-ordination of national integration policies

---

[46] Article 5 of the Directive specifies that migrants need to accord with any required integration tests that are required by the member state in which they reside. Article 15 allows these tests to also apply to those long-term residents that exercise the right of free movement following five year's legal residence. This is seen as a potential impediment to EU free movement objectives (Carrera, 2005)

[47] http://europa.eu.int/eures

(European Council, 2004). The JHA Council meeting of November 19 2004 agreed a common set of principles that would underly a common approach to integration.

- Integration was understood as a two-way process
- Adherence to basic values by migrant newcomers was emphasised
- Employment was seen as a key to the process of integration
- The need to learn language and understand the history and institutions of the country to which migrants move was stressed
- Educational attainment was identified as a key element of integration
- Access to institutions and services for migrants need to be guaranteed
- Interaction between immigrants and the Member State citizens should be promoted
- There would need to be respect for diverse cultures and religions
- Migrants should be encouraged to participate in the political process
- Immigrant integration issues should be mainstreamed in all relevant portfolios
- Targets and indicators to assess the effectiveness of policies should be introduced.

Closely linked to the discussion of the direct effects of EU action in the area of immigrant integration is the question of implementation. An attempt to monitor and map the effects of EU action and to identify deficits was conducted in 2004 by the European Civic Citizenship and Inclusion Index (ECCII, 2005).[48] The ECCII was a systematic attempt to examine how favourable Member States' policies were towards immigrant inclusion. The ECCII was an attempt to measure policies in 15 EU Member States not outcomes. The index analysed five strands:

- Labour market inclusion;
- Rights of residence;
- Family reunion;
- Naturalisation;
- Anti-discrimination (ECCII, 2005: 15-16).

Each strand was then divided into four dimensions:

- *Eligibility* requirements necessary for the status, *scope* of anti-discrimination legislation, ease of *access* to the labour market;
- *Conditions* needed by immigrants to fulfil access to the status, *remedies* available in case of discrimination, *security* of employment;
- *Security* of status, strength of *equality agencies*, *labour market integration measures* to access inclusion;
- *Rights* associated with status, *pro-active* policies in place to combat discrimination (ECCII, 2005: 16-17).

Key findings were that:

- Implementation deficits were found to exist in many member states;
- Member States tended to score consistently high or consistently low (Spain and Belgium were consistently high, Austria and Greece were consistently low);
- There were not significant differences between countries with longer (such as France, Germany and the UK) and those with comparatively shorter immigration histories (such as Spain, Finland and Ireland);
- Analysis suggested that EU Member States confer relatively generous rights on a status (long term residence) but that the status is rather difficult to acquire. The exception to this is anti-discrimination where the scope of legislation is broad, but the record of implementation is weaker.

---

[48] This research was co-ordinated by Andrew Geddes and Jan Niessen with the support of the British Council in Brussels, the Foreign Policy Centre (London) and the Migration Policy Group , Brussels).

The ECCII was an attempt to look systematically at experiences across the EU-15 prior to the May 2004 accession with the aim of repeating the exercise in the future. The ECCII provides a picture of the direct effects of European integration, as well as highlighting some gaps and deficits, which will be further discussed in the sections that follow.

7.4 EU initiatives and co-ordination mechanisms

The attention in this section turns to more indirect effects of EU actions in the area of immigrant integration. This includes measures pursuant to the European Employment and Social Inclusion/Protection Strategies as well as schemes such as EQUAL that aim to tackle discrimination in the labour market. The effects here can be indirect in the sense that they are not directly and exclusively related to immigrant integration (employment and social policy) or because they alter the structure of political opportunities by providing new funding possibilities.

EQUAL operates within the 'four pillars' of the European Employment Strategy: employability, entrepreneurship, adaptability and equal opportunities and Article 13 of the Amsterdam Treaty, which provides a legal basis for combating discrimination based on gender, race, ethnic origin, religious or other beliefs, disability, age or sexual orientation. The four pillars provide a framework for 8 themes with a ninth related to the integration of asylum-seekers. The themes are
Employability
- Facilitating access and return to the labour market
- Combating racism and xenophobia
Entrepreneurship
- Opening up the business creation process
- Strengthening the social economy (the third sector)
Adaptability
- Promoting lifelong learning and inclusive work practices
- Supporting the adaptability of firms and employees to structural economic change and the use of information technology and other new technologies
Equal Opportunities for Women and Men
- Reconciling family and professional life, as well as the reintegration of men and women who have left the labour market, by developing more flexible and effective forms of work organisation and support services
- Reducing gender gaps and supporting job de-segregation
Asylum Seekers
- Helping the integration of asylum seekers (in relation to the world of work)
In addition to this thematic approach EQUAL is based on the principles of partnership, transnational co-operation, innovation, empowerment and mainstreaming.

EQUAL provides a good example of the way in EU action can have both direct and indirect effects on immigrant integration. It has priorities that specifically target migrants and minorities, but others that are more broadly focused but that will include migrants. EQUAL also re-structures political opportunities by providing new funding sources. The issue that is raised and that is explored in the remainder of this section is how these objectives correspond to other EU action in the areas of social and employment policy and how the issue of immigrant integration in relation to these actions can be understood.

<u>Co-ordination mechanisms</u>

When we explore EU employment and social inclusion we see the ways in which debates about the impact of globalisation and demographic change have impacted upon discussions of the future organisation of work and welfare. Migration and immigrant integration are, of course, part of this debate. The debate about economic migration has been substantially impelled by concerns about the effects of population change on the labour markets of Member States. The Commissions' Green Paper on Economic Migration (CEC, 2004b) referred to the conclusions of the Thessaloniki European Council which emphasised 'the need to explore legal means for third country nationals to migrate to the Union, taking into account the reception capacities of the Member States'. In the Green Paper the Commission makes specific reference to 'the impact of demographic decline' and 'the fulfilment of the Lisbon objectives'. The Hague European Council meeting called for 'a policy plan on legal migration including admission procedures capable of responding promptly to fluctuating demands for migrant labour in the labour market'. The Green Paper also emphasised the need for measures on economic migration to be accompanied by effective integration policies.

There are important links between immigrant admission policies and integration. A state may pursue migration by the highly skilled – as many EU Member States have tried to do (MacLaughlan and Salt, 2002) – but there may still be a need for migrant workers in lower skilled occupations. The migration history of European countries in relation to guestworker and post-colonial migration flows also suggests that migration streams initially envisaged as temporary tended to lead to permanent settlement. In terms of the framework established in Section 2 of this paper, EU action in linked policy areas such as employment and social inclusion can have important although more indirect implications for migration and immigrant integration. A key issue is how concerns about immigrant integration can be effectively mainstreamed. Can this occur, for example, through the development of the Open Method of Co-ordination applied to social inclusion and employment or is there need for a separate OMC applied to immigrant integration?[49]

In the field of employment the 1997 Luxemburg Jobs Summit launched the idea of an EES with three objectives:
- Achieving full employment;
- Increasing productivity and quality at work;
- Promoting cohesion.

The European Council meeting in Lisbon (2000) and Thessaloniki (2003) set employment targets:

---

[49] The OMC is a voluntary process to which all EU member states committed themselves in pursuit of the Lisbon strategy objectives. There are five elements:

Agreeing <u>common objectives</u> for the Union

Establishing <u>common indicators</u> as a means of comparing best practice and measuring progress

Translating the EU objectives into national/regional policies through the development of two yearly <u>National Action Plans</u> for social inclusion

Publishing <u>reports</u> analysing and assessing the National Action Plans

Establishing a <u>Community Action Programme</u> to promote policy cooperation and transnational exchange of learning and good practice

- an overall employment rate of 70% in 2010 (67% in 2005);
- a female employment rate of 60% in 2010 (57% in 2005);
- an older workers (55+) employment rate of 50% in 2010.

By 2003 it was clear that the EU was not meeting its targets. A High Level task force was established led by former Dutch Prime Minister Wim Kok to examine the issues. The Kok report highlighted the need for more flexible labour markets but with security for workers (so called 'flexicurity') so that contracts and types of employment could be more attuned to labour market needs while guarding against the creation of a 'two tier' workforce within which 'insiders' benefit from high levels of employment protection while 'outsiders' experience lower protection. A contentious issue has been agency work. In March 2002 the Commission proposed an Agency Workers Directive that would give agency workers the same pay and benefits as full-time workers after six weeks employment. The UK, Poland and Germany blocked this proposal because they said that it would lead to less rather than more labour market flexibility.

In the area of social inclusion, the 2004 Joint Report by the Commission and Council (CEC/Council, 2004) identified the following priorities:
- Increasing labour market participation
- Modernising social protection systems
- Tackling disadvantages in education and training
- Eliminating child poverty
- Ensuring decent accommodation
- Improving access to quality services
- Overcoming discrimination and increasing the integration of people with disabilities, ethnic minorities and immigrants

For the Member States the pursuit of these objectives means the creation of stronger links with economic and employment policy, the strengthening of implementation capacity, a focus on key issues and the setting of targets to monitor and evaluate policy (pp.7-8). For the Commission and Council the objectives mean the mainstreaming of social inclusion across all EU policies; making greater use of the OMC to facilitate delivery, using the structural funds to promote social inclusion and further developing indicators and other sources of data that can be used for policy evaluation (pp.8-9). There is a particular emphasis on delivery, targets, benchmarking and indicators. Social inclusion is understood as:

> a process which ensures that those at risk of poverty and social exclusion gain the opportunities and resources necessary to participate fully in economic, social and cultural life and to enjoy a standard of living and well-being that is considered normal in the society in which they live. It ensures that they have greater participation in decision-making which affects their lives and access to their fundamental rights (p.8).

The Joint Report surveyed the second round of National Action Plans against poverty and social exclusion. It noted too the 'special difficulties facing immigrants as regards their social inclusion' as a specific issue highlighted for the second round of NAPs. The Joint Report also discusses the ways in which Lisbon demonstrates that economic, employment and social policies are closely linked and mutually reinforcing (p.3).

The Joint Report is critical of Member States' actions regarding immigrant integration. The diverse position of migrants and Roma is recognised on p.31, as too are the notions of multiple risks and the accumulation of problems. In its evaluation of the NAPs the Commission appears to be critical of Member States' action regarding immigrant integration. The 2001 round of NAPs were seen to demonstrate the need to consider the position of

immigrants. The second round showed immigrants still to be at risk of social exclusion. Member States are, however, criticised for presenting the issues in general terms with little attempt to systematically analyse situations and factors regarding particular groups (p.92). The issue of discrimination is only covered in the NAPs submitted by the United Kingdom, Sweden, Finland, Belgium, Ireland and France. There is criticism too for Member States that emphasise adaptation by newcomers such as language training without compensating measures to tackle discrimination.

Another key issue picked up by the Joint Report's evaluation of NAPs is the lack of comparable data and common indicators (the UK, Netherlands, Belgium, Spain and France all list indicators with the UK particularly praised for the work done by the Cabinet Office on the labour market position of ethnic minorities (Cabinet Office, 2003). There are, however, very few specific targets and objectives.

> The lack of detailed data and indicators, let alone common indicators, hinders any thorough analysis of the situation facing these vulnerable groups. Envisaged and adopted measures need to be closely monitored and assessed to gauge their impact.

The number of migrants living in the EU is not known with precision because national data can employ different definitions of the referent group. Munz, (2004) used various data sources to demonstrate some of the issues that can arise. In particular, the kinds of distinctions that emerge when the unit of analysis shifts from foreign resident to foreign born (bearing in mind that the EU tends to focus on third country nationals, i.e. foreign residents). Munz points out that the definition 'foreign born' tends to give a more accurate picture of immigration and to present a slightly rosier picture in terms of social inclusion.

If indicators are to develop as a useful tool for of policy evaluation in the area of immigrant integration then some basic issues need to be addressed:

- What is the target group for EU indicators? A variety of referent groups exist across the EU based on data that might refer to country of citizenship, country of birth, date of entry, ethnicity, or a proxy of ethnicity. If EU policies are to be assessed then there would need to be a common data set based on common definitions available at EU level. If the target group is the immigrant population then the relevant issue is whether an individual is foreign born. In order to identify inter-generational issues, data could also be gathered for those who parents were foreign born. These could constitute a first level of EU-wide indicators. Given national diversity they could be supplemented by second and third levels that might be operationalised at national and sub-national levels.

- What would EU-wide indicators measure? Indicators need to explore the conditions of migrants across a range of social issues such as educations, skills and housing. The NAPs on social inclusion show a variety of measures that have been used. These include income poverty, access to the labour market, education and skills, decent housing, health, civic participation. It is also likely that there are various dimensions of these issues at EU, national and sub-national level and that indicators need to be designed to reflect this.

- How can the temporal dimension be taken into account in EU indicators? The rights of migrants tend to accrue over time. The problems encountered by new arrivals can be rather different from those of longer-term settled migrants. Newer migrants may be likely to have levels of employment that exceed the native population but may find it

difficult to participate in the society to which they move because of language barriers and discrimination. Longer-term migrants may be a more diverse stream composed of older and younger migrants, with lower levels of labour market participation and more engagement with welfare institutions. To target these population groups requires more information on country of birth, year of entry and the country of birth of parents in order to analyse issues for the second generation.

- What kinds of EU indicators could be used? Indicators that assess policies (such as the ECCII) are very different from those that asses outcomes. It is difficult to establish links between policies and outcomes and would require multivariate analysis that taken into account a wide range of factors that go far beyond migrant status. For example, there could be a town or city with a large immigrant population that experiences high levels of social exclusion. This could point to cumulative disadvantage that requires policy interventions. There may, however, be a neighbouring community of Member State citizens experiencing the same disadvantages. The likely driver here is not immigration, but may well link to a wider variety of factors linked to economic and social change. Interventions targeted at only one group may fuel resentment amongst others.

The question that can be raised regarding immigrant integration is how this issue (the 7th of the social inclusion priorities in the Joint Report) can itself be mainstreamed? Is immigrant integration best pursued through EU action in related areas of employment and social policy or are there dimensions to the issues associated with immigrant integration that could benefit from a separate OMC process? The creation of the National Contact Points on Integration (NCPI) in 2003 has demonstrated both commonalities and specificities in the debate about social inclusion as applied to immigrants. Key issues raised in the NCPI discussions were: access to employment with issues such as recognition of qualifications' language skills; educational attainment; civic educations for new immigrants; participation in society and politics; the risk of poverty and social exclusion; housing; discrimination and racism. The Handbook on Integration for Policy-makers and Practitioners was then produced in 2004 as a 'tool for the exchange of information and best practice' (NCPI, 2004: 6). The report is organised into 3 main sections looking at:
- Introduction programmes for immigrants and refugees within which language training is crucial
- Civic participation
- The development and use of indicators

The Handbook recommends the closer co-ordination of the immigrant integration related issues that now appear in the European Employment Strategy, the Social Inclusion Process and the Enterprise Scoreboard.

7.5 **Conclusions and recommendations**

This chapter has surveyed EU action in the area of immigrant integration. It explored the concept of integration evident in EU actions and noted a tendency to link immigrant integration to existing EU legal, social and political resources related to economic integration, equal treatment and anti-discrimination (Groenendijk, 2004). This has been given renewed impetus by discussion of economic reform, social sustainability and the effects of population change on EU member states. It is generally recognised that immigration will play an important part in population growth in EU Member States. As the Commission's Green Paper on economic migration notes, there is a strong and necessary link between admissions

policies for economic migrants and integration. The Commission advocates a rights-based approach to economic migration, which means that 'third country workers should enjoy the same treatment as EU citizens in particular with regard to certain basic economic and social rights before they obtain long-term resident status' (CEC, 2004b: 10).

The chapter then moved on to examine the scope for EU action to affect Member States. It was argued that these effects could be:
1. *Direct* as a result of legislation
2. *Indirect* as a result of changes in political opportunities arising from EU co-ordination in linked areas such as employment and social inclusion
3. *Framing effects* as a result of the impact on perceptions of the key issues arising from co-ordination and exchange between Member States.

These three categories are not mutually exclusive and can actually be reinforcing. It is likely that legislation such as that relating to anti-discrimination, family reunion and the rights of long-term residents will create new legal and political opportunities and thus can have both indirect and framing effects. In turn, indirect and framing effects could feed demand for new legislation to address, for example, problems gaps or inadequacies in the legal framework identified as a result of increased co-ordination.

The chapter then analysed the existing legal framework and its implementation (section 3), initiatives such as the EQUAL programme and co-ordination mechanisms (section 4). It was shown that the debate about immigrant integration is linked to economic reform, social sustainability and the creation of an area of freedom, security and justice. The key elements of an EU strategy regarding immigrant integration were identified by the Council of Ministers in November 2004. Some of these issues have also been considered in other policy areas such as employment and social inclusion, to which the OMC applies. The OMC is based on agreement on common objectives, common indicators, National Action Plans, regular reports and a Community Action Programme to promote policy cooperation and transnational exchange of learning and good practice. There are some dangers in attempts to learn lessons from practices in other countries because ideas that work well in one setting may not work quite so well in others. As Papademetriou and O'Neill (2004: 4) note: '"best practices" applied clumsily in different economic, social and historical settings may very well result in worst outcomes. In particular a country's labour market and social welfare policies strongly influence the labour market experience of immigrants and thus the outcome of immigration policies'. Migration is clearly linked to broader economic and social issues. However, the 2005 Joint Report by the Council and the Commission on Social Inclusion was critical of Member State actions with regards to immigrant integration because of, for example, the absence of comparable data and of effective procedures to monitor and target the implementation of measures. This suggests that closer attention needs to be paid to immigrant integration.

1. The situation of immigrants can appear an add-on to broader employment and social inclusion objectives. Moreover there may be distinctions between the position of migrants and other socially excluded groups. There is a case that the application of the OMC to immigrant integration could make a positive contribution to EU action.

2. Migration will make an important contribution to population growth in the EU. In such circumstances, the reception conditions for new migrants are very important. There is a strong case for a rights-based approach that seeks to put in place a horizontal rights-based

approach to migrants before they become long-term residents dealing with basic economic and social rights and laying down the foundations for future integration.

3. Language and education have become key components of integration policies in Member States as they are closely linked to the labour market. The EU could play a key role in the dissemination of good practice regarding such schemes.

4. Skills training and the recognition of qualifications are substantial impediments to labour market access. EU action could reduce some of these barriers.

5. There is an increased emphasis in Member States' policies on adaptation by newcomers such as through courses for new immigrants. There is, however, a need for such courses to be accompanied by vigorous action to target unfair discrimination against immigrants. There is evidence of implementation gaps (ECCII, 2005). The legal framework is in place and should be fully implemented.

6. Indicators can provide an important tool for the evaluation of policy. The Joint Report on Social Inclusion highlighted the difficulties that arise when the referent group for Member States' policies (and subsequent data sets) can differ very markedly. There is a need for robust indicators formulated in a way that addresses EU-wide issues as well as accounting for those issues that are more particular to member states. It is also important that a common definition of the referent groups for EU wide data be established. Thus, it could be argued that there is a need to gather information on country of birth, year of entry and parents' country of birth in relevant survey instruments such as the European Labour Force Survey. This could be the basis for EU-wide indicators related to labour market access, rights of residence and anti-discrimination supplemented by indicators designed to assess national and sub-national issues in Member States.

8 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

8.1 A holistic approach to integration

The main objective of this project has been to study ways in which several EU Member States have been handling the integration of immigrants and their descendants. In particular, we have studied the impact of immigrant integration on employment, on social protection and on social cohesion in the Member States. Our first step was to analyse the course of integration processes in three different domains: the legal and political domain, the social and economic domain and, thirdly, the social and cultural domain. Here we found similarities between the Member States, but also significant differences. Such differences depend, among other things, on the Member States' length of experience with large-scale immigration and on the characteristics of their immigrants. Characteristics of the Member States themselves, such as the shape of their economy, rules and regulations and their integration policies proved to be equally significant.

This led us to the conclusion that immigrant integration can only be understood from a holistic perspective. Segmented views lead to partial analyses and, therefore, to partial solutions. The concept of social cohesion has proved to be a useful instrument in our approach. Social cohesion refers to the way in which various parts of society, whether communities, age groups, income groups or regions, relate to one another. The more social cohesion there is, the more likely a society is to be stable and to remain stable. In our liberal democracies this is a precondition for growth, social order and solidarity. Social cohesion implies that no communities or groups are excluded from participating fully in a society. This makes it understandable why social cohesion has become a key notion in immigrant integration. In all Member States immigrants and their descendants – sometimes referred to as 'ethnic minorities' – appear to have become a barometer for the success or failure of social cohesion.

Obviously, the way in which Member States pursue social cohesion differs in accordance with particular characteristics. Substantial differences have emerged from the many comparisons between Member States that we have made in this study, and we will try to find explanations for these. In spite of such differences it is obvious that throughout the EU, social cohesion gets shape in two areas in particular. These are employment and social protection. Employment is highly significant, because having a job not only provides people of immigrant descent with opportunities for inclusion and for social recognition, but it also enables them to generate their own income. This reduces dependency on others; independence leads to more equality. However, a good system of social protection for those who are unable to look after themselves is equally seen as an expression of social cohesion. Solidarity with the less privileged is also a basis for greater equality. Yet, solidarity also has certain limits. It is impossible to show the same degree of solidarity with anyone in the world. This becomes particularly relevant in the case of immigration, as decisions have to be made on the degree of solidarity with people who have not always been members of a society. There is a tension between the openness of an immigration society and the closed character of the welfare state.

In each of the three fields studied – social cohesion, employment and social protection - public authorities are key players. In this chapter we will try to draw some conclusions on

how they fulfil their roles, on similarities and differences that can be found between Member States and on possible explanations for these. We will also attempt to indicate certain areas where in future the EU may play a stimulating or a co-ordinating role.

8.2 <u>Employment</u>

For this study we have chosen to compare three Member States: Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom. Sweden and the UK have a much longer immigration tradition than Spain has. The employment situation for immigrants and their descendants in the former two countries is significantly below the national average. In Spain the opposite is the case. Spain has a relatively large number of undocumented migrant workers who are not included in the statistics and who act as a buffer in the labour market. In Sweden and the UK most people of a migrant background have the same rights and entitlements as the original population; the number of undocumented migrants is much smaller than in Spain. This implies that in Sweden and the UK immigrants and their descendants have to compete for jobs on an equal footing with the native population. In doing so they experience a significant disadvantage. The paradox here is that in Sweden and the UK migrants basically have the same rights as the rest of the population, but a much lower employment rate (except among certain communities). In Spain, by contrast, the employment rate is above the national average, but many migrants have fewer rights. A major difference between Sweden and the UK is that the former has always pursued a much more active employment policy than the latter. By contrast, the UK is a more typical example of a free market economy than Sweden is.

We have identified and investigated a number of areas where we believe action should be taken to promote immigrant integration in employment, which is conditional for a higher level of social cohesion. The first of these areas concerns human capital. It is often argued that migrants have fewer opportunities in the labour market because their skill levels are below average. However, this is only true for certain communities. In Spain, for example, the level of education of migrants from European non-EU countries, from Latin America and Asia is roughly similar to that of the local population. And in Sweden, the share of university graduates among immigrants is about the same as for the Swedish-born population. In the UK the average skill level among people of Chinese and Indian descent is higher than for the 'white' population. Notwithstanding these findings, we must also conclude that in all countries immigrants are overrepresented among the lowest skill levels. This is also the case for the EU as a whole.

This makes the development of human capital into a top priority for enhancing immigrant employment. We have equally noted the widespread phenomenon that immigrants at higher skill levels more often work below their capacities and in economically weaker branches of industry, than non-immigrants with the same qualifications. Immigrants also earn less for the same work. Several factors account for these differences. Among these are difficulties that immigrants may encounter because their foreign diplomas and experience are not recognised. Inadequate language proficiency and insufficient knowledge of a country's cultural specificities are also highly relevant factors, and, last but not least, there is discrimination by employers.

All these factors contribute to a lack of opportunities for people of immigrant origin with the implication that their human capital remains underused. Not only does this lead to frustrations and the undermining of social cohesion, it is also disadvantageous for the development of the EU economy. Most Member States, particularly those with longer

immigration traditions, have become aware of this dilemma. They have developed and implemented policy instruments to remedy the situation, many of which have been discussed in this report. A general conclusion that we may draw from this discussion is that Member States with a relatively recent immigration experience tend to focus their efforts on promoting schooling and language training. As the immigration experience grows, it becomes increasingly clear that discrimination is also a powerful factor in explaining disadvantages faced by immigrants.

To combat discrimination, two complementary strategies can be distinguished. One is through legislation: ensuring the enforcement of effective anti-discrimination laws, will oblige employers to consider more carefully their procedures around recruitment and retaining. Policies of affirmative action have similar objectives, but these are more widespread in North America than in Europe. The other strategy is to improve the functioning of the employment services, particularly for immigrants. The role of such services has become more important as redirecting persons who have become unemployed to the labour market has become a primary objective not only of employment policies, but also of social protection. Given this objective, the functioning of employment services should be more individualised and also be more specifically geared towards the needs and demands of immigrant communities. The dilemma, however, is that this may arouse objections from their non-immigrant clients, who may feel neglected. This is why many Member States tend to opt for mainstreaming rather than for targeting their provisions, even though under certain conditions, tailor made solutions may be more effective than the former. Here lies a clear dilemma, which none of the Member Sates has been able to solve so far.

8.3 Social protection

In this study we have interpreted social protection primarily in terms of entitlement to benefits of the welfare state, which are powerful instruments to prevent poverty and social exclusion. When we think of welfare state provisions, our primary interest lies with social security benefits, such as unemployment and disability allowances, public pensions and forms of general income support. However, access to provisions such as health care, public housing etc. can also be seen as forms of social protection.

For our comparative analysis of social protection we have studied four Member States. In the literature each of these four are cited as examples of a different type of welfare state. The United Kingdom is the typical example of the liberal welfare state, emphasising self-reliance and the primacy of the market. Austria is a conservative-corporatist type of welfare state, combining moderate levels of welfare support with legacies of corporatism. Denmark is a social-democratic welfare state, combining higher levels of support with social-democratic principles of universal solidarity and redistribution. Finally, we have studied Italy, which is of the relatively new, Southern European type, characterised by a generally low level of coverage and a sharp differentiation of benefits.

Our comparative analysis of developments and policies with regard to immigration and the welfare state revealed that all four countries studied are confronted with the same challenges, but that they reactions differ. The issue of granting social protection rights to foreigners clearly reveals the tension between promoting integration and equal rights for immigrants and at the same time securing the general sustainability of the social protection system in the long run. In all countries studied, and actually in all EU Member States, this tension has resulted in legislative arrangements that tend to disentitle migrants from certain

benefits or to set additional conditions to their access. However, such practices can have negative consequences for the migrants' integration. There are signs of high poverty risks in Denmark and Austria, precisely the countries where recent reforms of social policy and integration laws are motivated by reasons of immigration control and by the wish to limit the (perceived) negative impact of immigration on the welfare state. The case of Italy shows that difficulties in obtaining a stable, legal status can also constitute a major obstacle for access to social entitlements.

As a general rule, the entitlements of immigrant to contribution-based benefits, such as unemployment insurance, are less restrictive than their entitlements to publicly funded means-tested benefits. Contribution-based programmes are quite comparable to private insurance, but publicly funded programmes require income transfers based on solidarity. In many instances, solidarity with non-EU immigrants is limited, particularly with those who have arrived only recently. Entitlements to publicly funded benefits have become more restrictive for certain categories, such as spouses. Some Member States (e.g. Italy and Austria) try to achieve this by differentiating access rules to social protection instruments, others by putting up more and higher barriers to immigration (e.g. Denmark). It must also be noted that Member States with relatively liberal ideas on entitlements for immigrants have singled out specific categories of migrants from their regimes, particularly asylum seekers, for whom they have developed specific reception policies with limited entitlements, but also with restricted or exclusionary rights of labour market access.

It is difficult to come to a general conclusion on the use of social protection measures and instruments by immigrants and people of immigrant descent. There are considerable differences between Member States. In Member States with a relatively recent immigration experience, migrants are generally less well represented among the beneficiaries than in older immigration countries. A common explanation for this is that older migrants have accumulated more rights and tend to have their families with them. Nevertheless, there is a considerable divergence between the different social provisions. It seems logical that in situations where immigrants are strongly represented in the lower income brackets, they also have a high representation among recipients of general income support measures. By contrast, migrants are underrepresented among recipients of old age pensions, given their relatively young age. There is a feeling in some of the more generous welfare states in the EU that their generosity may act as a pull factor to attract migrants. In recent years this has been a powerful argument, particularly in countries such as Denmark and the Netherlands, to make their immigration rules stricter, rather than to reduce immigrant entitlements. However, it cannot be easily concluded whether a high level of social protection indeed works as a magnet on migration. Some authors have suggested that this is the case, others suggest that a high level of social protection reduces the number of returns, since the alternative of staying on is so attractive. High levels of social security may thus keep migrants trapped in the margins of a society of which they may not always wish to be part.

Equal entitlements do not guarantee equal access to (quality) social services and provisions. This is important, for these services and provisions are often of crucial importance for a successful integration. In this report this issue has been examined in relation to health care. The socially deprived situation of substantial numbers of migrants, in combination with migration related factors such as language, cultural and religious differences, can hinder their access to health care. Apart from the obvious dangers for public health, this also bears the risk of stigmatisation segregation Various initiatives, often developed locally, to promote equal access even in situations of equal entitlements, have been discussed in this study.

Our comparison of Member States has clearly revealed some of the main dilemmas related to social protection provisions for immigrants. A high level of social protection may prevent poverty and thus promote social stability and social cohesion. It may also attract more immigrants – or at least prevent them from leaving – and enhance their dependency on public funds. This is why migrants are among the major target groups of activating labour market policies. However, such policies often imply limiting and lowering benefits as an incentive. This may have detrimental social and economic effects on the less skilled and educated segments of the population at large, including migrants. Thus, governments are confronted with the two-fold challenge to improve the social inclusion and labour market participation of migrants (and other vulnerable categories), but without increasing their risk of poverty and exclusion.

In current debates in many European states immigration is often depicted as a burden to the welfare state. The more general challenge is to turn immigration into an asset. The anticipated demographic decline, as reflected in ageing populations and an ageing workforce, is a major reason for this debate. Who will be paying the pensions of the post-World War II baby-boom generation and who will care for them when they will be ailing? Until a few years ago most Member States saw immigration as a potential threat to their levels of social protection. Recently, however, this view has tended to change. There are growing debates in many places on how the EU systems of social protection may benefit from more migration. The European Commission is assuming a leading role in putting this issue on the political agenda.

There is a consensus that future immigration can alleviate the pains of an ageing population, but only if the new migrants contribute more to the system of social protection than they benefit from it. This is more likely to happen if the migrants are well-educated, young and able-bodied people, whose skills are in demand. A common European policy approach is to control immigration in combination with a policy of improved immigrant integration. In addition, some first steps are being taken towards more selective immigration policies, mostly to attract highly skilled migrants. In this respect, the liberal approach of the United Kingdom contrasts with the more restrictive immigration and mandatory integration policies of Denmark and Austria. Immigrants can also constitute an important resource for upholding welfare regimes. This is the case for domestic workers in Italy and for medical personnel in the United Kingdom.

Yet, promoting immigration, even on a highly selective basis, shall never be a panacea for all challenges that European welfare states are currently facing. First, all EU Member States are in more or less the same demographic situation. Where will they find the large number of young and highly qualified migrants who not only can support their provisions, but also are willing to come? Secondly, it should not be forgotten that one day these newcomers will also be old, and be entitled to benefits. Should new migrants again pay these? It has been calculated that migration, if carefully orchestrated, can alleviate some of the pains of an ageing population and help keep social protection at an acceptable level, but it is not the overall solution. Major efforts to promote the integration of the current migrant populations must also be continued vigorously.

It is interesting to note that some authors argue the opposite way. They claim that the relatively high level of social protection in parts of Europe, e.g. in comparison to the USA, actually is a structural factor for the enduring demand for unskilled foreign labour. The small

difference between social benefits and the lowest wage levels does not encourage people with low skills to find a job and to keep it. Thus, at the lower end of the labour market there is a constant need for new workers. The risk that they have to rely on social protection measures remains small as long as they stay in the informal sector of the economy. However, this cannot go on forever, not only for humanitarian reasons, but also because the presence of sizeable numbers of undocumented migrant workers will challenge the social order, as the South European Member States have been experiencing. Thus, solving the tension between admitting immigrants on the one hand and providing similar levels of social protection to everyone on the other hand – sometimes referred to as the immigration/welfare paradox – continues to require substantial investments, both political and financial.

8.4 Social cohesion

In all European societies employment and social protection can be major contributors to social cohesion, also in relation to immigration. However, they are not the only ones. Social cohesion certainly covers more areas than these two, though the concept as such is more vague and less clearly delineated than is the case for the other two central fields of our study. This explains why Member States differ considerably in their interpretation of the notion of social cohesion and in their policies that aim at promoting it. Even the term social cohesion as such is not commonly used in all Member States, it has been gaining some ground lately. Notwithstanding such differences, all Member States are concerned about ways of promoting and maintaining social order and feelings of togetherness among their populations. This is particularly the case when they are faced with a growing diversity that stems from immigration.

In this project we have analysed and compared policies in four Member States - France, Germany, the Netherlands and Portugal - that aim at promoting social cohesion, even if they are not explicitly labelled as such. We have opted for France and Germany, because traditionally these two countries have very different, almost opposing views on membership and belongingness. In Germany such notions are most often interpreted in ethnic terms, whilst the dominant interpretation in France is in civic terms. The Netherlands and Portugal both recently opted for a new approach in their policies of immigrant integration. The former rather abruptly changed from multiculturalism to more coercive forms of integration. The latter has only recently recognised itself as a country of immigration and has actively begun to try and find a balance between diversity and cohesion. In spite of such differences, however, we have also noticed a certain convergence among most Member States in their concerns about social cohesion issues and in their efforts to find answers to the various challenges posed by immigrant integration.

In this study social cohesion has been defined primarily in terms of two main strands:
i) Reduce social exclusion of certain groups in a society – in this case of immigrants in particular – and reduce disparities between groups;
ii) Strengthen social relations and social capital between groups.

Promoting employment and improving social protection obviously contribute to social cohesion, particularly, though not exclusively through the first strand. In this study, we have also analysed and discussed ways of promoting social cohesion through the second strand. The strengthening of social relations and social networks, that are major elements of this approach, can be achieved primarily at a local level. The national level seems too abstract for this and the situation in different parts of each Member State is too diverse. This is why

we have focussed on urban policies. In most Member States these policies have gained increased attention as a means to combat the multiplication of disadvantages in segregated areas and run-down city neighbourhoods. Although urban policies not always make specific references to issues directly related to immigration, they remain highly relevant for improving the situation of migrants. In most Member States migrants are more than often overrepresented in cities, and more in particular in neighbourhoods and areas that are from a socially and economically vulnerable.

Most urban policy programmes include a mix of the following components:
- Creating more and better opportunities for participation, particularly in employment and education;
- Improving social relations with a special emphasis on inter-cultural issues (including security-related issues and handling cultural diversity);
- Improving the physical environment: refurbishing and renovation, also of the public space;
- Economic regeneration by supporting the local economy and local enterprises.

The weight and the priority given to each of these elements differ widely from city to city, also within one and the same Member State. For that reason we have not only analysed urban policies at the national level in the four Member States mentioned earlier, but we have also included a more detailed analysis of three cities – Stuttgart, Rotterdam and a suburb of Lisbon - where interesting initiatives have been taken recently.

Perhaps one of the most striking results of our comparison of local situations and local policies is that ideological differences that may play a role at the national level are not always reflected in the more practical, 'down-to-earth' approach that is characteristic for the local level. The sense of urgency tends to be higher at the local level, where the effects of lacking social cohesion are felt more immediately. However, for the implementation of concrete change local authorities often depend on legal provisions and financial resources that must be made available at the national level.

Form our study of local initiatives it has emerged clearly that promoting social cohesion in urban areas very much depends on an effective participation of the population in all its diversity. It is important not only that membership of organisations is actively encouraged among migrants, but also that migrants and their organisations are actively involved in decision-making processes. This was widely recognised in the interviews we held with a number of migrant organisations in several Member States. In practice, however, the immigrant voice is not always heard in a systematic manner. Migrants often feel that they are not taken seriously and that their interests are not accounted for. This makes some of them less inclined to feel part of the community where they actually live, be it national or local. This, in turn, reinforces stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination. Needless to say, this can have a very harmful effect on social cohesion.

Among the four Member States that we have studied in more detail, France and the Netherlands tend to shy away from acknowledging the relevance of multiculturalism for the functioning of society, also at an urban level. According to the official policies in these states ethnic or cultural identification is a private affair and should not play a role in contacts with public authorities. In this view a public acknowledgement of ethnic or cultural differences may undermine principles of unity and equality. Here lies a dilemma. Equality lies indeed at the basis of our democratic societies and the separation of state and religion is major

achievement of European civilisation. However, if immigrants prefer to organise themselves on the basis of their shared cultural or ethnic origins (which may include religion) it may be sensible to open up a dialogue with them, rather than neglect them, and risk to push them into marginalisation or even radicalisation. Furthermore, there is a lot of evidence that, in certain situations, ethnically selected mediators and mediating organisations can have an important role in effectively bridging the gap between general institutions and services, and the immigrant population.

8.5 <u>New Member States</u>

In nearly all New Member States that integrated into the European Union in May 2004, immigration has in general been a very new phenomenon. As a consequence, there is a lack of information on trends and tendencies that relate to this subject. However, we have included a chapter on the new Member States in this report, because it is generally expected that immigration will become prominent within the next few years and because we think that the new Member States may learn from experiences – both positive and negative ones - in the old Member States.

Until now, unemployment among immigrants has not been a great issue of concern in the new Member States. Since most of the migration is employment-related the labour market integration of immigrants is often less problematic. In the Czech Republic for example two-thirds of the immigrants are economic migrants coming to work. A point system was introduced in 2003 to select migrants from certain countries according to their skills and qualifications. There are very few data on the employment and working conditions of migrants in the Czech Republic. Some indications would suggest that migrants fulfill the same role as in southern Member States of the EU, which means filling positions that Czech workers are either unable or unwilling to take up. Many of the EU-15 Member States are also grappling with ways to use immigration policies to meet the needs of the labour market. However, one key lesson is that temporary migrants often stay. In this context initial disadvantages can prove to persist and even be passed on to the second generation. It is therefore important to provide skills and language education, in combination with establishing measures to combat discrimination.

The new Member States face many challenges in restructuring their social protection system to the new market economies. Poverty risks are high, and most states have only limited experience of building comprehensive strategies to fight poverty and promote social inclusion. Since the social protection systems are less developed and immigrant numbers few, immigration not commonly related to the issue of economic sustainability of welfare state (either in positive or negative way). Poland has the lowest average employment rate and highest unemployment rate of all the new Member States. Social protection policies are modest in comparison to EU-15. Most immigrant groups are entitled to basic health services, but unemployment benefits are reserved to certain categories of immigrants. Because of the difficulties in obtaining legal employment and the under-developed social protection system, parts of the immigrant population risk marginalisation. A general lesson from the "older" countries of immigration in Europe is that equal social entitlements and provisions for resident foreigners have proven to be of enormous importance for their social integration and prevention of marginalisation as well as for the reduction of tensions.

Given their small numbers of immigrants, the relationship between immigration and social cohesion has not been given much attention in most of the new Member States. In

comparison to most other new Member States Slovenia has a high immigration rate. As in much of the EU-15, different flows have occurred under differing economic and political conditions and, therefore, have provoked different reactions from the local population. Slovenia experienced much immigration from other parts of what was then the Republic of Yugoslavia from the 1960s onwards. The integration of these immigrants was never a topic of debate. In the 1990s, the next wave of Yugoslav immigration came in the very different context, as Slovenia became the destination of war refugees. This time the influx triggered a debate on the social impact of migrants on the new democracy and tolerance of the young state of Slovenia. The influx of undocumented migrants from non-European countries in 2000-2001 gave rise to a similar reaction and was seen as a threat to the national identity. Civil society reactions included hostility from some parts of the population, but also a mobilisation in favour of assisting the refugees.

Experiences from the EU-15 show that integration policies often have been reactive rather than proactive. However it is much easier to prevent marginalisation than to try afterwards to remedy situations of exclusion. There is thus an argument for the new Member States to develop and implement integration policies already at an early stage of immigration. In this case the lessons from western states in integrating minorities can be of use (see for example Kymlicka 2000).

8.6 The European Union policy framework

Elements of a common EU approach in relation to the integration of migrants can mainly be identified in the areas of economic policy, social inclusion and 'freedom, security and justice'. The interpretation of the notion of 'integration' is fundamental to developing a common approach. So far, elements of equal treatment and non-discrimination have been pivotal in developing EU action on integration. This is also linked to the economic purposes of the EU in terms of the promotion of integration and participation in social and economic life, as exemplified in the Lisbon process.

A number of initiatives have been taken since the 1999 Tampere Declaration, which includes the objective of fair treatment and integration of third country nationals. Key legal developments include the anti-discrimination Directives of June and November 2000, the family reunification Directive of March 2003 and the Directive on the rights of long-term residents of November 2003. There are clear linkages between economic integration and non-discrimination, and many of the policy initiatives have taken place in the context of promoting participation in employment. For example, the revised employment guidelines of 2003 put stronger emphasis on reducing the employment gap between nationals and non-nationals. In the area of Justice and Home Affairs the new Hague programme 2005-2010 calls for more co-ordination of national integration policies and agrees on a set of principles that underlie a common approach to integration.

Decision-making in the field of integration at the EU-level can affect Member States in three ways: (1) directly as a result of legislation, (2) indirectly as a result of changes in political opportunities that arise from EU coordination in linked areas such as employment and social inclusion, and (3) through framing effects, that is how issues are perceived by the state as a result of coordination and exchange. The three categories can be mutually reinforcing. For example, indirect and framing effects can feed a demand for new legislation.

Given the different levels of policy making as well as different national approaches in issues relating to integration, a key issue is how to ensure that the integration perspective is included in all sets of policies in a co-ordinated manner. In this context, the Open Method of Coordination (OMC), already used for employment and social inclusion processes is of importance. However, it is not clear whether integration of immigrants is best dealt with as a mainstream component in existing OMCs or whether a specific process should be developed. Experiences with immigrant integration in the current OMCs show a problem of developing indicators. There is also a risk that Member States put little emphasis on analysing and doing something about the problem when it is mainstreamed. There is, however, also a case for arguing that, in view of the differences between immigrants and other groups, a specific OMC on immigrant integration could make a positive contribution, notably in the development of indicators. Specific areas where an involvement from the EU can have an impact are related to major impediments that migrants encounter in the labour market: the recognition of skills and qualifications and improving language proficiency and educational achievements.

9 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE POLICY AND ACTION

In this chapter we intend to present on the basis of our research some general considerations and concerns together with some more specific recommendations for policy, both at the EU-level and at the level of the Member States.

9.1 General considerations and concerns for policies

In chapter 6 some observations are made that relate to the three themes studied and that may be relevant for the new Member States. In the EU-10, immigration does not yet have the same social and political priority as in the EU-15. However, this situation is likely to change in a relatively near future. Some points of attention have been formulated that are drawn from a comparison of Estonian and 'Western' policies of integration made by the well-known Canadian scholar Will Kymlicka (2000). It is interesting to note that, though they were presented as 'lessons *from* the West', these are just as relevant to the new Member States as to the old ones. Departing from his considerations we have amended and supplemented them on the basis of the findings of our study to formulate general preconditions, considerations and concerns for the development of policies that are likely to promote social cohesion, of which employment and social protection are obvious elements.

i) Strengthen the links between different policies - taking a holistic approach
The study has demonstrated not only that the processes of immigrant integration can only be understood from a holistic perspective, but also that a holistic approach taking in account all relevant aspects is a precondition for a successful integration policy. This has already been observed by the European Commission (CEC 2003). For example, Denmark's new social protection policy intended to activate migrants would not be effective without a comprehensive employment and local integration policy. Not only should the relevant aspects of immigrant integration be taken in account, but related facets of the immigration situation and policy should also be considered. Considerations of immigration control are increasingly gaining significance within integration policies, as exemplified in the Dutch newcomer integration policy. Conversely, the effects of immigration flows and policies on immigrant integration have to be considered as well. The labour market policy with regard to immigrants in for instance Spain should take into account the presence of a considerable undocumented migrant population.

ii) Rights-based approach, anti-discrimination measures
The crucial importance of a rights-based approach and vigorous anti-discrimination measures is a recurrent insight across all the themes studied. It is also a central concern of the EU action, as pointed out in the chapter on EU policy. Insecurity of rights diminishes the immigrants' commitment to integration. The importance of this prerequisite is underlined by the integration problems within segments of former guestworkers in countries in Central Europe that retained the principles of temporary guestworker model for a long time. Sometimes receiving societies fail to live up to the democratic principles they proclaim, for example by denying immigrants to associate. The democratic principles and institutions of the liberal-democratic society are an important means for immigrants to rectify such deficiencies (see also Zolberg & Clarkin 2003: 7). Others have already pointed to the important role of courts in consolidating migrants' rights (Guiraudon 2000). Anti-discrimination legislation is one of the elements of a rights-based approach. It is however important to supplement this with an effective implementation of the legal framework. The

three thematic studies have shown that discrimination is an important obstacle, for promoting social cohesion, employment integration and social protection of immigrants. A strong protection against discrimination is crucial (see also Kymlicka 2000). In the next section we will present some more specific recommendations on anti-discrimination.

iii) Clear minimal requirements with regard to integration
As observed in several chapters of the reports, Member States' increasingly put an emphasis on the necessity for newcomers to adapt. This is partly a product of learning by practice in the "older" countries of immigration. However, the rules regarding integration must be clear: immigrants must know what is required of them and need to know that these rules will not be changed to create higher barriers (Kymlicka 2000). Furthermore, within liberal democratic societies these legitimate requirements can only be minimal. Integration can be demanded primarily as a matter of linguistic and institutional integration and the sharing of basic political principles, so as to avoid exclusion. Asking more than that tends to clash with the principles of liberal democracies. Furthermore, when clear minimal requirements are formulated that newcomers have to comply with, the state must support the facilities that are expected to assist a migrant in the integration process (e.g. language learning, civic education). This does not necessarily imply public provision of the facilities, but it does mean that states must warrant sufficient and appropriate services that are affordable by the immigrants.

iv) Integration is a dynamic two-way process
Sometimes, problems of integration are attributed to immigrants only. However, our study gives ample evidence that integration and social cohesion depends on the efforts of both immigrants and receiving societies. For instance, discrimination and unequal treatment are important factors to explain the lower employment rate of migrants in many of the Member States.

v) Recognise the diversity of the target group in length of residence, citizenship, ethnic origins, skill levels, etc.
The so-called 'immigrants' include a huge variety of groups with different experiences, resources and challenges. Generic immigrant policies are often implicitly targeted to one category of immigrants, and may have very little effect on other groups. In particular, the second generation is often neglected with the increased emphasis on language education and specific training to newcomers. In addition, the newcomer groups are very diverse with different needs and skills. Consequently, there is a need to consider the right to an individualised approach and avoid developing generic immigrant policies.

vi) Mainstreaming vs specific policies.
Both the social protection and the employment sections show that in some cases, immigrants and ethnic minorities often can not access or make use of different health, social inclusion or employment projects to the same extent as the rest of the population, for various reasons, despite having equal rights to programmes or entitlements, or even supposedly be a prioritised group. On the one hand, this may be due to discrimination. On the other hand this would seem to point to the fact that mainstreaming is not always helpful or not implemented appropriately. However, developing specific policies for immigrants can also have adverse effects from a social cohesion and social inclusion perspective. No simple solution can be found to tackle this problem. There is a tendency to limit the development of specific policies issues relating to reception and integration measures for newcomers, and to mainstream measures for long-term immigrants and ethnic minorities. There are good reasons for this, as there are indications that generic policies and services are of crucial importance for the

integration of immigrants. However, the mainstream policies and programmes ought to pay specific attention to the particular barriers of the various immigrant groups.

vii) Empowerment of individuals, supporting civil society
The participation of immigrants should be increased, not only from a legal-political perspective, but also in practice. Migrants and minorities should have a role in the formulation and administration of the integration policy itself, to overcome suspicion and to promote active participation (See Kymlicka 2000). But there seems to be a mixed record from the different attempts to include immigrants' point of view in policy-making through consultative boards etc. This necessitates reflection and a search for more effective instruments for participation. In any case, there should be more support to and increased visibility of civil society initiatives on employment, social protection and social cohesion projects, and more attention for help to self-help. For example, the Portuguese urban policy example (and also the French mediators) shows that the direct involvement of the target groups is very important for the sustainability of projects.

9.2 <u>More specific recommendations for policy</u>

In the following section we will present some more specific recommendations for policies on EU and on national level, taking into account both the above-mentioned general considerations and concerns, and the insights from the previous chapters. The recommendations will concern both the three main themes, and also touch upon some issues that are important across all the themes: data monitoring, research and discrimination. Making recommendations regarding national integration policies for such a variety of countries, immigrant groups and situations is very difficult, not to say impossible. Ideally, recommendations should be specified for the characteristics of the receiving country (e.g. type of welfare state and labour market) and characteristics of the migrants (high or low skilled, differences in generation, gender, etc.). Although we will specify our recommendations in some cases, often we have refrained from that. Not only would this make the list of recommendations too complex, but in view of the complexity of the situation in the Member States, a detailed indications of the different factors of importance would demand a more in-depth and expanded research in these themes.

9.2.1 Employment

National level

In general, individualised approaches and services, taking into account the diversity of the immigrant population as well as the diversity of capacities and interests of immigrants, are more successful to improve the labour market participation of immigrants. This will improve the programmes and actions of national employment services in reaching and assisting migrants considerably. More concrete suggestions to improve national employment services are**:**

- Training for officials on anti-discrimination, and inter-cultural relations;
- Supporting a more customised approach, taking account of the individual skills and situation of the immigrants and ethnic minorities;
- Increased contacts and networks with the private sector to find placement, and combat eventual resistance among employers;

- Providing support and incentives to local employment agencies to actively promote employment of immigrants and ethnic minorities.

Developing appropriate partnerships is a common success factor for labour market integration. This can be done by:

- Involvement of social partners in formulating strategies for promoting employment of immigrants and ethnic minorities;
- Supporting private sector initiatives and build up local partnerships between employment administrations, local organisations and companies to develop solutions for the specific local situations.

In all countries, skills are seen as crucial factors for labour market success. However, migrants often are confronted with many different obstacles for fully utilising their skills. One way to improve this is by skills recognition and enhancement. Some concrete recommendations:

- Develop methods and processes for the recognition of formal and informal education and skills;
- Ensure that language training is more relevant to the future or current labour market participation of immigrants, for example by language courses combined with workplace induction; adapting the language courses according to the education and skills of the participants; and by providing language training in combination with specialised additional training in a specific field of work;
- Enhance educational attainment for improved labour market integration of second-generation immigrants, by improving the support to language learning in schools for children of immigrants.

Further, promotion and dissemination of good practices in integration strategies and anti-discrimination policies within companies is advisable. Some more recommendations with regard to anti-discrimination can be found below.

EU level

Actions on the EU level to support and facilitate the national policies mentioned above are:

- More research and best practice exchange on language learning in employment in combination with training and newcomer policies;
- Support training and awareness-raising to key national, regional and local public administration officials;
- Support exchange between Member States of practices on methods to adapt and improve public employment services to become more effective in assisting immigrants to find employment;
- Support the development of standards for the recognition of qualifications.

9.2.2 Social protection

National level

The research on social protection revealed the shortage of data on the social situation of immigrants in some of the Member States, for example on the poverty risks and health situation of migrants. Such knowledge is a first prerequisite for developing policies. Therefore, it is advisable to increase the knowledge on aspects of the social situation of migrants, through including indicators such as the country of birth in mainstream surveys and/or through specific investigations.

Various categories of migrants are disentitled to a range of social protection provisions in different Member States. This is especially the case for non-contributory social rights that most likely constitute a safety net. This enhances the risk on poverty of especially migrants without permanent residence status. This underlines the importance of a rights-based approach and of providing greater security of rights for various categories of immigrants. However, this may not apply to categories of temporary migrants, which demand a more flexible approach.

Such a rights-based approach needs to take into account the interrelations between different legal frameworks, for example between residence statuses and social security legislation. It should also take consideration of the links between policies related to immigration and integration policy, respectively. For example, it is important to consider the effect of restrictive rights (to employment) on the social and economic integration of long-term immigrants (family members, asylum seekers).

The overrepresentation of migrants among recipients of social benefits in some Member States has led to the development of activating measures focussing on these groups. This is not always as successful for all parts of the migrants' community and it may increase their risk of poverty and social inclusion. In particular for resource-weak groups, a more successful approach would be to complement passive activation policies (through incentives) by providing active support to finding employment.

Equal social rights do not guarantee equal access to and equal quality of social services and provisions. Access can be improved in several ways, depending on the type of social provisions and the category and number of migrant clients. Some general recommendations.
- Main problems of access are related to differences in culture and language. Cultural mediators and interpreters can offer a solution.
- Explore ways to cooperate with NGOs and immigrant organisations in order to improve access to services, on local and national level;
- Support local organisations active in the promotion self-help and empowerment approaches.
- Support research and experiments with developing methods for making services more culturally-sensitive, as well as the exchange of such methods.

In some Member States, immigration is viewed as a burden to the welfare state rather than a potential asset. This negative outlook is one-sided and all but stimulating for migrants to contribute to the society. Instead, a more pro-active and forward-looking approach to facilitate integration into employment is more effective. For example, the Resource project on refugees has shown that many refugees in the various Member States have the skills and qualifications that employers need to fill their (future) vacancies. Therefore, Member States should consider refugees' experiences and develop policies and measures that make the pathways to employment quicker and easier for refugees, for example by language course,

recognition of qualifications, taking into account prior qualifications and work experience, shorten asylum determination procedures etc. (Resource Project 2004, Conference Report)

EU level

On EU level the national policies mentioned above can be supported by:

- Research on poverty risks and levels among immigrants and ethnic minorities, in the context of social protection expenditure and activation policies. And further research on the links between employment, social exclusion and social protection policies; for example on the impact of social protection rights on the possibility to find employment, and the effect of exclusion from the labour market on the utilization of social protection.
- Improve monitoring of social inclusion indicators for immigrants and ethnic minorities (see data collection below);
- Initiate a discussion on minimum rights to social protection for immigrants (at least those with long-term status);
- Consideration of the rights of shorter term residents. A rights-based approach for short-term residents (i.e. prior to the acquisition of long-term residents rights after five years in an EU member state) that would establish basic economic and social rights and laying down the foundations for future integration.
- Exchange of experiences and practices between Member States to improve access to services (social, housing, health) for immigrants and ethnic minorities.

9.2.3   Social cohesion

National level

On local level, the authorities are confronted with concrete and practical challenges and dilemmas associated with immigrant settlement, obstacles to integration and participation, and other social dynamics such as tensions between different population groups. For this reason, urban and integration policies are decentralised in many Member States. Therefore, in this section we will make recommendations both on the national and the local (or regional) level.

Recommendations for national authorities:
- Support the economic development of urban regions;
- Support and facilitate a national urban policy programme

Recommendations for local authorities:
- Support initiatives by citizens and local (immigrant) organisations to increase social inclusion of immigrants and other excluded groups and to enhance social relations. Support for such initiatives should be responsive and proactive. Especially for marginal groups, distrustful of officials, social or community mediators and mediating organisations can play a productive role.
- Support dialogue and cooperation on local level between actors involved in urban or similar policies, such as public administrations, immigrant organisations, other NGOs, the private sector. Dialogue could focus more on the setting up of common initiatives rather than merely be a forum for NGOs to provide advice for policy developments.

- Support for inter-cultural dialogue and interactions on local level, both on street and city-wide level.
- Investigate (an monitor) whether general institutions and provisions are equal accessible to all citizens, including migrants. Specific measures, such as mediators and interpreters may be necessary to bridge the gap between institutions and parts of the migrant population.
- Take a pragmatic stance towards the dilemma of generic versus specific measures.
- Investigate the social relations and social capital possessed by immigrants and how these capacities and networks can be utilised, strengthened and diversified to support their self-help and participation in the neighbourhood and local society.
- An intercultural mainstreaming approach should be accompanied by empowerment and capacity building among deprived parts of the citizenry, including migrants.

EU-level

On EU level the national policies can be supported by:
- Promoting civil society dialogue on local level – for example through a supporting grant scheme for roundtables on the civic participation of immigrants and the role of immigrant organisations in local democratic and political life.
- Create a platform for the representation of migrants' organisations on EU level, as is suggested by the Commission (CEC 2005: A common agenda for integration).

9.2.4 Data and policy monitoring

National level

Regardless of whether the countries opt for a mainstreamed or specific approach to integration, monitoring systems must be strengthened (or developed) in all relevant sectors: education, health, social inclusion, employment etc. In order to be able to get a correct picture of the situation of the different groups of immigrants, and to follow their progression over time, it is necessary to collect data based not only on nationality and country of birth, but also on the parents' country of birth (one or both). Other useful categories for advanced data collecting could be for example the length of stay and the region of origin.

EU level

Employment

The labour force survey has been improved to include information on the country of birth. The next step would be to include, as far as possible, information on the parents' country of birth, in order to monitor the situation of the second generation of immigrants. Statistics from some of the countries collecting such data suggests that some of the disadvantages are transferred to the next generations of immigrants, but in order to establish the extent of this, data collection has to be refined.

Further categories on for example the region of origin, the length of stay in the country would also be useful for a more detailed view of the situation.

Social inclusion and social protection

The EU statistics on Income and Living conditions does not currently collect information on foreign-born citizens. Similarly, the common indicators for social inclusion are currently not broken down by country of origin. The inclusion of data on foreign-born and, possibly in a second step, persons with foreign-born parents, would considerably contribute to the collection of information on the social situation of immigrants and ethnic minorities.

Data on country of origin should also be included in a systematic manner in the Eurobarometer on social inclusion, such as for example the EU health survey.

The dimensions on immigrants in the social inclusion and employment OMCs should be improved by giving a higher visibility to immigrants instead of regrouping them under the category 'other vulnerable groups'.

It would be worthwhile to organise a discussion between Member States on the monitoring of the integration process, with an exchange on different practices regarding the development and use of indicators.

The scope of the National Contact Points on integration should be broadened to include wider issues of social inclusion. The conclusions of the study show that a holistic approach needs to be taken, including elements of social inclusion, social protection, employment, education, urban policies etc. Participation should be broadened as to include other forms of social and communal participation.

9.2.5   Discrimination

National level

Studies on the existence of discrimination in countries with longer experience of immigration seem to indicate that various forms of discrimination persist, in more subtle forms, despite the existence of legislation. More data and research is needed on the forms and extent of discrimination, both in employment and with regard to access to services.

Field studies such as "testing" are useful for mapping the extent of discrimination, and can be a good complement to the monitoring of reported cases.

There is evidence of implementation gaps in the application of the EU anti-discrimination framework (ECCII, 2005). The legal framework is in place and should be fully implemented.

Legislation does not seem to be enough to combat subtle and persistent forms of discrimination - a more proactive approach is needed. In the public sector, awareness-raising and training to relevant actors (social services, employment services etc) is a first step.

It is useful to support and develop partnerships between public and private actors (companies, NGOs, experts) to combat discrimination, in particular in the employment sector. Partnerships between public administrations and social partners could play a key role in supporting and disseminating good practices, agreement on common principles and codes of conduct, and development and implementation of awareness-raising activities and training.

Another practical advice is to support the development and exchange of good practices within companies in promoting diversity.

EU-level

Recommendations on EU level:
- Continue to build on the EQUAL initiatives, ensure a wider dissemination of good practice from the programme;
- Sponsor training and awareness raising on anti-discrimination for public officials especially those involved in designing and delivering employment services. (Through a grant scheme for example) This could build on the experiences from the actions for the exchange of information and good practice between Member States that has already taken place under the community action programme to combat discrimination 2001-2006;
- Encourage private sector-involvement through support for initiatives to promote diversity in the context of the CSR strategy and programme.

9.2.6 Research

National and EU levels

- Mapping study on the role of immigrant associations in promoting civic participation, and social inclusion;
- Research on the effects of differing rights and entitlements on the risk of poverty among immigrants;
- Specific research on the socio-cultural indicators of integration, for example, to the feeling of belonging of immigrants to the host society, and whether this is related to language skills, educational achievements, being employed etc.

REFERENCES

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Berger-Schmitt, R 2000 "Social cohesion as an aspect of the qualities of societies: concept and EUReporting Working Paper, Center for Survey Research and Methodology, Mannheim.

Entzinger, H. & R. Biezeveld, 2003, Benchmarking in Immigrant Integration. Report for the European Commission. EUR

Heckmann, F., 1999, Integration Policies in Europe: National differences or convergence? EFMS Paper Nr. 33.

Heckmann, F, 1997, Patterns of Immigrant Integration in Germany. EFMS Paper Nr. 14.

Penninx, R., 2004, Integration policies for Europe's immigrants: performance, conditions and challenges. An expert paper for the Sachverständigenrat für Zuwanderung und Integration.

Vertovec S 1997 "Social Cohesion and Tolerance" Discussion Paper

WODC, 2004, De ontwikkeling van een integratiekaart. The Hague: WODC/Ministry of Justice.

Chapter 2 – Overview of Integration

Baldwin-Edwards, M. (2002) *Immigration, Immigrants and Socialisation in Southern Europe,* Opening keynote lecture Symposium Neth. Institute at Athene.

Baldwin-Edwards, M. (2004) *The changing mosaic of Mediterranean Migrations* MPI, Migration Information Source

CEC (2003a) *Communication from the Commission to the council, On Immigration, integration and employment,* COM (2003) 306 final including: Annex 1: 'Synthesis report on national Integration policies'. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

CEC (2003b) *Employment in Europe 2003, Recent trends and prospects.* European Commission, DG Employment and Social Affairs (Chapter6 'Immigration and employment in the EU')

CEC (2003c) *Equality, Diversity and Enlargement,* DG Employment and Social Affairs

CEC (2004a) *Concluding document from the first technical seminar on introduction of newly arrived immigrants and refugees,* Copenhagen 5-6 February 2004. Migrapol Integration 22 final. DG Justice and Home Affairs

CEC (2004b) *Annual report on equality and non-discrimination 2004,* DG of Employment and Social Affairs

CEC (2004c) *First annual report on Migration and Integration,* Brussels

CEC (2004d) *Employment in Europe,* DG Employment and Social Affairs

CEC (2004e) *The Social Situation in the European Union 2004*

Centre for Equal opportunities (2003) *Report on the 10 years of existence of Centre for equal opportunities and the fight against racism*

Cholewinski, R. (2002) *The legal status of migrants admitted for employment – A comparative study of law and practice in selected European States.* MG-ST (2002) 2. Council of Europe

Chopin et al (2004) *The implementation of European anti-discrimination legislation: work in progress,* Brussels: MPG

Coussey, M. (2000) *Framework of integration policies,* Council of Europe , DG III – Social Cohesion, Directorate of Social Affairs and Health

Ederveen, S. et al (2004) 'Destination Europe: immigration and integration in the European Union. European Outlook 2', Annex to the *State of the European Union 2005,* CPB, SCP and CBS The Hague: Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Entzinger, H. & R. Biezeveld (2003) *Benchmarking in Immigrant Integration*, report for the European Commission. EUR

Entzinger, H. (2004) *Integration and Orientation Courses in a European Perspective*, Expert Report for the Sachverständigenrat für Zuwanderung und Integration

EUMC (2004a) *Migrants, minorities and legislation: documenting legal measures and remedies against discrimination in 15 Member States of the European Union*

EUMC (2004b) *Racism and Xenophobia in the EU Member States, trends, developments and good practice,* Annual Report 2003/2004 - Part 2

EUMC (2004c) *Migrants, minorities and education*, Comparative report produced by Dr Mikael Luciak

EUMC (2004d) *Migrants, minorities and employmen*", Comparative report produced by the International Centre for Migration Policy Development

EUMC (2005) *Majorities' attitudes towards minorities: Key findings from the Eurobarometer and the European Social Survey*

EU Networks on Integration of Refugees (2000), *Report from the European Conference on Refugee Participation in Local Policy Making and Political Life*, Nürnberg 26th-27th May 2000

Eurobarometer (2003) *The Health of adults in the European Union*, Special Eurobarometer 183.7

European Civic Citizenship and Inclusion Index (2005), London/Brussels: Foreign Policy Centre/British Council Brussels/Migration Policy Group.

EUROSTAT (2004) *Yearbook* (Chapter 2, pp 19-24: Migration and Asylum)

Eurydice (2004) *Integrating immigrant children into schools in Europe*

Felip Santamaría N. et al (2002) *Inmigrantes y atención sanitaria*

Fennema, M. & Tillie, J. (1999) 'Political participation and political trust in Amsterdam. Civic communities and ethnic networks', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 25 (4): 703-726.

Geddes, A. (2004) *Immigration and European Welfare States*, ESCUS briefing paper, Sheffield University

GELD (2001) *Les discriminations raciales et ethniques dans l'accès au logement social*

German federal government (2003) *National Action Plan for Social Inclusion 2003-2005*

Giudici, C., A. Guarneri (2002) *Migrations and living conditions in new member states and candidate countries: a regional approach*. Conference paper.

Groenendijk, K., E. Guild, R. Barzilay (2000) *The legal position of Third Country Nationals who are Long-term Residents in a Member State of the EU.* Study carried out on behalf of the European Commission (Directorate General for Justice and Home Affairs). Centre for Migration Law, University of Nijmegen.

Guild, E. (2000) *Identification of legal elements for a successful integration policy* . Council of Europe.

Heckmann, F. (1999) *Integration Policies in Europe: National differences or convergence?* EFMS Paper Nr. 33.

International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights, (2005) *Intolerance and Discrimination against Muslims in the EU*

IOM (2004) *Migration trends in selected EU applicant countries* (Czech Republic, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia)

Martiniello, M. (2005) *Political participation and mobilisation of immigrants and their offspring in Europe,* Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers in International Migration and Ethnic Relations;1/05. Malmö University – IMER

Mayr, K. (2003) *Immigration: Economic Effects and Political Participation –An Overview and Assessment of the Literature*

Michalowski, I, (2004) *An overview on introduction programmes for immigrants in seven European Member States.*The Hague: ACVZ/ Adviescommissie Vreemdelingenzaken.

Niessen, J. and Y. Schibel (2004) *Handbook on Integration for policy-makers and practitioners* European Commission, DG Justice, Freedom and Security.

Niessen, J., M. José Peiro, Y. Schibel (2005) *Civic citizenship and immigrant inclusion - A guide for the implementation of civic citizenship policies,* Brussels: Migration Policy Group (MPG)

OECD, (2005) *Trends in International Migration, SOPEMI 2004* Edition. Paris

Peers, S., R. Barzilay, K. Groenendijk and E. Guild, (2000) *The legal status of persons admitted for family reunion : A comparative Study of Law and Practice in some European States,* Strasbourg: Council of Europe

Penninx, R., J. Roosblad (eds.), (2000) *Trade Unions, Immigration and Immigrants in Europe 1960-1993. A Comparative Study on the Attitudes and Actions of Trade Unions in Seven West-European Countries*, Berghahn Books, New York/Oxford

Penninx, R. (2004) *Integration policies for Europe's immigrants: performance, conditions and challenges,* an expert paper for the Sachverständigenrat für Zuwanderung und Integration.

Penninx, R, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello, S. Vertovec (2004) *Citizenship in European Cities: Immigrants, Local Politics and Integration Policies,* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Phalet, K., C. van Lotharingen en H. Entzinger , 2000, Islam in de multiculturele samenleving: opvattingen van jongeren in Rotterdam. Utrecht: ERCOMER.

Rath, J., R. Penninx, K. Groenendijk and A. Meyer (2001) Western Europe and its Islam. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill.

Ray, B (2004) *Practices to promote the integration of migrants into labour markets*, Migration Policy Institute. (Prepared for the European Commission, DG Employment and Social Affairs)

RMO (2003) Inburgering: educatieve opdracht voor nieuwkomer, overheid en samenleving. Advies van de RMO uitgebracht aan de ACVZ. Werkdocument 1, The Hague.

Romero-Ortuño (2004) 'Access to health care for illegal immigrants in the EU: should we be concerned', *European Journal of Health Law* no 11: 245-272, 2004, Martinus Njihoff Publishers

Salt, J. (2005a), Current Trends in International Migration in Europe. Council of Europe. CDMG (2005) 2

Salt, J. (2005b) *Types of migration in Europe: implications and policy concerns.* Paper for the Council of Europe conference, Strasbourg, April 2005.

Steinhilber, S (2003) *The Specific Situation of Female Migrant Workers in Relation to Social Security*, Report to the Committee of Experts on Co-ordination in the Field of Social Security of the Council of Europe

Sunier, T. 1996. Islam in beweging. Turkse jongeren en islamitische organisaties. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis

Swedish Integration Board (2001) *Arbetslöshetsförsäkringen - för vem?*, Report series 2001:1

Swedish Integration Board (2004) "Barns och ungdomars uppväxtvillkor", Chapter in *Integrationsrapport 2003*

Swedish National Institute of Public Health, (2003) *Annual Health Survey*

Ugba A. (2005) *Active civic participation of immigrants in Ireland*, Country Report prepared for the European research project POLITIS, Oldenburg
2005, www.uni-oldenburg.de/politis-europe

UK Government (2003) *National Action Plan for Social Inclusion 2003-2005*

University of Bamberg (2001) Final project report from project "Effectiveness of National Integration Strategies Towards Second Generation Migrant Youth in a Comparative European Perspective – EFFNATIS"

Van den Berg, L. et al, 2004, National Urban Policies in the European Union. EURICUR/EUR

Van Tubergen, F. & I. Maas (2004). Women migrants in the European Union. A demographic and socioeconomic profile. The Hague: Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.

Vertovec S. (1997) *Social Cohesion and Tolerance,* Discussion Paper

Vertovec S. Wesseldorf S. (2005) *Migration and cultural, linguistic and religious diversity in Europe: An overview of issues and trends*, Centre on Migration, Policy and Society. Working paper no 18, Oxford University, 2005

Weil, P. (2001) 'Access to citizenship: A comparison of twenty five nationality laws' Also published in: T. Alexander Aleinikoff and D. Klusmeyer (eds.), *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*, Washington, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, DC.

Zetter, R., D. Griffiths, N. Sigona, M. Hauser (2002) *Survey on policy and practice related to refugee integration,* Oxford Brookes University. Main report and Annex. Commissioned by the European Refugee Fund Community Actions 2001/2.

Chapter 3 - Employment

Barnes et al (2005) *Ethnic minority outreach: an evaluation*, Department for work and pensions, Research report no 229

Böhning W.R (1995) 'Labour market integration in Western and Northern Europe: which way are we heading', *The integration of migrant workers in thelabour market: Policies and their impact*, International Migration papers 8 ILO Employment Department

Carrasco Carpio, C (1999) *Mercados de trabajo: los inmigrantes económicos*, Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales IMSERSO, Madrid.

Consejo Económico y Social (CES) (2004) *Informe sobre la inmigración y el mercado de trabajo en España*

Colectivo Ioé (2002) *Intervenciones sociales para la promoción del empleo y la igualdad de los inmigrantes extranjeros con participación de la administración local*

Colectivo Ioé (1999) Stop a la discriminación laboral de los inmigrantes: proyecto español de la Iniciativa Comunitaria EMPLEO-INTEGRA http://www.nodo50.org/ioe/

Dustmann et al (2003) *Labour market performance of immigrants in the UK labour market*, Home Office Online report 05/03

Ederveen et al (2005) 'Destination Europe: Immigration and integration in the European Union', Annex to the *State of the European Union 2005*

Ethnic Minority Employment Task Force (EMETF) (2004) *Equality, opportunity, success. 1 year progress report*

Jobcentre plus (2004) *Annual report and accounts 2003-2004*

Griffiths D (2003) *English language training for refugees in London and the regions*, Home Office Online Report 14/03

Le Grand, Szulkin (2002) *Permanent disadvantage or gradual integration: explaining the immigrant-native earnings gap in Sweden*

Literacytrust (2005) "Good practice on literacy and social inclusion" http://www.literacytrust.org.uk/socialinclusion/adults/goodpractice.html#Skillzone

Modood T, Berthoud R et al (1997) *Ethnic minorities in Britain: Diversity and disadvantage*

Münz R, (2004) *Migration, labour markets and migrants' integration in Europe: a comparison,* Hamburg Institute of International Economics. Paper for the EU-US seminar on integrating immigrants into the workforce. Washington DC June 28-29 2004

Pumarez Fernandez (2004) *Trabajadores extranjeros en España: Evolución y cambios en un contexto de crecimiento económico prolongado* (2000-2003) Paper for the Congreso sobre la inmigración en España 10-13 noviembre 2004, Girona

Samverkan för arbetsmarknadsintroduktion (2004) *öppna dörrar – sänkta trösklar*, DS 2004:22, Stockholm

Solé C., Parella S. (2003) 'The labour market and racial discrimination in Spain' *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* Vol.29 No.1 :121-140

Spanish Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (2003) *Basic information report (BIR)*

Spanish Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (2004) *National Action plan for Employment 2004*

Spanish government Delegation for Foreigners and Immigration (2001) *Acuerdo por el que se aprueba el programa global de regulación y coordinación de la extranjería y la inmigración*

Swedish Government (2002) *MISEP Basic Information Report 2002*

Swedish Government (2003a) *Bill 2002/03:44*

Swedish Government (2003b) *National Action Plan on Employment 2003*

Swedish Government (2005) *Det blågula glashuset – strukturell diskriminering i Sverige*, Betänkande av Utredningen om strukturell diskriminering på grund av etnisk eller religiös tillhörighet SOU 2005:56,Stockholm

Swedish Government (2004) 'Migration och integration – om framtidens arbetsmarknad' Annex 4 to *Långtidsutredningen 2003/04* Swedish government SOU 2004:73

Swedish Integration Board (2005) *Statistikrapport 2004*

Swedish Integration Board (2004) *Integrationsrapport 2003*

Swedish Integration Board (2003) *Uppsalamodellen – en model för effektivare integration*

Swedish National Agency for Education (2002) *Skolverkets uppdrag om sfi för högutbildade invandrare*

Swedish National Labour Market Administration (2003b) 'Överenskommelse för att förebygga och motverka diskriminering I Arbetsmarknadsverkets verksamhet'

Swedish National Labour market administration (2003a) 'Press release project "språnget"' 2003-02-19 www.ams.se

Swedish National Labour market administration (2004) 'Språnget hjälpte Galina till rätt spår', Arbetsmarknaden 2004-02-26 www.arbetsmarknaden.se

Trade Union Confederation (TUC) (2005) 'Fifty years to plug ethnic minority employment gap, says TUC' http://www.tuc.org.uk/equality/tuc-10161-f0.cfm

UK Cabinet Office (2003) *Ethnic Minorities and the Labour Market Final Report*

Working Group on ESOL (2000) *Breaking the language barriers* http://www.lifelonglearning.co.uk/esol/front.htm

UK Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2005) *Ethnicity and Education: the Evidence on Minority Ethnic Pupils*, Research Topic Paper RTP 01-05

UK National Employment Panel (2004) *Fair Cities: Employer-led Efforts that Produce Results for Ethnic Minorities*

UK National Employment Panel (2005) *Enterprising people, enterprising places* http://www.nationalemploymentpanel.org.uk/work/pbrreport.htm

Zegers de Beijl R (ed) (2000) *Documenting Discrimination Against Migrant Workers in the Labour Market A comparative study of four European countries*, ILO, Geneva

Chapter 4 - Social Protection

Appel, M., L. Wohlgenannt, P. Fernández de la Hoz (2005) 'Country Report of Austria' In: *Dimensions of Integration: Migrant Youth in Central European Countries*, IOM International Organization for Migration, Vienna

Baganha, M.I. (2000) 'Immigrants social citizenship and labour market dynamics in Portugal' In: M. Bommes & A. Geddes (eds.)

Baldwin-Edwards, M. (2002) *Immigration and the welfare state: a European challenge to American Mythology* UEHR Working Paper, MMO working paper No.4, Mediterranean Migration Observatory.

Bank, R. (2000) Europeanising the reception of asylum seekers: the opposite of welfare state politics. In: M. Bommes & A. Geddes (eds.)

Bichl, N. (2003) *Migrationspolitik in Österreich*. Referat im Rahmen des Treffen der development officer des europäischen Armutsnetzwerkes EAPN in Österreich / Mai 2003

Boeri, Tito, Gordon Hanson & Barry McCormick, Eds. (2002) *Immigration Policy and the Welfare System*; Oxford: Oxford University Press

Bommes, M., A. Geddes (eds.) (2000) *Immigration and welfare : challenging the borders of the Welfare State,* London and New York: Routledge

Brochman, Grete and Tomas Hammar (eds.) (1999) *Mechanisms of Immigration Control: A Comparative Analysis of European Regulation Policies,* Oxford: Berg.

CEC (2003) Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Immigration, Integration and Employment, COM (2003) 336 final

CEC (2004) Green Paper on an EU Approach to managing Economic Migration, COM (2004) 811 final

Chaloff, J. (2003). 'Italy', In: J Niessen, Y. Schibel and R. Magoni (eds) *EU and US approaches to the management of immigration,* Brussels/Rome, MPG.

Dansk flygtningehjaelp (2004) *Flygtninge i Danmark – integration*

Düvell, F (2005), 'Active Civic Participation of Immigrants in the United Kingdom' Country report prepared for the European research project POLITIS, Oldenburg.

Eckhart (2002) *Intercultural Mainstreaming, Empowerment and Capacity Building as Strategies of Women's Health Policy in Vienna - Selected Models of Good Practices,* Paper for the 7th Metropolis conference, September 9-13, 2002. http://www.international.metropolis.net/events/7th_conf_norway/papers/54_FEM-oslo-e.doc

EMN & IDOS (2004) *The impact of immigration on Italy's society.* Edited by IDOS, the Italian National Contact Point within EMN. European Migration Network. Rome

EMN & IOM Vienna (2004) The impact of immigration on Austria's society. Austrian contribution to the European pilot study " The impact of immigration on Europe's societies". Report of the Austrian Contact Point within the European Migration Network. Vienna

Engbersen, G., J.C. Vrooman, E. Snel (eds) (2000) *Balans van het armoedebeleid. Vijfde jaarrapport armoede en social uitsluiting,* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Entzinger, H. (2004). *Integration and Orientation Courses in a European Perspective*, Expert Report written for the Sachverständigenrat für Zuwanderung und Integration

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*; Princeton: Princeton University Press.

EuroHealthNet (2004) *Promoting social inclusion and tackling health inequalities in Europe: an overview of good practices from the health field.* Brussels

Fassmann, H & I Stacher (eds) (2003) *Österreichischer Migrations und Integrationsbericht: demographische.* Klagenfurt/Celovec: Verlag Drava

Ferrera, M. (1996) 'The southern model of welfare in social Europe' *Journal of European Social Policy,* 6/1, 17-37

Förster, M. & K. Heitzmann (2003) 'Einkommen und Armutsgefährdung von Migrantinnen in Österreich', In: Fassman & Stacher (eds)

Geddes. A (2000) *Denying access: asylum seekers and welfare benefits in the UK*, In: M Bommes & A. Geddes (eds)

Geddes, A. (2003) 'Migration and the Welfare State in Europe', *The Political Quarterly*, August 2003, vol. 74, pp. 150-162(13)

Goli, M & S Rezaei (2005) 'Active Civic Participation of Immigrants in Denmark', Country report prepared for the European research project POLITIS, Oldenburg

Government of Austria, (2003), *National Action Plan on social inclusion 2003-2005*

Government of Denmark, (2003), *National Action Plan on social inclusion 2003-2005*

Government of Italy, (2003), *National Action Plan on social inclusion 2003-2005*

Government of the UK, (2003)*, National Action Plan on social inclusion 2003-2005*

Groenendijk, K., E. Guild, R. Barzilay (2000) *The legal position of Third Country Nationals who are Long-term Residents in a Member State of the EU.* Study carried out on behalf of the European Commission (Directorate General for Justice and Home Affairs). Centre for Migration Law, University of Nijmegen

Guiraudon, V. (2000) The Marshallian triptych reordered: the role of courts and bureaucracies in furthering migrants' social rights. In: M. Bommes & A. Geddes (eds.)

Hammar, T. (1990) *Democracy and the Nation State*. Aldershot: Avebury

Hansen FK, Hansen H 2004 'Starthjælp og introduktionsydelse - Hvordan virker ydelserne?' CASA center for alternativ samfundsanalyse www.casa-analyse.dk

Herzog-Punzenberger, B. (2003) 'Ethnic segmentation in school and labor market – 40 year legacy of Austrian guestworker policy' *International Migration Review* 37(4): 1120-1144

Jonker, B. (2004) *RESOURCE Project: Refugees' contribution to Europe. Overall Summary.* Study carried out by Education Action International – RETAS as part of a European-wide research programme funded by the European Refugee Fund (ERF). London.

Kelly R, Morrell G. and Sriskandarajah D. (2005) Migration and Health in the UK. An IPPR FactFile. Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) London.

Kosic, Ankica, & Anna Triandafyllidou (2005) 'Active Civic Participation of immigrants in Italy' Country report prepared for the European research project POLITIS, Oldenburg

Kraler, A. & K. Sohler (2005) 'Active Civic Participation of Immigrants in Austria' Country Report prepared for the European research project POLITIS, Oldenburg

MFH Project, (2005) 'Project summary Migrant-Friendly Hospitals Project' March 2005.

Morissens, A (2003) *An Exploration of Immigrant's Inclusion in Different Welfare Regimes*, Paper prepared for the Young Researchers' Workshop, Stirling University, May 16-17 2003

Municipality of Forlì, et al (2003). *Access to the Health Services for Immigrant Women*, Final Report for the European Project "Immigrated Women Health Access, IWHA", available at http://www.comune.forli.fo.it/Documenti/39/relazione_finale_ing.pdf.

Nielsen, A. (2002) Sundhedsvæsenet og de etniske minoriteter. AMID Working Paper Series 28/2002. Academy for Migration Studies in Denmark.

OECD (2005) *Trends in International Migration,* Annual Report 2004, Paris, OECD

PICUM (n.d) Basic rights and social assistance to undocumented migrants. Platform for cooperation on undocumented migrants. PICUM website www.picum.org .[Accessed 25 May 2005]

Roberts, S. (2000) *Migration and social security: Parochialism in the global village*. Paper International Social Security Association (ISSA)

Ruspini, P (ed.) (2000) Easy scapegoats: Sans-Papiers immigrants in Italy. Report prepared for the project "Easy Scapegoats: Sans-Papiers Immigrants in Europe". (Weinheim: Freudenberg Stiftung)

Ruspini, P. (2004) *Public Policies and Community Services for Immigrants' Integration: Italy and the European Union*, Research Study for the project supported by the Italian Ministry of Labour and Social Policies "Immigrants' Integration Paths and active Labour Policies: National and International Experiences" (Milan: ISMU Foundation, 2004), unpublished.

Schoukens, P. (2004) *Exploratory report on the access to social protection for illegal labour migrants*, ISSA, Oslo meeting April 2004

Sciortino, G. (2004a) 'Immigration in a Mediterranean Welfare State: The Italian Experience in a Comparative Perspective', *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis* 6/2: 111-129

Sciortino, G (2004b) 'When Domestic Labour is Not Native Labour: the Interaction of Immigration Policy and Welfare Regime in Italy', in Gorny, A., P. Ruspini, (eds) *Migration in the New Europe: East-West Revisited* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2004), pp. 177-198.

Sriskandarajah, D., L. Cooley, H. Reed (2005). *Paying their way: the fiscal contribution of immigrants in the UK*. London: Institute for Public Policy Research.

Steinhilber, S. (2003) *The Specific Situation of Female Migrant Workers in Relation to Social Security*, Report to the Committee of Experts on Co-ordination in the Field of Social Security of the Council of Europe.

Tamsma, N. P. C. Berman (2004) *The role of the health care sector in tackling poverty and social exclusion in Europe*. EuroHealthNet and the European Health Management Association.

Think Tank on integration in Denmark (2002) *The integration of foreigners in the Danish society*

Unger, Brigitte, and Karin Heitzmann (2003) 'The adjustment path of the Austrian welfare state: back to Bismarck?' *Journal of European Social Policy* 13 (4)

Waldrauch, H. (2003) *Austria - Immigration and integration of foreign nationals: flows, stocks and policies*. Report prepared for the Forum Internazionale ed Europeo di Ricerche sull'Immigrazione (FIERI), FIERI website http:// 194.116.10.213/fieri/

Zetter, R., D. Griffiths, et al. (2002). *Survey on policy and practice related to refugee integration. Main Report.* Commissioned by European Refugee Fund Community Actions 2001/2 and conducted by School of Planning, Oxford Brookes University. Draft final report December 2002, Oxford Brookes University.

Zincone, G., (2004) 'Main features of Italian immigration flows and stock'. Document on FIERI website, http:// 194.116.10.213/fieri/

Chapter 5 - Social Cohesion

Bade, K.J. & M. Bommes (2000) Migration und politische Kultur im „Nicht-Einwanderungsland. In: K.J. Bade, R. Münz (Eds.) *Migrationsreport 2000. Fakten, Analysen, Perspektiven*. Frankfurt am Main/ New York, pp. 163-204.

Blok Committee (2004) Bruggen bouwen. [Building Bridges] 'Final Report from the Temporary Committee to investigate integration policy in the Netherlands' (Tijdelijke Commissie Onderzoek Integratiebeleid), Lower House, 2003-2004, 28 689, no. 8-9

Caldeira M J et al (2003) 'Lisboa' in *Migrant integration in European cities*
Ethnobarometer www.ethnobarometer.org

City of Rotterdam, (2002a) *The new élan of Rotterdam….And this is how we do it* Program of the City Council of Rotterdam.

City of Rotterdam, (2002b) *Samenleven in Rotterdam. Deltaplan Inburgering: op weg naar actief burgerschap* [Living together in Rotterdam: Delta plan for integration: on our way to active citizenship]. November 2002.

City of Rotterdam, (2002c) *Mensen maken de stad.*

City of Rotterdam, (2003b) *Rotterdam zet door. Op weg naar een stad in balans*. [Rotterdam continues, on the pathway to a balanced city]. December 2003.

City of Stuttgart, (2003) *A Pact for Integration: The Stuttgart Experience*. Landeshauptstadt Stuttgart, Der Oberbürgermeister (the Lord Mayor).

City of Stuttgart, (2004) *Ein Bündnis für Integration. Grundlagen einer Integrationspolitik in der Landeshauptstadt Stuttgart*. New Edition of the 2001 program. Stuttgart, Stabsabteilung für Integrationspolitik (Department of Integration).

Conseil d'Analyse Economique (2004) *Ségrégation urbaine et intégration sociale*. La documentation Française

Conseil Economique et Sociale (CES) (2004) *Avant-projet de loi de programmation pour la cohésion sociale*. La documentation Française

COS (2003) *Prognose Bevolkingsontwikkeling Rotterdam 2003-2017*. [Prognosis for Population Groups 2003-2017]. Centre for Research and Statistics (COS) of the City of Rotterdam.

Cour des Comptes (2004) *L'accueil des immigrants et l'intégration des populations issues de l'immigration*

Crul, M. & H. Vermeulen (2003) 'The second generation in Europe. Introduction'. *International Migration Review* 37 : 965-986.

Cyrus, N. & D. Vogel (2003) 'Germany'. *EU and US approaches to the management of immigration,* Brussels/Rome, MPG.

DARES (2003) *Les adultes-relais : premiers éléments d'évaluation*. Ministère de l'Emploi, du Travail et de la Cohésion Sociale

Dornette, J (2004) *Big City Policy in Germany*, Development Corporation Amsterdam 2004

Dutch Government (2004) *The Government response to the report entitled "Bruggen bouwen" [Building bridges] from the Temporary Committee to Investigate Integration Policy (the Blok committee*), May 2004.

Dutch Minister of Aliens Affairs and Integration (2003), Letter on 'New Style Integration Policy', September 2003, Lower House of Dutch Parliament, 2003-2004, 29 203 no. 1.

Dutch Ministry of Aliens Affairs and Integration (2005a) 'Nota Breed Initiatief Maatschappelijke Binding'. [Memorandum on Broad Initiative on Social Cohesion]16 March 2005.

Dutch Ministry of Aliens Affairs and Integration (2005b) 'Nota weerbaarheid tegen radicalisering van moslimjongeren' [Memorandum on society's self defence against radicalisation among Muslim youth] 25 March 2005

ECRI (2005) "Third Report on France" European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)

Equal Treatment Commission (2005) 'Advice on the housing policy of the city of Rotterdam' Commissie Gelijke Behandeling (CGB), 7 July 2005.

Espinasse M-T (1998) 'Development of urban policy in France 1977-1996' in *Immigration, integration and cities – exploring the links* OECD 1998

Esteves A et al (2003) 'Country report – Portugal'. *MPG: EU and US approaches to the management of immigration* Migration policy group www.migpolgroup.com

European Commission (2004) *The Social Situation in the European Union 2004.*

Fermin, A., K. Le Blansch, G. Bonevacia,V. Smeulders (2003) Quick Scan Ondersteuning Initiatieven Antillianen. Report for the Ministry of Justice/DCIM. The Hague: Consultancy QA+.

Fonseca, M.L., J. Malheiros, A. Esteves, 2004, Portugal: the multilevel governance of migration. Text for FIERI web site: http://194.116.10.212/fieri/

FORUM (2004) *Het Integratiebeleid na het parlementair onderzoek* [Integration policy after the Dutch Integration Policy Investigation]. Utrecht, FORUM Institute for Multicultural Development.

Freedman J (2004) *Immigration and insecurity in France,* Aldershot, Ashgate

Green, S (2001) 'Immigration, Asylum and Citizenship in Germany: The Impact of Unification and the Berlin Republic', *West European Politics* 24/4

Haut Conseil à l'Integration (2003) *Le contrat et l'intégration.* La documentation Française.

Heckmann, F. (2003) 'From ethnic nation to universalist immigrant integration: Germany' In: Heckmann & Schnapper (eds) 2003, *The integration of immigrants in European Societies.*

High Commissioner for Immigration and Ethnic Minorities www.acime.gov.pt

ILO (2004), *The fight against poverty and social exclusion in Portugal – experiences from the national programme of fight against poverty*

ISEO & COS (2004) Integratie en inburgering in Rotterdam. Minderhedenmonitor 2003. [Minority monitor 2003 commissioned by the city of Rotterdam]. Rotterdam

Kommission "Zuwanderung", (2001) 'Zuwanderung gestalten - Integration fördern. Bericht der Unabhängigen Kommission "Zuwanderung"'

Koopmans, R. (2004) 'Migrant mobilisation and political opportunities: variations among German cities and a comparison with the United Kingdom and the Netherlands', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30(3): 449-470.

Kraal, K. (2003a) 'The Amsterdam Mentoring Project' In: Zolberg & Clarking (eds.).

Kraal, K. (2003b) Establishing a Turkish Mosque in Amsterdam. In: Zolberg & Clarking (eds.).

Ligue des droits de l'Homme (2002) CODAC et 114, Rapport de Synthèse de la LDH 2001/2002' http://www.ldh-france.org/docu_groupes3.cfm?idgroupe=167&idpere=162

Maurer, S. (2003a) Paris: Direct action for immigrant housing. In: Zolberg & Clarking (eds.).

Maurer, S. (2003b) 'Women mediators of the 20th district of Paris'. In: Zolberg & Clarking (eds.).

Ministère de l'Emploi, du Travail et de la Cohésion Sociale (2003) *National Action Plan for Social Inclusion 2003-2005*

Ministère délégué à la ville (2000) 'Circulaire DIV/DPT-IEDE/2000/231 du 26 avril 2000 relative à la mise en œuvre du dispositif des adultes-relais dans le cadre de la politique de la ville'

Ministère de l'intérieur (2004) 'Circulaire NOR/INT/K/04/00117/C relative à des Missions nouvelles des commissions départementales d'accès à la citoyenneté (CODAC), commissions pour la promotion de l'égalité des chances et la citoyenneté' (COPEC)

Moore, D. (2004) 'Migrants as mediators in a comparative perspective' In: R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello, S. Vertovec (eds.) *Citizenship in European cities. Immigrants, local politics and integration policies*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 127-138.

PaVEM, 2005, 'Participation Agenda 2020'. Committee for Participation of Women from Ethnic Minorities.

Portugese Decree-law no 251/2002

Portugese Government (2003) *Plan National d'Action pour l'Inclusion, Portugal* http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/social_inclusion/naps_en.htm

PRI (Policy Research Initiative) (2005) *Social Capital as a Public Policy Tool Project Report* September 2005.

PRI & OECD (2004) *The Opportunity and Challenge of Diversity: A Role for Social Capital?* Synthesis Report PRI-OECD Conference Nov. 2003.

PRI & OECD (2003) *The Opportunity and Challenge of Diversity: A Role for Social Capital?* Background Documents. PRI-OECD Conference Nov. 2003.

Rufin (2004) J-C "Chantier sur la lutte contre le racisme et l'antisemitisme". Ministère de l'intérieur, de la sécurité intérieure et des libertés locales. Documentation Française

Snel, E., J. de Boom, G. Engbersen (2005) *Migration and migration policies in the Netherlands 2003*. Dutch SOPEMI-report 2003. Rotterdam: Risbo.

Stasi B (2004) *Vers la haute autorité de lutte contre les discriminations et pour l'égalité : rapport au Premier ministre*, La Documentation Française

Teixeira A, Albuquerque R (2005) 'Active Civic Participation of Immigrants in Portugal' Country Report prepared for the European research project POLITIS, Oldenburg www.uni-oldenburg.de/politis-europe

Tillie, J (2004) 'Social Capital of Organisations and Their Members: Explaining the Political Integration of Immigrants in Amsterdam', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30(3): 529–541

Toubon J (2004) *Mission de préconfiguration du centre des ressources et de mémoires de l'immigration*. La documentation Française

Van den Berg, L. et al, 2004, National Urban Policies in the European Union. EURICUR/EUR

Zolberg, A. R., and A.J. Clarking (eds.) (2003) *Sharing Integration Experiences: Innovative community practices on two continents*. New York: International Centre for Migration, Ethnicity and Citizenship, New School University.

Chapter 6 – The New Member States

Active civic participation of immigrants in Europe: Overview, (2005). European Research project POLITIS, Oldenburg.

Andreev, S.A. (2005) 'Active Civic Participation of Immigrants in Slovenia' Country report prepared for the European research project POLITIS, Oldenburg.

CEC (2003) *Equality, Diversity and Enlargement.* DG Employment and Social Affairs

CEC (2004) *Equality and non-discrimination Annual report 2004*

CEC (2005) *Report on social inclusion 2005.* An analysis of the National Action Plans on Social Inclusion (2004-2006) submitted by the 10 new Member States. European Commission, Employment and Social Affairs DG.

Černík, J. (2005*)* 'Active Civic Participation of Immigrants in the Czech Republic' Country report prepared for the European research project POLITIS, Oldenburg

Czech Republic, (2004) *National Action Plan on Social Inclusion 2004 – 2006*, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs

Drbohlav, D. (2003) Czech Republic. In: J. Niessen, Y. Schibel and R. Magoni (eds*), EU and US approaches to the management of immigration*, Brussels/Rome, MPG.

Drbohlav, D. (2004) 'Czech Republic, The times they are a-changing', Volume II of *Migration Trends in selected EU Applicant Countries* (European Commission funded Project). Vienna, International Organization for Migration (IOM).

Drbohlav, D. (2005) The Czech Republic: From Liberal Policy to EU Membership. Migration Information Source (MPI). MPI website.

Drbohlav, D., J. Černík & D. Dzurova (2005) 'Country report on the Czech Republic' In: IOM, *Dimensions of Integration: Migrant Youth in Central European Countries.* (European Commission funded Project). Vienna, International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Erjavec, K. (2003) 'Media construction of identity through moral panics: discourses of immigration in Slovenia', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 29 (1): 83–101.

Giudici, C. & A. Guarneri (2004) *Migrations and living conditions in new Member States and Candidate countries: a regional approach,* Paper for the 2nd Conference of the EAPS Working Group on International Migration in Europe, Rome, Nov. 2004

Government of Poland (2004) *National Action Plan on Social Inclusion for 2004-2006*, Ministry of Social Policy, Warsaw.

Iglicka, K. (2005) Active Civic Participation of Immigrants in Poland, Country Report prepared for the European research project POLITIS, Oldenburg

Korys (2004) 'Poland, Dilemmas of a sending and Receiving Country' Volume III of *Migration Trends in selected EU Applicant Countries,* (European Commission funded Project). Vienna, International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Korys, I. (2005) 'Country report on Poland', in: IOM, *Dimensions of Integration: Migrant Youth in Central European Countries.* (European Commission funded Project). Vienna, International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Kraler, A. & K. Iglicka (2002) Labour migration in Central and Eastern European Countries. In: F. Laczko, I. Stacher, A. Klekowski von Koppenfels (eds.) New challenges for migration policy in Central and Eastern Europe. IOM and ICMPD. The Hague: T.M.C. Asser Press: 27-44.

Kymlicka (2000) 'Estonia's integration policies in a comparative perspective', in *Estonia's Integration Landscape: From Apathy to Harmony,* Talinn: Jaan Tonissoni Instituut, pp. 29-57

OECD (2004) *OECD economic survey of the Czech Republic 2004*

OECD, (2005) *Trends in International Migration, SOPEMI 2004* Edition. Paris

Popov, A. (2004) *Can Your Motherland Hurt Your Chances to Get a Job Abroad? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination Against Legal Foreigners in the Czech Republic.* Paper. Department of Economics, University of Chicago

Salt, J. (2003) *Current trends in international migration in Europe,* Council of Europe

Zavratnic Zimic, S. (2004) 'Slovenia: The perspective of a Country on the 'Schengen Periphery'. *Migration Trends - Volume VI.* (European Commission funded Project). Vienna, International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Chapter 7 – The EU Policy Framework

Brubaker, R. (2001) 'The Return of Assimilation? Changing Perspectives on Immigration and Its Sequels in France, Germany, and the United States', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24: 4, 531-548.

Cabinet Office (2003) *Ethnic Minorities in the Labour Market*, London: Cabinet Office.

Caporaso, J. (1996) 'The European Union and forms of state: Westphalian, Regulatory or Post-Modern?, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34 (1), 29-52.

Caviedes, A. (2004) 'The open method of co-ordination: a tool for prising open fortress Europe?', *Journal of European Public Policy,* 11 (2) 289-310.

CEC (2000) *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on a Community Immigration Policy*, COM (2000) 757 final.

CEC (2001a) *White Paper on European Governance*, COM (2001) 408 final.

CEC (2001b) *Communication on a Community Immigration Policy*, COM (2000) 757 final.

CEC (2001c) *Communication on an Open Method of Co-ordination for the Community Immigration Policy*, COM (2001) 0387 final.

CEC (2003) *Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Immigration, Integration and Employment*, COM (2003) 336 final.

CEC (2003) *Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions First Annual Report on Migration and Integration*, COM (2004) 508 final.

CEC (2004a) *Green Paper on an EU Approach to managing Economic Migration*, COM (2004) 811 final.

CEC (2004b) *Handbook on Integration for Policy-Makers and Practitioners*, Brussels: Directorate General for Freedom, Security and Justice, November 2004.

CEC (2005) *Communication from the Commission on the Social Agenda*, COM (2005) 33 final.

CEC/Council (2004) *Joint Report on Social Inclusion*, 7101/04.

European Civic Citizenship and Inclusion Index (2005), London/Brussels: Foreign Policy Centre/British Council Brussels/Migration Policy Group.

European Council (1999) *Conclusions*, Tampere, October 1999.

European Council (2000) *Conclusions*, Lisbon, March 2000.

European Council (2003) *Conclusions*, Thessaloniki, June 2003.

European Council (2004) *Conclusions*, The Hague, November 2004.

Favell, A. (2001) 'Immigration Policy and Integration Research in Europe: A Review and a Critique', in T. A. Aleinikoff and D. Kluesmeyer, *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*, Washington DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Favell, A. (2001) *Philosophies of Integration: Immgiration and the Idea of Citizenship in Britain and France*, 2nd edition, Palgrave Macmillan: London.

Groenendijk, K. (2004) 'Legal concepts of integration in EU migration law, *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 6: 2, 111-126.

Joppke, C. and Morawska, E. (2003) *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*, London: Palgrave.

Kok, W. (2004) Facing the Challenge: The Lisbon Strategy for Growth and Employment, High Level Group on Lisbon Strategy, Brussels.

Munz, R. (2004) *Migration, Labour markets and Migrants' Integration in Europe: A Comparison*, Paper for the EU-US Seminar on Integrating Immigrants into the Workforce, Washington DC June 28-29 2004.

Papademetriou, D. & O'Neill, K. (2004) *Efficient Practices for the Selection of Economic Migrants*, Paper prepared for the European Commission DG Social Affairs and Employment.

Scharpf, F. (2001) European Governance: Common Concerns versus The Challenges of Diversity, NYU School of Law, Jean Monnet Center Symposium 'Mountain or molehill? A critical appraisal of the Commission White Paper on Governance', http://www.jeanmonnetprogram.org/papers/01/010701.html.

Annex I: Indicators for integration

Entzinger, H. & R. Biezeveld, 2003, Benchmarking in Immigrant Integration. Report for the European Commission. EUR

Heckmann, F., 1999, Integration Policies in Europe: National differences or convergence? EFMS Paper Nr. 33.

Penninx, R., 2004, Integration policies for Europe's immigrants: performance, conditions and challenges. An expert paper for the Sachverständigenrat für Zuwanderung und Integration.

WODC, 2004, De ontwikkeling van een integratiekaart. The Hague: WODC/Ministry of Justice.

Annex II: Data on Immigration and Integration

Baldwin-Edwards, M. (2002) Immigration and the Welfare State: a European challenge to American Ideology.
Table 2: Public social expenditure, % GDP, 1997.

Boeri, T., G. Hanson, B. McCormick,(2002) Immigration Policy and the Welfare System. Table 3.2 (page 74): Welfare dependency of EU citizens and migrants form non-EU countries.

Ederveen, S. et al (2004) Destination Europe. Immigration and integration in the European Union. European Outlook 2. Annex to the State of the European Union 2005. CPB/SCP/CBS, The Hague.
Figure 2.13 (page 41): Unemployment rate of immigrants 15-64 years, by country

EU (2004e) The Social Situation in the European Union 2004. Table p. 105: Share of non-national citizens living in the EU-25 Member States, 2002 or more recent available data

European Commission (2004d) *Employment in Europe*. DG Employment and Social Affairs Table 14 "Employment rate of the 15-64 years population for EU-15 (less DE and IT)" p.54

Eurostat (2004) Yearbook 2004, p. 52: Net migration, including corrections Per 1 000 inhabitants

OECD (2005) *Trends in international migration, annual report 2004*
Figure I.10 "Employment and unemployment rates for selected categories of workers according to nationality, 2002-2003 average" p. 62 (selected EU Member States)
Figure I.11 "Proportion of foreign or foreign-born in total unemployment, relative to their share in the labour force, 2002-2003 average" p.63
Table I.20 Acquisition of nationality in selected OECD countries (p.111)

Reyneri, E. (2001) Migrants' involvement in irregular employment in the Mediterreanean countries of the European Union. ILO IMP-Working Papers 41

Table 2 (p.6) Numbers of authorised foreign people (residence permits) and estimates of unauthorised immigrants.

Salt, J. (2005a) Current Trends in International Migration in Europe. Council of Europe
Table 4: Stock of foreign population as a percentage of total population in selected European countries, 1995-2003 (per cent)
Table 6: Size of the foreign born and foreign-national populations in selected European countries, according to the 2001 (or latest) national census

Salt, J. (2005b) Types of migration in Europe: implications and policy concerns. Paper European Population Conference 2005. Strasbourg 7-8 April 2005
Table 3 (p.10): Immigration flows to selected European countries.

Schneider, F (2004) The Size of the Shadow Economies of 145 Countries all over the World:First Results over the Period 1999 to 2003
Table 3.5: The Size of the Shadow Economy in 21 OECD Countries