



CIT5-CT-2005-028802

LOCALMULTIDEM

Multicultural Democracy and Immigrants' Social Capital in Europe:
Participation, Organisational Networks, and Public Policies at the Local Level

SPECIFIC TARGETED RESEARCH PROJECT (STREP)

PRIORITY 7: Citizens and Governance in a Knowledge Based Society

Deliverable no. 1:
WP1 Political Opportunity Structures Indicators,
Guidelines for Data Collection

Due date of deliverable: 31 March 2006 (45 calendar days = 15 May 2006)
Actual submission date: 11 May 2006 (Final version: 14 March 2008)

Start date of project: 1 February 2006

Duration: 36 months

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable: Fondation Nationale de Sciences Politiques (FNSP-CEVIPOF, France, partner 3) and Université de Genève (UNIGE, Switzerland, partner 2)

Revision: [2]

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework Programme (2002-2006)		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	X
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

INTRODUCTION

This document constitutes the basis and guidelines for the data collection of POS indicators, the main goal of workpackage 1. The following guidelines will be followed by all six participating teams, when collecting the data in their case studies and when producing the country reports. Two different processes of data collection, and thus two different sets of guidelines, have been agreed: institutional POS indicators, and discursive POS indicators.

Institutional POS indicators:

About 100 indicators have been defined in order to grasp a wide range of various aspects of the institutional political opportunity structure that can have an effect on immigrants' political integration.

Different dimensions are considered. The first refers to immigrants' individual rights, in particular rights related to the access to the community (permits to stay, rules for the acquisition of the host nationality, etc.), socio-economic rights, anti-discrimination and local political rights. For this dimension, the *Civic Index* of the Migration Policy Group has been used as a source of useful and comparable indicators.

The second dimension concerns group-related rights: cultural requirements to access the community, as well as collective resources and rights immigrants have in the host country at the local level. The various fields of education, religious practices and representation in the media, are taken into account. For this dimension, previous work and indicators by Koopmans et al. (2005) have been used as sources for the elaboration of our indicators.

Thirdly, the specific institutional local political opportunity structure is considered, both general (configuration of powers at the national and local levels and local participation mechanisms) and specific to immigrants (policies towards immigrants and immigrants' organizations).

For comparative purposes, a 3-level scoring has been used for each indicator, in addition to the narrative presentation of the indicator (which is included in Deliverable 5). The score "-1" refers to the most restrictive situation that can be envisaged, the score "1" corresponds to the most open configuration and the score "0" applies to intermediary potential situations.

Discursive POS indicators:

Our intention is to conduct a systematic analysis of 'discursive interventions' in reports of main newspapers in our cities, drawing on the established method of 'political claims analysis'. Political claims analysis builds on protest event analyses as developed in the field of social movements and collective action, but extends the method to include speech acts and public discourse variables. Whereas protest event analysis takes protest as an indicator of the level of challenges to the political system, political discourse analysis takes the emergence and public visibility of movement "frames" as an indicator for the "meaning giving" side of challenges to dominant political and cultural norms, values, and problem definitions. The two approaches focus on different dimensions of collective challenges to political power: the first relating an action type variable – protests – to institutional

political opportunities; and the second relating an interpretative scheme variable – frames – to the dominant sets of cultural and political norms, i.e., in our terminology to discursive opportunity structures.

The dataset will be uniformly built through collection of discursive interventions at the specific level in each locality. Each of these discursive interventions is characterised by a typical structure. We focus on the most important variables that allow us to grasp in each country the discursive interventions in the field of immigration and ethnic relations both at the national and at the local level. Actor, object, addressee, and issue of the discursive intervention are the main variables for data collection and analysis, which will be carried out with SPSS software. In addition, we will also code information on the ‘position towards the object’ so as to evaluate which actors intervene more explicitly in favour or against the interests of immigrants. Finally, we will collect the usual information on timing (day, month and year, summarised in a single 8-digit variable) of each discursive intervention.

This document provides all the text documents that form the guidelines and instructions for the data collection process of WP1. Additionally, the two leading partners provided an SPSS blank data file to be used as the template for data entry, which can not be included in this text document.

INSTITUTIONAL POS INDICATORS

GUIDELINES ON THE STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT, LIST OF INDICATORS AND SCORING

INTRODUCTION SECTION

Write a brief introduction (1-2 pages) with a presentation of the general immigration situation:

- **the current situation of immigration** in the country/city: the nature of immigration (work immigration, family immigration, etc.), its newness or oldness (newly arrived immigrants/second and third generation), its importance.
- **main current issues related to immigration in the public debate** in the country/city over the last years
- main lines of the **recent laws/public programs** on immigration
- + **all other relevant information to understand the indicators.**

NOTE ON SCORING: each time a split according to the three ethnic groups is requested, a **general score** representing the situation of the “typical” immigrant (in the statistical sense) in the country/city must also be added.

I – INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

1. ACCESS TO THE COMMUNITY

Presentation of the **main types of permits** in the country.

a) Short-term permits

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
1	Automatic acquisition of the permit if mother or father of a national minor child Split: For each of the three groups	No such a provision exists or further conditions apply	Only if she/he contributes financially to the child's raising and if the child is unmarried <i>and/or</i> with economic requirements	More open conditions
2	Automatic acquisition of the permit if marriage with a national Split: For each of the three groups	No such a provision exists or further conditions apply (length of marriage > 1 year)	If length of marriage is at least = 1 year <i>and/or</i> with economic requirements	More open conditions (no condition of length of marriage, no economic requirements...)
3	Economic resources requirement Split: For each of the three groups	Additional requirements (for example accommodation requirements as well)	At least the level of the minimal social income (provided by the welfare state to support the poorest people)	More open conditions
4	Link between work	Obligation to first	Obligation only for	Possibility to stay in

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
	regime and permit regime Split: For each of the three groups	have a work contract to stay on the territory	some economic sectors	the territory without work contract, to search for a job
5	Grounds for withdrawal: a. proven fraud in the acquisition of permit b. sentence for serious crimes c. actual and serious threat to public policy or national security d. sufficient level of resources Split: For each of the three groups	Grounds include d <i>or</i> other than a-b-c	Grounds include c but not d	No other than a-b

b) Long-term residence permits (duration of validity: ≥ 5 years)

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
6	Acquisition of the permit if mother or father of a national minor child Split: For each of the three groups	No such a provision exists or further conditions apply	If length of residence is $>2 < 5$ years (with or without economic requirements)	More open conditions (required time of residence shorter, etc.)
7	Acquisition of the permit if marriage with a national Split: For each of the three groups	Further conditions <i>Code -1 the situation where the two conditions (length of marriage and residence) are cumulative and one of them ≥ 5 years</i>	If length of marriage $>2 < 5$ years and/or if length of residence $>2 < 5$ years (with or without economic requirements)	More open conditions of length of marriage and/or of length of residence (with or without economic requirements) <i>Code +1 the situation where the two conditions (length of marriage and residence) are not cumulative (but alternative) and one of them ≤ 2 years</i>
8	Required minimum time of habitual residence Split: For each of the three groups	> 6 years	$> 4 \leq 6$ years	≤ 4 years
9	Economic resources requirement Split: For each of the three groups	Additional requirements (for example accommodation requirements as well)	At least the level of the minimal social income (provided by the welfare state to support the poorest people)	More open conditions
10	Percentage of given permits over the total number of applications – National Level	< 50 %	$\geq 50 < 80$ %	≥ 80 %

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
	Split: For each of the three groups			
11	Grounds for withdrawal: a. proven fraud in the acquisition of permit b. sentence for serious crimes c. actual and serious threat to public policy or national security d. sufficient level of resources Split: For each of the three groups	Grounds include d <i>or</i> other than a-b-c	Grounds include c but not d	No other than a-b
12	Expulsion precluded a. after 20 years of residence as a long-term residence permit holder b. in case of minors c. residents born in the host country or admitted before they were 10, once they have reached the age of 18 Split: For each of the three groups	None	- At least a <i>or</i> b - or in all three cases, except in case of heavy sentences (prison sentences ≥ 5 years or serious threat to national security such as espionage, terrorism etc.)	In all three cases

c) Access to nationality

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
13	Eligibility for second and third generation immigrants (<i>jus soli</i>) Split: For each of the three groups	Further requirements (continuous residence since birth, etc.)	On application at a certain age (16/18 years, or before if parents can ask for their child) <i>and</i> with a condition of length of residence: ≤ 5 years	Automatically at birth
14	Marriage with a national Split: For each of the three groups	Further conditions <i>Code -1 the situation where the two conditions (length of marriage and residence) are cumulative and one of them > 5 years</i>	If length of marriage $> 3 \leq 5$ years and/or if length of residence $> 3 \leq 5$ (with or without economic requirements)	More open conditions of length of marriage and/or of length of residence (with or without economic requirements) <i>Code +1 the situation where the two conditions (length of marriage and residence) are not</i>

				<i>cumulative (but alternative) and one of them ≤ 3 years</i>
15	Required minimum time of habitual residence Split: For each of the three groups	> 8 years	> 5 \leq 8 years	≤ 5 years
16	Economic resources requirement for naturalization (first generation immigrants) Split: For each of the three groups	Additional requirements (for example accommodation requirements as well)	At least the level of the minimal social income (provided by the welfare state to support the poorest people)	More open conditions
17	Percentage of approved naturalizations over the total number of applications – National level Split: For each of the three groups	< 50 %	$\geq 50 < 80$ %	≥ 80 %
18	Grounds for withdrawing status: a. proven fraud in the acquisition of citizenship b. actual and serious threat to public policy or national security Split: For each of the three groups	Other than a-b	No other than a-b	No other than a

2. FAMILY REUNION

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
19	Eligibility for legal residents Split: For each of the three groups	≥ 2 years of legal residence <i>and/or</i> holding a permit for ≥ 2 years	> 1 year of legal residence <i>and/or</i> holding a permit for > 1 year	≤ 1 year of legal residence <i>and/or</i> holding a residence permit for ≤ 1 year
20	Economic resources requirement Split: For each of the three groups	Additional requirements (for example accommodation requirements as well)	At least the level of the minimal social income (provided by the welfare state to support the poorest people)	More open conditions
21	Duration of validity of permit Split: For each of the three groups	≤ 1 year renewable permit <i>or</i> new application necessary	- Depends on sponsor's permit (but not equal to it) <i>or</i> - > 1 year renewable permit but not equal to sponsor's	Equal to sponsor's residence permit and renewable
22	Grounds for withdrawing: a. Public policy or security major threat	Other grounds	Grounds include c	No other than a-b

	<p>b. Proven fraud in the acquisition of permit (inexistent relationship or misleading information).</p> <p>c. Break-up of family relationship (before three years)</p> <p><i>Do not forget to also consider economic requirements or other requirements (because the score is then -1)</i></p> <p>Split: For each of the three groups</p>			
23	<p>Right to autonomous residence permit for partners and children reaching age of majority</p> <p>Split: For each of the three groups</p> <p>Split (if needed): one score for partner; one score for children</p>	After > 5 years <i>or</i> upon certain conditions	After > 3 ≤ 5 years	After ≤ 3 years
24	<p>Percentage of entrances in the territory through family reunion over the total number of applications – National level</p> <p>Split: For each of the three groups</p>	< 50 %	≥ 50 < 80 %	≥ 80 %

3. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RIGHTS

a) Labour market access

- *Short-term permits*

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
25	Access to employment Split: For each of the three groups	Legal limitations in both public and private sector	Legal limitations in the public sector only (also for activities not involving an actual participation to the exercise of public authority)	Equal access with nationals, excluding the activities involving an actual participation to the exercise of public authority (such as the army, the police, the magistracy, the diplomatic corps...)
26	Termination of a foreigner's work contract is a reason for revoking or refusing to renew his/her permit of stay Split: For each of the three groups Only consider <i>workers</i> here (not immigrant with another status: family, student, etc.)	In all cases except if the foreigner has a new job/a new job offer	Not if the foreigner has lost his/her job: a new permit is then granted for ≤ 6 months	Not if the foreigner has lost his/her job: more open conditions (new permit granted for more than 6 months ; possible new extension afterwards on some conditions, etc.)

- *Long-term residence (duration of validity: ≥ 5 years)*

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
27	Access to employment Split: For each of the three groups	Legal limitations in both public and private sector	Legal limitations in the public sector only (also for activities not involving an actual participation to the exercise of public authority)	Equal access with nationals, excluding the activities involving an actual participation to the exercise of public authority (such as the army, the police, the magistracy, the diplomatic corps...)
28	Unemployment is a reason for revoking or	Yes (or except if the foreigner still has	Only if it results in the foreigner's	Not at all

	refusing to renew his/her permit of stay Split: For each of the three groups. Only consider <i>workers</i> here (not immigrant with another status: family, student, etc.)	sufficient resources to live)	welfare dependence (ie for his/her minimum income to live) <i>for a long period</i> (≥ 1 year)	
--	--	-------------------------------	--	--

b) Welfare state access

- Illegal immigrants

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
29	Access to social security, social assistance and healthcare for illegal immigrants Split: For each of the three groups	No access	- Only health assistance - or health assistance and other types of assistance but all related to dangerous and emergency situations - or legal access but low/no implementation	Health assistance <i>and</i> other social rights (for example: some minimal child benefits, urgent housing...)

- Short-term permits

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
30	Access to social security, social assistance and healthcare for non-nationals a. minimum income support b. minimum housing support c. family and child benefits d. assistance in case of illness e. pregnancy and maternity care f. long-term care Split: For each of the three groups	Less than core benefits <i>or</i> no access	- Limitation to core benefits: a, d, e and f - or access to all benefits but with conditions of time of residence/of legal employment for one or some of them - or legal access but limited/no implementation - or legal access but possible negative consequences for immigrants (for example: risk of expulsion or permit withdrawal if welfare dependent)	Equal access with nationals for all these benefits

- Long-term residence permits

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
31	Access to social security, social assistance and healthcare for non-nationals a. minimum income support b. minimum housing support c. family and child benefits d. assistance in case of illness e. pregnancy and maternity care f. long-term care Split: For each of the three groups	Less than core benefits <i>or</i> no access	- Limitation to core benefits: a, d, e and f - or access to all benefits but with conditions of time of residence/of legal employment for one or some of them - or legal access but limited/no implementation - or legal access but possible negative consequences for immigrants (for example: risk of expulsion or permit withdrawal if welfare dependent)	Equal access with nationals for all these benefits

4. ANTI-DISCRIMINATION RIGHTS

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
32	Legislation against ethnic discriminations (mentioning the criteria of “race”, “origin”, “ethnic belonging” or other formula referring to ethnic discriminations): type of actions”.	No legislation against ethnic discriminations	Legislation only against actions (for example: to refuse a good or a service to a person due to his/her race/origin)	Legislation against actions and words (oral or written racial defamation; racial insults...)
33	(if a legislation exists) Types of sanctions in case of racially discriminatory hiring	Only fines	Possibility of imprisonment < 2 years maximum	Possibility of imprisonment ≥ 2 years or ≤ 2 years <i>with</i> loss of rights
34	Public structures dealing with ethnic discriminations	None	Structures with only a consultative/ study role	Structures with stronger powers (help and information to victims, significant role in the definition and implementation of public policies, etc.)

5. POLITICAL RIGHTS

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
35	Right to vote in local elections Split: For each of the three groups <i>Disregard EU nationals for general score</i>	No right	Right: with a condition of length of residence ≥ 5 years <i>or</i> with a condition of length of residence <i>and</i> another condition	Right with a condition of length of residence < 5 years
36	Right to stand for local elections Split: For each of the three groups <i>Disregard EU nationals for general score</i>	No right	Right: with a condition of length of residence ≥ 5 years <i>or</i> with a condition of length of residence <i>and</i> another condition <i>or</i> restricted to certain posts	Unrestricted right with a condition of length of residence < 5 years

II – CULTURAL/GROUP RIGHTS

1. CULTURAL REQUIREMENTS TO ACCESS THE COMMUNITY

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
37	Cultural requirements for obtaining short-term permits Split: For each of the three groups	Language requirement and other cultural conditions (such as knowledge of history/culture/civic knowledge)	- Language requirement only - or cultural requirements only for the renewal of the permit	None
38	Cultural requirements for obtaining long-term residence permits (duration of validity ≥ 5 years) Split: For each of the three groups	Language requirement and other cultural conditions (such as knowledge of history/culture/civic knowledge)	- Language requirement only - or cultural requirements only for the renewal of the permit	None
39	Cultural requirements for naturalization (first generation immigrants) Split: For each of the three groups	Language requirement and other cultural conditions (such as knowledge of history/culture/civic knowledge)	Language requirement only	None

2. LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
40	Host-country language programs for immigrant adults	None or totally private-funded programs	- Private programs receiving public subsidies but these only represent a part of their funding - public-funded programs but limited/rare implementation	Public programs
41	Host-country language programs for immigrant children	None or totally private-funded programs	- Private programs receiving public subsidies but these only represent a part of their funding - public-funded programs but limited/rare implementation	Public programs

3. SCHOOLING

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
42	Possibility of public funding for Muslim private-owned schools (full time schools)	No possibility <i>and</i> existence of such a funding for other denominational schools (dominant religion in particular)	No public funding for any kind of denominational private-owned schools	Possibility of public funding
43	(if there is a possibility) Number of public-funded Muslim schools (full-time schools)	None	Rare structures ≤ 0,1 school for 1 000 Muslims in the locality	More developed structures
44	Possibility of public funding for other minority group private-owned schools (full time schools) Split: For each of the three groups	No possibility <i>and</i> existence of such a funding for other private-owned schools	No public funding for any kind of private-owned schools	Possibility of public funding
45	(if there is a possibility) Number of public-funded minority group schools (full-time schools) Split: For each of the three groups	None	Rare structures ≤ 0,1 school for 1 000 persons of the minority group s in the locality	More developed structures
46	Cultural/language courses for pupils of minority groups inside public	None or totally private-funded programs	- Only partly public-funded/supported programs (for	Public-funded programs with implementation

	schools (courses on their original language and/or culture) Split: For each of the three groups		example: subsidies not representing the total of the budget; only public buildings granted for these courses, etc.) -public-funded programs but limited/rare implementation	
47	Changes in public schools 'curriculum to take into account the cultural diversity of society <i>Note: changes here are not to mean in the last 2-3 years, but as compared to the "traditional" vision of the country. So those changes may have taken place a long time ago.</i>	None	-Limited changes (for example, small sections in the history/ geography/citizenship education/religious education... curricula about immigration or the cultural differences existing on the national territory, etc.) -significant changes (multiculturalism explicitly recognized as an important line of the curriculum) but limited/rare implementation	Multiculturalism/ cultural diversity are explicitly recognized as important lines of the school curriculum

4. RELIGION

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
48	Religious education in public schools	Religious education classes where the majority religion is predominantly or exclusively evoked	- No religious education in public schools - Islamic classes possible but limited/rare implementation	Religion-specific classes including Islamic ones (families choose to have them or not)
49	Islamic religious signs in the public sector	Not allowed	- allowed under some conditions - or no public regulation and not well tolerated in practice	- allowed without conditions - or no legislation and tolerated in practice
50	Islamic religious signs in the private sector	Not allowed	- allowed under some conditions - or no public regulation and not well tolerated in practice	- allowed without conditions - or no legislation and tolerated in practice
51	Islamic breaks for praying	Not allowed	- allowed under some conditions	- allowed without conditions

			- <i>or</i> no public regulation and not well tolerated in practice	- <i>or</i> no legislation and tolerated in practice
52	Cemeteries and burial according to Islamic rite	Not allowed	- allowed under some conditions - <i>or</i> no public regulation and not well tolerated in practice	- allowed without conditions - <i>or</i> no legislation and tolerated in practice
53	Local public budget for mosques (building and managing)	No possibility of public funding <i>and</i> existence of such a funding for buildings of other religions	No public funding for any kind of religious buildings	Possibility of public funding.

5. MEDIA

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
54	Islamic religious programs in public and state-subsidized private broadcasting (not including cable and satellite)	None	<1 hour a week	≥ 1 hour a week
55	Programs in public and state-subsidized private broadcasting (not including cable and satellite) for other minority groups or for the whole immigrant population Split: For each of the three groups	None	<1 hour a week	≥ 1 hour a week

6. LABOUR MARKET: GROUP RIGHTS

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
56	Affirmative actions for ethnic minorities in the private sector Split: For each of the three groups	None	- In some companies only: no public regulation/incitation about this - <i>or</i> public incitation/regulation but not targeted specifically to immigrants/ethnic minorities but to all disadvantaged people	Public regulation/incitation (reporting on workforce composition, incitation to implement quotas, financial incentives for the employment of people of ethnic minorities, etc.)

57	Affirmative actions for ethnic minorities in the public sector Split: For each of the three groups	None	Report, studies on the workforce composition only	Stronger measures (quotas regulation, targets to be achieved, etc.)
58	Measures to further the integration of foreigners into the labour market Policy targets to reduce unemployment of foreigners Policy targets to promote vocational training for foreigners	No elements	- Any of these elements (or other) but not all - or limited/rare/to be done implementation - or targeted to some categories of immigrants only	All elements

III - GENERAL POS

1. CONFIGURATION OF POWERS

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
59	Degree of federalism and decentralization	Scoring on the basis of Lijphart's indicators and values		
60	Decentralization at the local level: sub-local public structures (at the level of district, neighbourhood) with political powers	None	Limited powers: low budget, only a role of implementation and no role in the definition of local policies, which is centralized	Greater powers: specifically in charge of some sectors of public policies (definition and implementation), involvement in the definition of the whole city 's local policies
61	Power distribution in the city	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The executive (e.g. mayor and deputy mayors) is dominant is the decision-making - Balance of powers between the executive and the legislative (e.g. local council) - The legislative is dominant 		
62	Electoral systems – Local level	Only majoritarian	Predominantly majoritarian with a degree of proportionality	Proportional representation
63	Party systems in the city	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Two-party system - Multiparty system 		
64	Party(ies) in power in the city	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - one party - a coalition of parties 		
65	Party (ies) in power – National Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Right - Centre - Left <u>over the 10 past years</u>		
66	Party (ies) in power – Local Level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Right - Centre - Left <u>over the 10 past years</u>		

2. PARTICIPATION MECHANISMS

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
67	Referenda (Local level)	No possibility of referendum	Only consultative referenda	Binding (the measure cannot be adopted or must be abrogated)
68	Who can initiate the referendum? (Local level)	No possibility of referendum	Only the local council/the mayor	Also a percentage of the citizens ("Popular initiative" referendum)
69	Number of (consultative or binding) referenda held over the past 10 years (Local level)	<5	≥ 5<10	≥ 10
70	Existence and type of citizen assemblies (Local level)	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not institutionalized, occasional citizen assemblies - Not transparent representation of citizens (representation through associations only; strong presence of local officials, political parties within such bodies, etc.) - Not really working (very occasional meetings, very limited participation of citizens within them, etc.) 	Institutionalized citizen assemblies (with regular meetings, etc.)
71	Powers of citizen assemblies (Local level)	None	Only consultative	Stronger power in the decision-making
72	Involvement of civil society organizations (associations, foundations interest groups...) in the <u>definition</u> of local policies	None	Informal and optional consultation	Formal, regulated consultation
73	Involvement of civil society organizations (associations, foundations interest groups...) in the <u>implementation</u> of local policies	None	In partnership with public institutions	Full delegation of powers for the implementation of policies
74	Pluralism of the participation / intermediation of	- Only one major organization of the civil society is	Coordinated and corporatist system (which gives	Pluralist system (various interest and issue groups taken

	interests system in the city	consulted - or no defined participation /intermediation of interests system in the city	preference to “traditional” organisations such as trade unions and employers’ organisations)	into account in the decision-making process)
75	Is there a specific department in the local council devoted to promote citizen participation?	No department and no specific policy	No department, but there is a policy integrated within various departments	There is a specific department devoted to promote citizen participation policies
76	Is there a bill of rights or a similar local legislation that regulates how citizens can influence the decision-making processes in ways other than selecting their elected representatives?	None	Yes, there exists a regulation but it is very restrictive in terms of the rights of participation granted to citizens	Yes, there exists a regulation and it provides various mechanisms to participate during decision-making processes (hearings, appeals, consultation bodies, etc.)
77	Number of local-council-owned buildings granted to associations as meeting spaces Raw number per 1,000 inhabitants			
78	Average percentage of local budget devoted to subsidising associations in general (1995-2005) Raw percentages			
79	If there are sub-local public structures: do citizens have participation mechanisms within these structures?	No sub-local public structures or citizens do not elect the officials at these bodies (they are appointed by the city council)	There are sub-local public structures but citizens have limited influence (mostly reduced to their vote to select the representatives at these bodies)	Yes, citizens (or associations) have substantial participation mechanisms in these sub-local structures (e.g. consultation, participation in meetings, etc.)

IV – SPECIFIC POS (related to immigration & ethnic relations)

N°	Indicator	Scale		
		-1	0	1
80	Main responsibility for immigrants ‘ integration policies	National government	Balance of powers between national and local governments	Local government
81	Public information and support services for immigrants at the local level (which inform them about their rights, the institutions to which they can address, etc.)	None	Little developed	More developed (well-organized services, with, for example, interpreters, large opening hours, personal advice, following etc.)
82	Which institution (s) has(ve) the leading role in the field of immigrants’ integration? – Local Level	Local councillors The mayor A specific deputy mayor / A deputy mayor with other tasks as well A specialized service/a not specialized service, etc.		
83	Policies related to immigrants’ integration at the local level	None	Only studies, collection of data and/or policy papers about immigrants ‘ integration	Actual implementation of policies (with specific budgets)
84	Is there a specific department in the local council devoted to immigrants’ integration policies?	No department and no specific policy	No department, but there is a policy integrated within various departments	There is a specific department devoted to immigrants ‘ integration policies
85	Percentage of total local budget devoted to immigrants’ integration policies. Raw percentage			
86	Council/board/ assembly that represents immigrants/minority groups (for example, in France, the Parisian Council of Non-Eu foreigners)	None	- Informal and optional consultation - not (really) working institution	Formal, regulated consultation
87	Involvement of minority/immigrant organizations in the <u>definition</u> of local policies Split: For each of the three groups	None	Informal and optional consultation	Formal, regulated consultation
88	Involvement of minority/immigrant organizations in the <u>implementation</u> of local	None	In partnership with public institutions	Full delegation of powers for the implementation of policies

	policies Split: For each of the three groups			
89	Involvement of organizations specialized in immigration/integration issues in the <u>definition</u> of local policies	None	Informal and optional consultation	Formal, regulated consultation
90	Involvement of organizations specialized in immigration/integration issues in the <u>implementation</u> of local policies	None	In partnership with public institutions	Full delegation of powers for the implementation of policies
91	Involvement of organizations playing a relevant role for immigrants' integration (such as Human rights organizations) in the <u>definition</u> of local policies	None	Informal and optional consultation	Formal, regulated consultation
92	Involvement of organizations playing a relevant role for immigrants' integration (such as Human rights organizations) in the <u>implementation</u> of local policies	None	In partnership with public institutions	Full delegation of powers for the implementation of policies
93	Involvement of the local power in the funding of minority/immigrants organizations	No public funding available for these organizations	On the same basis of as "autochthonous" or "non-ethnic" organizations	- Separate funding schemes addressed to "immigrant" or "ethnic-based" organizations - or clear specific policy to favour the funding of these organizations (for example: a certain amount is reserved to these organizations or some "points" are given to their applications)
94	Requirements to be able to apply for subsidies	Strong requirement concerning the language that should be used	Only requirements concerning the type of activities implemented	No requirement other than those for "autochthons"
95	Party arrangements to favour the presence of persons with ethnic minority background in	None	Informal attempts to encourage their presence	Formal attempts (quotas regulation, targets to be achieved, special

	the leadership of the party – Local level Split: For each of the three groups			lists presented, etc.)
96	Party arrangements to favour the presence of persons with ethnic minority background in the party (rank-and-file members)– Local level Split: For each of the three groups	None	Informal attempts to encourage their presence	Formal attempts (quotas regulation, targets to be achieved, special lists presented, etc.)
97	Share of radical right and anti-immigrant parties in the electoral vote – National level: general elections <u>Mean over the 10 past years (raw percentage)</u>	> 10	> 5 ≤ 10 %	≤ 5 %
98	Share of radical right and anti-immigrant parties in the electoral vote – Local level: general elections <u>Mean over the 10 past years (raw percentage)</u>	> 10	> 5 ≤ 10 %	≤ 5 %
99	Share of radical right and anti-immigrant parties in the electoral vote – Local elections (city council) <u>Mean over the 10 past years (raw percentage)</u>	> 10	> 5 ≤ 10 %	≤ 5 %

GENERAL CONCLUDING COMMENTS SECTION

⇒ More global evaluation of the openness of the situation for immigrants, for each main dimension: various categories of individual rights (access to the community, family reunion, and so on), of cultural/group rights (schooling, religion and so on...), general and specific POS. Has the situation gone towards more openness over the years?

- Comparison between the different levels:
 - Is the situation more open for individual/group rights? Is there a gap between these two levels of rights?
 - Is a favourable situation concerning general citizens' participation mechanisms concomitant with a same open situation with regard to immigrants' participation?
- Comparison between the situations of the 3 immigrant groups.

DISCURSIVE POS INDICATORS

CODEBOOK

DISCURSIVE INTERVENTIONS IN THE LOCAL POLITY AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE POLITICAL INTEGRATION OF IMMIGRANTS

Manlio Cinalli (FNSP, partner 3) and Marco Giugni (UNIGE, partner 2)

29-7-2007

Note: This codebook is a shorter and adapted version of the codebook used in the MERCI project (Mobilization on Ethnic Relations, Citizenship and Immigration). See Koopmans, Ruud, Paul Statham, Marco Giugni, and Florence Passy, 2005, Contested Citizenship, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Aims and scope

The intention to engage fully with ‘discursive opportunities’ is based on the idea that public discourse and discursive frames have an important impact on the way and the degree to which immigrants are or become politically integrated. The analysis of discursive frames might also convey a better understanding of which groups are in a better position for becoming politically integrated within our local polities. A main objective of our project is to assess the impact of local discursive practices on immigrants’ political integration across our cities. This objective is emphasised throughout our project proposal since the role of local discourse has been neglected in previous studies of immigrants’ political integration. A way to explore this idea of ‘discursive opportunities’ might consist of a content analysis of main public documents that are produced by political parties and policy elites in our local polity. Yet, this research effort would overlook the discourse of other main actors in the city, in particular relevant organisations within civil society which often intervene in the field of immigration and ethnic relations (e.g. churches, NGOs, trade unions, xenophobic movements, etc.).

Hence, we propose a second and alternative way to assess the role of local discourse on the integration of immigrants in our cities. Our intention is to conduct a systematic analysis of ‘discursive interventions’ in reports of main newspapers in our cities, drawing on the established method of ‘political claims analysis’. Political claims analysis builds on protest event analyses as developed in the field of social movements and collective action, but extends the method to include speech acts and public discourse variables. Whereas protest event analysis takes protest as an indicator of the level of challenges to the political system, political discourse analysis takes the emergence and public visibility of movement “frames” as an indicator for the “meaning giving” side of challenges to dominant political and cultural norms, values, and problem definitions. The two approaches focus on different dimensions of collective challenges to political power: the first relating an action type variable – protests – to institutional political opportunities; and the second relating an interpretative scheme variable – frames – to the dominant sets of cultural and political norms, i.e., in our terminology to discursive opportunity structures.

We integrate these two approaches by combining the quantitative rigor of protest event analysis with the sensitivity to discursive content of political discourse approaches. This is achieved, first by moving beyond protest and analysing *all* forms of public claim-making, including purely discursive forms such as public statements, press releases and conferences, publications, or interviews, alongside conventional forms of political action such as litigation or petitioning, as well as classical protest forms such as demonstrations or political violence. Second, we extend the range of actors to include not just the forms of collective action of particular actors, but simply *any* act of claim-making in our fields of interest, regardless of the actor who made the claim, including the usual suspects of protest event analysis (social movement groups, NGOs, etc.), as well as interest groups (e.g., employers associations or churches), but also political party, parliamentary, governmental and other state actors.

The dataset will be uniformly built through collection of discursive interventions at the specific level in each locality. Each of these discursive interventions is characterised by a typical structure. Specifically, the structure of claims for our study will be broken down into six elements:

1. Location of the claim in time and space (WHEN and WHERE is the claim made?)
2. Claimant: the actor making the claim (WHO makes the claim?)
3. Form of the claim (HOW is the claim inserted in the public sphere?)
4. The addressee of the claim (AT WHOM is the claim directed?)
5. The substantive issue of the claim (WHAT is the claim about?)
6. Object actor: who is or would be affected by the claim (FOR/AGAINST WHOM?)

We focus on the most important variables that allow us to grasp in each country the discursive interventions in the field of immigration and ethnic relations both at the national and at the local level. That is, claims must be referred to the country under study. Reactions abroad to claims occurring in the country are excluded, together with any other claim that has no reference to the country under study. Statements by actors of the country which are made away from the country are coded, together with any other claim by any actor made in the country itself. Claims by international actors that take place in the country are also coded. Actor, object, addressee, and issue of the discursive intervention are the main variables for data collection and analysis, which will be carried out with SPSS software. In addition, we will also code information on the ‘position towards the object’ so as to evaluate which actors intervene more explicitly in favour or against the interests of immigrants. Finally, we will collect the usual information on timing (day, month and year, summarised in a single 8-digit variable) of each discursive intervention.

Unit of analysis

We define an instance of claim making (shorthand: a claim) as a unit of strategic action in the public sphere. It consists of *the purposive and public articulation of political demands, calls to action, proposals, criticisms, or physical attacks, which, actually or potentially, affect the interests or integrity of the claimants and/or other collective actors*. Unlike the narrow definition of contentious politics that underlies studies of protest events, our definition includes political claims regardless of the form in which they are made (statement, violence, repression, decision, demonstration, court ruling, etc.) and regardless of the nature of the actor (governments, social movements, NGOs, individuals, anonymous actors, etc.). Note also that political decisions and policy implementation are defined as special forms of claim-making, namely ones that have direct effects on the objects of the claim.

The units of analysis are instances of claim-making. Our definition of claim-making implies two important delimitations that require some elaboration: (1) instances of claim-making must be the result of purposive strategic action of the claimant and (2) they must be political in nature.

(1) To qualify as an instance of claim-making, the text must include a reference to an ongoing or concluded physical or verbal action in the public sphere, i.e. simple attributions of attitudes or opinions to actors by the media or by other actors do not count as claim-making. Example: “The Greens, who want to extend recognition to people persecuted by non-state organisations ...” This does not qualify as claim-making by the Greens. By contrast, the sentences “The Greens, who *said* they wanted to extend recognition to people persecuted by non-state organisations...” would qualify as an instance of claim-making because it contains a reference to actual verbal action. Verbs indicating action include, e.g., said, stated, demanded, criticised, decided, demonstrated, published, voted, wrote, arrested. Nouns directly referring to such action include, e.g., statement, letter, speech, report, blockade, deportation, decision. The occurrence in the newspaper report of such verbs or nouns is a precondition for the coding of a claim. Reports that only refer to “states of mind” or motivations were not coded (e.g., references such as want, are in favour of, oppose, are reluctant to, are divided over).

(2) *Claims must be political, in the sense that they relate to collective social problems and solutions to them, and not to purely individual strategies of coping with problems. If a parent complains about her child's treatment in school, this is not an instance of claim-making, unless the case refers to a problem of wider collective social relevance (e.g., if the complaint relates to the child being forbidden to wear the Islamic headscarf in class). Another example consists in court debates and rulings in asylum cases. These were only coded if the parties involved referred to arguments that went beyond the individual case.*

Statements or actions by different actors are considered to be part of one single instance of claim-making if they take place at the same location in time (the same day) and place (the same locality) and if the actors can be assumed to act “in concert” (i.e. they can be considered as strategic allies). For such cases, our coding scheme allows the coding of up to two different claimants. Examples:

- Two substantively identical statements by the same actor on two different days, or on one day in two different localities are two separate claims. In case of repeated statements or

announcements, each one is coded as a separate claim (for example, when an actor announces several times that it will hold a meeting on asylum).

- Statements by different speakers during a parliamentary debate or a conference are considered part of one instance of claim-making as long as they are substantively and strategically compatible. Thus, two different speakers may be taken together if they all express a similar point of view. However, if the speakers take positions that are substantially different enough to reject the zero hypothesis that they are “acting in concert”, the statements were coded as separate claims.
- If an identifiable part of a peaceful demonstration breaks away from a march and turns violent, the assumption of acting in concert is no longer warranted and a separate claim is coded.
- Information found in another article or newspaper issue on a given claim that has been coded previously should be corrected. For example, claims that were coded but are found in a further issue of the newspaper not to have occurred must be withdrawn from the sample. Similarly, additional information found in another article (even on a different issue of the newspaper) regarding a claim previously coded is used to complete the coding of that claim.

It is important to emphasise that an instance of claim-making is not identical with individual statements or individual demands. One instance of claim-making (e.g., an interview given by the claimant) may consist of many different statements, which may address several different issues. These are all seen as part of one and the same instance of strategic action. We have decided, however, to code only one main issue, since in our experience there are only few instances of claims-making referring to more than one main issue. These instances would be far too rare for conducting any meaningful analysis.

Sampling rules

All claims are coded which are reported in the Monday, Wednesday, and Friday issues of the selected newspapers. The ideal would be to select a widely distributed high quality city-newspaper. However, we realise that this ‘ideal paper’ is not available in all our local cases. Each team will thus select a local paper specifying its characteristics in terms of quality (high quality broadsheet vs. tabloid), ideological leaning, (left/right), internal structure, presence of local sections (if only national papers are available), selling and distribution. From these newspapers, all main news sections (with the exclusion of ‘editorials’, ‘sport pages’, ‘culture and shows pages’, and various ‘specials’) of every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday issue will be sampled and coded for all political claims relating to immigration, migrant integration, and racism and xenophobia; that is, the full newspaper will be coded so as to include supranational, national and sub-national claims. For two collective actors – migrants and extreme right organisations and groups – we also code claims that are not related to immigration issues, e.g., homeland political issues in the case of immigrants, or claims on the Nazi regime or the Holocaust in the case of the extreme right. However, in order to avoid to fall into a circular reasoning and blurring dependent and independent variables, all claims by migrants will be excluded from the sample when we want to analyse the discursive opportunities in the local polity for the political integration of immigrants. These analyses will be restricted to non-immigrants actors.

The entire newspaper issue must be read throughout its main news sections, avoiding altogether electronic searches based on key-words. If an issue did not appear, the next available issue must be taken. If the latter is already part of the sample, the next issue not part of the sample must be taken. Claims reported in the issue consulted and which took place up to two weeks before the date of appearance of that issue are also coded (but only if they have not already been coded). In order to have a significant number of claims, we collect data covering the entire 2006. Additional time periods may be coded afterwards by each team on a voluntarily basis, according to different time availability of teams.

The duration of coding obviously varies according to the number of claims retrieved, to the type of reporting of the claims by the newspaper, and by the speed of the coder. Coding will be complemented by a short report on pre-testing as it was discussed in occasion of project meeting in Paris on December 2006. At the moment, we estimate that about 10 hours of work are necessary to select and code 1 month of newspaper issues. Therefore, about 120 hours should be necessary to complete the coding of the entire year 2006. For a coder working 20-25 hours per week, this amounts to less than 6 weeks of work. The French team will start coding at the beginning of June 2007 so as to provide more detailed estimates on the required work time.

List of variables

Identification of claim: IDCLAIM, DATE, TITLE, DESCR

Actors: ACTOR1-2, SACTOR1-2, PARTY1-2, ACTSCOP1-2, NATMIN

Forms of action: SFORM

Addressees: SADRES, ADRSCOP, SCRITAC, CRITSCOP

Content of claims: SSISSUE, SSISSUE, FIELD, ISSCOP, FOCUS, SFOCUS, POSIT

Object actors: OBJIDEN, SOBJIDEN, OBJNAT

Variables SSISSUE, FIELD, SFOCUS, and SOBJIDEN are not used in primary coding. They will be computed on the basis of the original variables.

Variable **IDCLAIM**

Variable label 'identification number of claim'

Variable **DATE**

Variable label 'date of claim (yyyymmdd)'

This variable is used to identify the claims and locate them in time. If only a vague identification of date is reported, such as "last week" or "a few days ago", the claim is coded as if it occurred 7 days earlier. If no indication of date is reported, the date of appearance of the newspaper is coded.

Variable **TITLE**

Variable label 'title of article'

Value labels (string variable)

Variable **DESCR**

Variable label 'short description of the claim'.

This is a key moment for the correct coding of claims. Coders should produce a very short description with the most basic element of the claim. It may also be useful to write this description in an "active form" even when the claim is linguistically reproduced in a "passive form".¹

Value labels (string variable)

¹ E.g. "Non-Christians have been banned from walking in some areas by the mayor of Rovato" would be better re-written into "The mayor of Rovato has banned non-Christians from walking in some areas".

Variable **ACTOR1 / ACTOR2**

Variable label 'first actor' / 'second actor'

Value labels (string variable)

Variable **SACTOR1 / SACTOR2**

Variable label 'summary first actor' / 'summary second actor'

In case of organisation or group identifications that fall into several groups at the same time, the following priority rules apply: 1) minority group identification, 2) extreme right and racist group, 3) antiracist and pro-minority group, 4) general solidarity, human rights and welfare groups, 5) all other groups.

Value labels

10 'governments'²

20 'legislatives'³

30 'judiciary'⁴

40 'police and security agencies'⁵

50 'state executive agencies specifically dealing with migrants'⁶

60 'other state executive agencies'⁷

70 'political parties'⁸

80 'unions and employees'⁹

90 'employers organisations and firms'

100 'churches'¹⁰

110 'media and journalists'

120 'professional organisations and groups'¹¹

130 'minority organisations and groups'

140 'antiracist organisations and groups'¹²

150 'pro-minority rights and welfare organisations and groups'¹³

² Governments and government representatives (spokespersons, ministers, royalty etc.) irrespective of territorial scope. The EU-Commission and Council of Ministers, the UN General Secretary and Security Council are coded as governments. Other examples: mayor, regional government, ministry of education. Includes vague actors such as "the State", "the establishment".

³ Legislatives and parliaments (all chambers), including individual members thereof, including parliamentary fractions of political parties. The European Parliament and the General Assembly of the UN are coded as legislatives. Other examples: local councils, parliamentary fraction of a party, MPs.

⁴ E.g., European Court of Justice, public prosecutor, individual judges, juries.

⁵ E.g., police (incl. aliens' police), military, secret service, Interpol, NATO. Note: the Police Union is coded as a union.

⁶ State here includes the supranational level (e.g., UNHCR).

⁷ E.g., ILO, WHO, social aid office, school authorities.

⁸ This category should be used only for parties as parties, e.g., party chairman, party congress, party, party spokesman, as well as for sub-organisations of parties. Note that the same person may be coded differently according to the way in which her or his position is described.

⁹ Includes the general categories "workers" and "employees".

¹⁰ Only "native" churches, not those of migrant origin. Islamic, Jewish, Hindu, but also non-western Christian churches (Armenian, Greek and other orthodox, Koptic, Moluccan churches, etc.) are coded as minority organisations. "Churches" includes, however, the vague actor "Christians".

¹¹ E.g., doctors, football players, research institutes and individual researchers, universities, schools, teachers, writers, intellectuals, solicitors, musicians, etc. Note: unions are always coded as unions, non-union organisations of police and judges are coded under their respective institution.

¹² All groups identified as "antiracists" or "antifascists" and organisations whose names or other explicit information indicates that antiracism is their primary goal. Includes organizations of people persecuted by the Nazi-regime, organizations of former members of the resistance, etc..

160 'general solidarity, human rights and welfare organisations'¹⁴
 170 'racist and extreme right organisations and groups'¹⁵
 180 'radical left organisations and groups'¹⁶
 190 'other civil society organisations and groups'¹⁷
 999 'unknown actors'¹⁸

Variable **PARTY1 / PARTY2**

Variable label 'party affiliation of first actor' / 'party affiliation of second actor'

Value labels (string variable)

Variable: ACTSCOP1 / ACTSCOP2

Variable label 'scope of first actor' / 'scope of second actor'

The notion of "scope" refers to the organisational extension of the organisation or institution. See further the examples given in the footnotes.

Value labels

1 'supra- or transnational: European'¹⁹
 2 'supra- or transnational: other'²⁰
 3 'foreign national: migrant homelands and exile'²¹
 4 'foreign national: other'²²
 5 'bilateral'²³
 6 'national'²⁴

¹³ All (semi-) private organisations acting specifically on behalf of migrants and minorities, but not (primarily) carried by these groups themselves. Includes private welfare organisations catering specifically to migrants or minorities.

¹⁴ This includes only private organisations (Red Cross, Amnesty International, Terre des Hommes, etc.), not state welfare agencies (these are coded as other state executive agencies). Only organisations whose aims go beyond the ethnic relations, immigration and citizenship thematic field are coded here, organisations catering specifically to migrants and minorities receive code 150.

¹⁵ Includes vague descriptions such as "skinheads" or "right-wing extremists".

¹⁶ Includes vague descriptions such as "Autonomous" or "left-wing groups", as well as radical left organisations. Radical left parties should be coded as political party, unless the party label is merely window dressing and does not indicate significant involvement in the electoral process (compare the preceding note on extreme right parties).

¹⁷ Does not include vague categories such as "neighbours", "local citizens", "youth", etc.

¹⁸ The "unknown" category includes vague groups such as "youth", "neighbours", or "local citizens". Note, however, that youth *organisations*, neighbourhood *associations*, or citizens' *initiatives* are coded as "other civil society organisations and groups". Note that this category should *never* be used for such cases that were included because we suspect that the actors are minorities. Such events always require some specific assumption about the nature of the group. E.g., anonymous arson attacks on Turkish banks will be coded if the assumption is justified that they have been carried out by Kurdish groups. In that case, however, "Kurds" should be coded as SACTOR1, and the SACTOR1 category 130 should be used.

¹⁹ E.g., European Parliament, European Trade Union Federation, European Association of Turkish Academics.

²⁰ E.g., UNHCR, World Council of Roma and Sinti, Amnesty International, International Council of Voluntary Associations, Helsinki Watch. Includes national branches of transnational organizations.

²¹ E.g., Turkish government (except when intervening on behalf of third party, then code as 4), PKK, FIS, homeland political parties. Also includes organisations of political exiles based in the country of residence but directed towards intervention in the politics of the homeland.

²² E.g., American Jewish Committee, Israeli government (except when acting specifically on behalf of Jews, then code as 3), Austrian Caritas, Front National (if not acting in France), foreign firms and investors.

²³ Bilateral organizations between countries.

- 7 'subnational'²⁵
- 8 'national or subnational'²⁶
- 9 'unknown: no organisation'²⁷

Variable **NATMIN**

Variable label 'nationality or ethnicity of minority or migrant actor'

Value labels (string variable)

This variable gives, if mentioned, the national or ethnic background of the minority actor. This variable aims to reproduce the specific discursive "labeling" occurring in the paper.

Variable **SFORM**

Variable label 'summary form of action'

Because the codebook allows for multiple codings on the level of form (i.e., the combination of repressive measure and verbal statement, the combination of protest and verbal statement), decision rules are needed for classification. The rule is protest > political decision > verbal statement > repressive measure. In other words, protest forms overrule verbal forms: a demonstration with statements is a demonstration. Likewise, a verbal form overrules a repressive measure: a court ruling accompanied by politically relevant statements is a verbal statement.

Value labels

- 10 'repressive measure'
- 20 'political decision'²⁸
- 30 'verbal statement'²⁹
- 40 'meetings'³⁰

²⁴ E.g., national government, national political parties, national judiciary, national union, national media (incl. local papers in name with national scope), national companies, national migrant organizations, national promigrant organizations.

²⁵ All actors with a regional or local scope. E.g., regional government, purely regional political parties, regional branches of national parties, local governments, local parties and party branches, regional newspapers, local minority organizations, local promigrant organizations.

²⁶ Code here such cases where the name of the organisation and/or your background knowledge does not allow you to determine whether or not the organisation's scope is nationwide or at some subnational level. Such cases are not coded as „unknown“ because we do know that the organisation is not foreign national, transnational etc. (i.e., code 8 means: *not* codes 1-5).

²⁷ This code is used for all claims for which no organisation or institution has been mentioned.

²⁸ Note that we include here only decisions of organisations and institutions with real political decision-making power, i.e. state representatives and institutions, as well as political parties represented in parliament. Thus, the passing of legislation, administrative decrees, decisions to deport asylum seekers, politically relevant court rulings, but also resolutions and programmatic decisions at party conferences are considered political decisions. "Decisions" in the form of resolutions, etc. by civil society organisations count as verbal statements (even though in the original codebook they appeared under the heading "institutional decisions").

²⁹ Includes press declarations and conferences, interview statements, calls to action, leaflets, publications. Also includes the category of "parliamentary debates", at least in as far as the act does not constitute a parliamentary decision, which, of course, should be coded as "political decision".

³⁰ This refers to conferences, meetings, congresses etc that take place inside. The codebook initially did not include these forms and coded claims made at such meetings as statements or decisions. However, in the case of extreme right organisations in Germany, the report often mentions just that an extreme right group held a "Tagung", without any indication of what was said. Such cases could not be coded as verbal acts and therefore a new category was created. The category is empty for all actors, except the extreme right (in theory, it might apply to other groups, too, in cases where only a meeting is reported, but not its aim).

50 'judicial action'³¹
 60 'direct-democratic action'³²
 70 'petitioning'³³
 80 'demonstrative protests'
 90 'confrontational protests'³⁴
 100 'violent protests'

Variable **SADRES**

Variable label 'summary addressee of claim'

Variable **SCRITAC**

Variable label 'summary criticised actor'

SADRES and SCRITAC have the same categorisations as the SACTOR variables, with the exception of code 999, which here stands for 'no addressee' and 'no criticised actor'. These variables are used to code the addressees of claims, i.e. the actors to which the actors refer in their claims. There are two types of addressees:

- SADRES refers to the addressee narrowly defined, i.e. the actor who is held responsible for acting with regard to the claim or at whom the claim is directly addressed as a call to act. In other words, this is the actor at whom a demand is explicitly addressed (usually, a state actor).
- SCRITAC refers to the criticized actors, i.e. the actor who is overtly criticized or mentioned in a negative way in the claim.

If there are more than one addressee or criticized actor, the following priority rules apply: (1) organizations or institutions (or their representatives) have priority over unorganised collectivities or groups; (2) state actors have priority over non-state actors. If these rules do not allow a decision, use the order in which the addressee or criticized actor are mentioned, unless it is possible to find a priority rule according to other information in the article.

Variable **ADRESCOP**

Variable label 'scope of addressee'

Variable **CRITSCOP**

Variable label 'scope of first criticised actor'

ADRESCOP and CRITSCOP have the same categorisations as the ACTSCOP1 and ACTSCOP2 variables, with the exception of code 9, which here stands for 'no addressee', 'no criticised actor'.

Variable **SISSUE** (three-digit codes)

Variable label 'summary issue'

Variable **SSISSUE** (two-digit codes)

Variable label 'summary of SISSUE'

³¹ Refers to appeals to the judiciary (e.g. filing lawsuits), not actions by the judiciary (the latter appear as repressive measures, statements, or decisions).

³² Probably exclusively relevant to the Swiss context: launching, collection and presentation of signatures in the context of referendum and initiative campaigns.

³³ Includes petitions, other form of signature collection (outside direct-democratic contexts) and letter campaigns.

³⁴ Includes in addition to the legal and illegal confrontational forms listed in the codebook the verbal form "graffiti".

Note that symbolic forms of violence against objects and persons count as confrontational (see codebook).

Variable **FIELD** (one-digit code)

Variable label 'policy field'

Value labels

0 'NO VERBAL CLAIM'

1 'IMMIGRATION, ASYLUM, AND ALIENS POLITICS'³⁵

10 'immigration, asylum, and aliens politics'

100 'general evaluation or policy direction'³⁶

101 'institutional framework, responsibilities, procedures, costs'³⁷

102 'migration prevention in homeland countries'³⁸

103 'entry and border controls'³⁹

104 'registration and internal control'⁴⁰

105 'recognition, residence rights, legal status and permits'⁴¹

106 'access to welfare services and the labour market'⁴²

³⁵ Includes all policies that pertain to the regulation of entry of migrants (including policies to prevent migration), their residence rights, and their, voluntary or involuntary, return. In this sense, the category is wider than in the original codebook and now includes residence rights, expulsions, etc., which were originally classified under minority integration politics. In addition, it includes issues of access to work and welfare for groups who do not (yet) have full residence rights (non-recognized asylum seekers and refugees, illegal aliens, and temporary labour migrants).

³⁶ E.g., "recognition that Germany is a country of immigration, "solidarity with asylum seekers", "prevent polarization in the asylum debate", "do not instrumentalize the asylum issue for electoral purposes"; (OBJIDEN coded as "aussiedler") "inform the public about the situation and problems of Aussiedler".

³⁷ E.g., "create a special ministry of migration", "search for a common European solution to immigration problems", "financial support from the federal government for local communities in order to help them deal with the consequences of immigration", "create a special parliamentary commissioner for refugees", "equal distribution of refugees among EU countries", "limit the costs of the asylum procedure", "more personnel for state agencies dealing with asylum seekers", "speed up asylum procedures", "improve housing conditions in asylum seeker centres", "Aussiedler should await the result of their application in their country of origin", "house Aussiedler in former barracks of the Soviet army", "increase the say of the Bundesländer in matters concerning the reception of Aussiedler".

³⁸ E.g., "combat the causes of migration through intensified aid for Eastern Europe and the Third World", "combat the persecution of Roma in Eastern Europe", "combat the causes of refugee flows", "improve the rights and living conditions of ethnic Germans in their countries of origin".

³⁹ E.g., "stricter entry requirements for Eastern Europeans", "introduction of a visa for foreign children" "no right to (re-)entry for foreigners who have committed crimes", "prohibit airline companies to transport people without visa to Germany", "intensified combat against Schlepperbanden (organized 'smuggling' of asylum seekers across the border), "exclude asylum seekers without visa from the procedure", "stricter controls to prevent illegal immigration" Now also includes family reunification and formation (formerly 104), as well as general statements about entry (formerly 100) such as "reduce immigration", "introduce an immigration law", "an open Europe", "set levels and forms of immigration as a function of Germany's economic needs"; (OBJIDEN coded as "asylum seekers"), "stop influx of asylum seekers"; (OBJIDEN coded as "labour migrants", OBJNAT as "east europeans") "limit the number of workers from Eastern Europe"; (OBJIDEN coded as "aussiedler") "stop the influx of Aussiedler"; (OBJIDEN CODED as "specific ethnic or national group", NATMIN as "Jewish") "controlled influx of Soviet Jews by way of yearly quota", "no limits on the reception of East European Jews". Unspecified statements on bodies of legislation whose main issue is the regulation of entry (e.g., Schengen, Loi Pasqua) are coded here (e.g., a statement which says nothing more than "against the Loi Pasqua").

⁴⁰ E.g., "against the central registration of data on foreigners", "extend police competences to control the identity of aliens", "take measures against the misuse of the right to asylum".

⁴¹ E.g., "regulate foreign women's residence rights independent from their husbands", "right to stay for women who are the victim of forced prostitution", "softening of the criteria to obtain unlimited residence permits", "limit the constitutional right to asylum", "limit rights to appeal for asylum seekers", "right to stay for asylum seekers who have been longer than three years in Germany", "freedom of movement for EU citizens", "abolish the special immigration rights for Aussiedler", "freedom for Aussiedler to choose where to live in Germany", "give Soviet Jews the same rights as Aussiedler", "legalisation of illegal aliens".

- 107 'expulsions/deportations'⁴³
- 108 'voluntary return'⁴⁴
- 109 'other specific issues'

2 'MINORITY INTEGRATION POLITICS'

- 20 'minority integration general'
 - 200 'general evaluation or policy direction'⁴⁵
 - 201 'institutional framework, responsibilities, procedures, costs'⁴⁶
- 21 'minority rights and participation'
 - 210 'general evaluation or policy direction'⁴⁷
 - 211 'naturalisation and citizenship'⁴⁸
 - 212 'political rights and participation'⁴⁹
 - 213 'social rights and participation: labour market'⁵⁰
 - 214 'social rights and participation: education'⁵¹
 - 215 'social rights and participation: health and welfare'
 - 216 'social rights and participation: language acquisition'⁵²
 - 217 'social rights and participation: housing and segregation'⁵³
 - 218 'social rights and participation: police and judiciary'⁵⁴
 - 219 'social rights and participation: other/general'
 - 220 'cultural rights and participation: education'⁵⁵

⁴² E.g., "special assistance for children of refugees", "limit social welfare payments to asylum seekers", "allow asylum seekers to work", "limit access of illegal aliens to medical services", "no access for children of illegal aliens to education".

⁴³ E.g., "expulsion of foreign extremists", "expulsion of criminal foreigners", "send back asylum seekers who have arrived from save third countries", "draw up a list of countries to which asylum seekers cannot be sent back", "deportation treaty between Germany and Turkey", "no violence against asylum seekers in the course of deportations", "improve conditions of detention of asylum seekers waiting for deportation".

⁴⁴ E.g., "homeland governments should motivate foreigners to return", "set up re-integration programs for asylum seekers willing to return".

⁴⁵ E.g., "strive for the integration of foreigners", "prevent polarization in the debate on minority issues", "strive for a multicultural society", "the multicultural society leads to a racial hotchpot". Note that such general references to "multicultural society" are not coded as "cultural participation and rights" because the term is often used as a broad catchword in calls for the acceptance of people with different cultural backgrounds. If it is used in referring to the more specific issue of cultural rights, then the more specific code should be used.

⁴⁶ E.g., "more resources for state agencies dealing with foreigners", "creation of a federal office for foreigners' questions".

⁴⁷ E.g., "equal rights and chances for foreigners".

⁴⁸ E.g., "allow dual nationality", "German citizenship for children born in Germany", "naturalization conditional upon sufficient knowledge of the German language" (note that this claim is not coded as "social rights and participation: language acquisition").

⁴⁹ E.g., "local voting rights for foreigners", "stimulate migrant political participation", "consult migrant organisations in decisions concerning them", "limit foreigners' right to demonstrate"; (OBJIDEN coded as "EU citizens"), "right to participate in local and regional initiatives and referenda for EU citizens"; (OBJIDEN coded as "Aussiedler") "reduce subventions for organizations of Aussiedler and Vertriebene".

⁵⁰ E.g., "introduce quotas for foreigners in certain professions". See also the footnotes to "education" and "police and judiciary".

⁵¹ E.g., "improve the education opportunities of young foreigners". Note that demands for a better representation of minorities among teaching personnel, or for a quorum for minorities in that regard are coded here, not in "labour market".

⁵² Refers to acquisition of the language of the country of residence. E.g., "reduction of special German language programs for Aussiedler". Claims pertaining to education in homeland languages should be coded as "cultural rights and participation: education".

⁵³ E.g., "set limits to the percentage of foreigners in city districts".

⁵⁴ Note that demands for a better representation of minorities in the police force, or for a quorum of minorities in the police force are coded here, not in "labour market".

- 221 'cultural rights and participation: religion'⁵⁶
- 222 'cultural rights and participation: (recognition of) group identity/differences'⁵⁷
- 223 'cultural rights and participation: other/general'⁵⁸
- 224 'other rights and participation'
- 23 'discrimination and unequal treatment'⁵⁹
 - 231 'general evaluation or policy direction'⁶⁰
 - 232 'discrimination in politics'
 - 233 'discrimination in the labour market'
 - 234 'discrimination in the education system'
 - 235 'discrimination in health and welfare services'⁶¹
 - 236 'discrimination regarding housing'
 - 237 'discrimination in the police and judiciary system'⁶²
 - 238 'discrimination: other specific issues'⁶³
- 25 'minority social problems'
 - 252 'crime'⁶⁴

⁵⁵ E.g., (OBJIDEN as "specific ethnic or national group, OBJNAT as "Turks") "introduction of Turkish as a second foreign language next to English".

⁵⁶ E.g., (OBJIDEN coded as "Muslim/Islamic") "stimulate the construction of mosks", "recognition of Islam on an equal footing with Christian churches", "creation of possibilities for ritual slaughtering for Muslims", "creation of Islamic graveyards", "introduce Islamic religious education organized in Germany, not directed from the homeland countries", "integrate Islamic religious education in the normal school curriculum" (note that the later two claims are coded here, not as "cultural rights and participation: education"); (OBJIDEN coded as "Jewish/Israelite", OBJNAT as "Jewish") "support for Jewish religious organizations", "allow polygamy". This category includes claims relating to Islamic fundamentalism as an ideology/religious current, i.e. such claims are NOT coded in 253 'political extremism and violence'. However, claims relating to Islamic-inspired violence such as that of the GIA will be coded in 253 (i.e. if it is the content of Islamic fundamentalism that is central, code here, if illegal/violent forms of action are central, code in 253).

⁵⁷ E.g., "protect the cultural identity of foreigners", (OBJIDEN is "specific national or ethnic group, OBJNAT is "Kurdish") "recognize Kurds as a group separate from the Turks", (OBJIDEN is "specific national or ethnic group", OBJNAT is "Roma and Sinti") "official minority status for Roma and Sinti".

⁵⁸ E.g., "involve additional external experts in court cases against foreigners in order to judge cultural differences in behavioural patterns". Note that this claim is coded here and not in "social rights and participation: police and judiciary". The decision rule is that the distinction between social and cultural rights is the first criterion of classification, the substantive domain (labour market, education, etc.) the second criterion. The claim cited here asks for special provisions on the basis of cultural difference. Social rights demands are claims for equality and compensation of inequalities, regardless of cultural difference.

⁵⁹ The difference with the "rights and participation" category is that "discrimination and unequal treatment" claims focus on the majority society and its institutions as the cause of unequal participation of minorities. In that sense they are in between "rights and participation" claims and "antiracist" claims. Thus, a claim to improve the housing conditions for minorities is a "rights and participation" claim, a claim that calls for the creation of a possibility for members of minority groups to file complaints if they feel they have been refused housing because of their racial or cultural background is an antidiscrimination claim. Thus, "rights and participation" claims refer to demands relating to (proactive) positive minority rights, whereas "discrimination and unequal treatment claims" refers to (reactive) protection against infringements on these rights by the majority society. The difference between discrimination claims and antiracist claims is that the latter refer to overt abuse or violence, while discrimination claims refer to "hidden" or structural sources of unequal treatment. If in the housing example a complaint would be filed against a landlord who had refused someone, saying "we don't want blacks here" the claim would be coded in antiracism. If the complaint is based only on the feeling that the landlord refuses people because they are black, or if the complaint refers to a structural phenomenon, e.g., that a housing corporation tends to give blacks housing only in certain neighbourhoods, then we are dealing with an antidiscrimination claim. Note that the language is not decisive here: claims-makers may refer to both types as instances of (institutional) "racism". Our use of the term racism is more narrowly circumscribed.

⁶⁰ E.g., "combat discrimination of foreigners", "introduce and anti-discrimination law".

⁶¹ E.g., "abolish special enquiries when foreigners apply for social welfare".

⁶² E.g., "abolish registration of foreigners in a special police register".

⁶³ E.g., "abolish church regulations that discriminate against non-Christians, for instance the impossibility of church marriage when one of the partners is non-Christian".

- 253 'political extremism and violence'⁶⁵
- 254 'other'
- 26 'interethnic, inter- and intraorganisational relations'⁶⁶
 - 261 'inter/intraethnic relations'⁶⁷
 - 262 'inter/intraorganisational relations'⁶⁸
- 3 'ANTI-RACISM'
- 30 'racism in institutional contexts'⁶⁹
 - 300 'general evaluation or policy direction'
 - 301 'racist and extreme right language in politics'⁷⁰
 - 302 'police racism and violence against minorities'⁷¹
 - 303 'racism in other state institutions'⁷²
 - 304 'racism in non-state institutions'
- 31 'non-institutional racism, xenophobia and extreme right tendencies in society'⁷³
 - 310 'general evaluation or policy direction'⁷⁴
 - 311 'moral appeals'⁷⁵
 - 312 'social and educational responses'⁷⁶
 - 313 'countermobilisation'⁷⁷
 - 314 'protection of minorities against violence'⁷⁸
 - 315 'extreme right parties: alliances and exclusion'⁷⁹

⁶⁴ E.g., "tougher line with criminal foreigners". Note that demands for expulsion of criminal foreigners are coded in "immigration and aliens politics".

⁶⁵ E.g., "tougher measures against foreign extremists", (OBJIDEN is "specific national or ethnic group, OBJNAT is "Kurdish") "lifting of the ban on the PKK". Also includes demands related to policies and evaluation regarding ethnic and race riots. Note that demands for expulsion of foreign extremists are coded in "immigration and aliens politics".

⁶⁶ Interethnic here refers to relations between different minority groups, not between minorities and the majority group.

⁶⁷ Included here are conflicts among different ethnic minority groups that are *not* related to homeland but derive from their political, religious or economic competition in the country of residence. In Britain, examples include both verbal and physical conflicts between moderate and fundamentalist Muslims or between Muslims and Jews. Note that this category should only be used if such claims cannot be coded in a substantive policy field in immigration, integration, or antiracism. I.e., if in the British example the conflict between different Muslim groups is on whether or not to strive for separate Muslim schools, this is not coded here, but in 221.

⁶⁸ Only if not related to a substantive issue. E.g., the claim by a rival Muslim organization that "the Islamic Federation does not represent the Muslim community", or claims referring to conflicts among the leadership of ethnic organizations..

⁶⁹ Note that this does not include all appeals against "institutional racism". This term, in fact, often refers to "hidden" and structural forms of discrimination, which we code in minority integration politics.

⁷⁰ E.g., "fight the use of racist language by politicians which paves the road for the extreme right".

⁷¹ E.g., "dismantle the voluntary police reserve because of its repeated involvement in racist and extreme right incidents".

⁷² E.g., "combat extreme right tendencies in the Bundeswehr".

⁷³ Any references to xenophobia (including antisemitism) are included here, as well as unspecific references to the extreme right. Claims which explicitly refer to aspects of the extreme right which are not, or only marginally related to immigration and minorities are not included, however. See below under 5.

⁷⁴ E.g., "against xenophobia and the extreme right", "formation of a common front against the extreme right". Note that such claims may occasionally be made by extreme right organizations, e.g., the Republikaner distancing themselves from xenophobic violence.

⁷⁵ E.g., "tolerance", "dialogue between Germans and foreigners", "solidarity with foreigners".

⁷⁶ E.g., "a better social politics", "civil education and information of the public".

⁷⁷ E.g., "organize a countermovement", "German citizens should protect asylum seeker centers", "counterdemonstrations only help the extreme right to get the media attention it wants". Also includes claims by extreme right and xenophobic groups against such countermobilization.

⁷⁸ E.g., "police should protect asylum seeker centers better against attacks".

⁷⁹ Claims that refer to how one should politically deal with extreme right parties. E.g., "no cooperation with extreme right parties". Not included are claims on political strategy with regard to the extreme right that are purely tactical

- 316 'repression: political responses'⁸⁰
- 317 'repression: judicial responses'⁸¹
- 318 'repression: police responses'⁸²
- 319 'repression: other'⁸³
- 320 'other specific issues'

4 'GENERAL XENOPHOBIC CLAIMS'⁸⁴

- 40 'xenophobic claims'
 - 400 'xenophobic claims'⁸⁵

6 'ACTOR CLAIMS MINORITIES'

- 61 'homeland politics'
 - 610 'pure homeland politics'⁸⁶
 - 611 'politics of country of residence with regard to homeland issues'⁸⁷
- 62 'other'
 - 621 'World War II/Holocaust'⁸⁸
 - 622 'other'

7 'OTHER CLAIMS RE: EXTREME RIGHT'⁸⁹

- 71 'general, unspecific claims'⁹⁰
 - 710 'general, unspecific claims'
- 72 'World War II, Third Reich, etc.'⁹¹

(these are coded in 760) or relate to topics other than immigration and minorities. I.e., if a call is made to boycott the Front National because of Le Pen's statement on the Holocaust as a detail in history, this claim is coded in 720. The present category is, however, the default. I.e., unless there is explicit evidence that the claim is inspired by something else than the extreme right's xenophobia, we code the claim in antiracism. Note that this category, too, includes claims by the extreme right itself against its political exclusion (unless again this exclusion is explicitly related to something else than xenophobia).

⁸⁰ E.g., "a better coordination of the fight against the extreme right", "politicians should resign if they do not adequately respond to racist incidents", "ban extreme right organisations", "ban extreme right demonstrations", "tougher legislation". Also claims by the extreme right against such repression.

⁸¹ E.g., "judges do not sentence the perpetrators of extreme right violence harshly enough". Also claims by the extreme right against such repression.

⁸² E.g., "police do not sufficiently interfere when xenophobic acts are committed", "organization X should be put under observation of the internal security agencies", "police should avoid spectacular clashes with extreme right groups, since that only gives these groups the publicity they want". Also claims by the extreme right against such repression.

⁸³ E.g., "exclude members of extreme right organizations from the civil service". Also claims by the extreme right against such repression.

⁸⁴ Xenophobic politics is defined by undifferentiated rejection of migrants and minorities. By definition, it includes claims that cannot be conveyed adequately in any of the above more specific codes. Thus "Ausländer 'raus'" is neither a call for a restrictive immigration and aliens politics, nor a call for a tough politics of integration, it simply rejects these two phenomena altogether. All demands in this field should have position code - 1. Demands against xenophobia are coded in "anti-racism".

⁸⁵ E.g., "Deutschland den Deutschen, Ausländer 'raus!'", also antisemitic claims (which then get OBJIDEN "specific ethnic or national group" and OBJNAT "Jewish").

⁸⁶ E.g., "stop repression of Kurds in Turkey", "against Kurdish attacks on Turkish targets in Germany".

⁸⁷ E.g., "against military support by the German government for the Turkish regime", "better protection for Turks against Kurdish attacks in Germany", "lift ban on the PKK in Germany", "boycott of Turkey by German tourists", "admit Turkey to the EU", "the German media give a false picture of the situation in Turkey".

⁸⁸ E.g., "remembrance of the victims of the Holocaust" (without any reference to present-day extreme right, otherwise code as 312).

⁸⁹ Includes all claims by extreme right groups and organisations on issues other than migration, minorities and xenophobia, as well as claims by other actors in reaction to such claims by the extreme right (where such claims have been coded; the Dutch case study does not include them).

⁹⁰ E.g., "the national right should unite", "the Republikaner will challenge the established parties in the upcoming elections".

- 720 'World War II, Third Reich, etc.'
- 73 'nationalist and revanchist claims'⁹²
 - 730 'nationalist and revanchist claims'
- 74 'extreme right opposition against political opponents'
 - 741 'anti-left claims'⁹³
 - 742 'claims against the established right'⁹⁴
 - 743 'general anti-establishment claims'
 - 744 'other'
- 75 'mainstream political issues'⁹⁵
 - 750 'mainstream political issues'
- 76 'electoral competition: purely tactical claims'
 - 760 'electoral competition: purely tactical claims'⁹⁶

Variables **SSISSUE** and **FIELD** are not used for primary code, but will be computed on the basis of **SISSUE**.

Variable **ISSCOP**

Variable label 'scope of issue'

Refers to the geographical and/or political scope of the claim. Scope here refers to the actors, actions, legislation or conventions that are implied in the claim. I.e., a claim has a scope beyond the national context (codes 1-5) if it refers to actors (e.g., the EU, foreign investors), and/or actions (e.g., improving conditions in homelands, economic aid to countries of origin), and/or legislation and conventions (e.g., the UN Children's Rights Convention, the European Charta on Minority Languages). The scope always refers to the widest scope geographical/political dimension implied in the claim. I.e., when the issue has both a national and a European dimension, "European" is coded. See further the examples given in the footnotes.

Value labels

- 0 'no verbal claim'⁹⁷
- 1 'supra- or transnational: European'⁹⁸
- 2 'supra- or transnational: other'⁹⁹

⁹¹ E.g., denial of the Holocaust, "Sieg Heil", "Heil Hitler", "against the enduring stigmatization of Germany because of the Holocaust", "the Holocaust is a detail in the history of the Second World War".

⁹² E.g., "against the recognition of the Oder-Neiße line" (i.e., the postwar German borders), "hand back property in Eastern Europe to Germans who were expelled or fled after the war", "establish a New German Reich", "Germany should become an independent european power, outside of NATO and the EU".

⁹³ E.g., "down with the Red front!".

⁹⁴ E.g., "against Politbonzen", "fight the corrupt political system".

⁹⁵ Statements by extreme right parties on 'mainstream' political issues, e.g., unemployment, environment, law and order (provided of course that the statement does not have an explicit xenophobic twist, then code under 4. For obvious reasons, we will not code claims relating to such mainstream issues by other than the extreme right.

⁹⁶ See the footnote to category 315.

⁹⁷ The number of cases here should be identical to that for the zero category of **SISSUE**. I.e., every verbal claim should have a score on scope.

⁹⁸ E.g., "The German government should strive for a common European solution of immigration problems" (claim has both a European and a national dimension, "European" is coded).

⁹⁹ E.g., "The UNHCR should determine which countries can be regarded as 'safe countries of origin'", "the UN Convention on the Rights of Children should prevail over the German Aliens' Law", "Create an international commission to investigate right-wing violence in Germany", "Right-wing violence is harmful to Germany's image abroad and may deter foreign investors" (frame). In order to give postnational hypotheses the benefit of doubt, all claims which refer generally to "human rights" will be coded here.

- 3 'foreign national: migrant homelands'¹⁰⁰
- 4 'foreign national: other'
- 5 'bilateral'¹⁰¹
- 6 national
- 7 subnational
- 8 'national or subnational'

Variable **FOCUS**

Variable label 'thematic focus: verbal and physical combined'

For verbal claims, this variable is equal to SSISSUE (the two-digit code). For physical claims (e.g., acts of violence), the value of the variable is determined on the basis of the (assumed) actor and the nature of the target. The most common examples are probably:

- attacks by xenophobic groups against migrants or minorities (incl. Jewish targets) : code 40
- attacks by extreme right groups against WWII related targets (e.g., monuments): code 72
- attacks by extreme right groups against political opponents (e.g., politicians, left-wing groups): code 74
- physical confrontations between ethnic minority groups related to homeland politics: code 61
- other physical confrontations between ethnic minority groups: code 26
- attacks against xenophobic and extreme right groups: code 31

All claims should get a code for FOCUS, except for repressive measures with no verbal claim attached (i.e., those repressive measures that have a missing value on SSISSUE); these get the value 99:

99 'repressive measure'

On the basis of FOCUS a variable **SFOCUS** (label: 'summary thematic focus') is constructed with the same categories as FIELD (one-digit code).

Variable **POSIT**

Variable label 'Position of claim towards issue'

Value labels

- 1 'anti-minority/xenophobic/extreme right'¹⁰²
- 0 'neutral/ambivalent/technocratic'¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰ E.g., "Improve the rights of ethnic Germans in their countries of origin", "Measures against the persecution of Roma in Eastern Europe".

¹⁰¹ E.g., "Increase economic aid to Eastern European countries to prevent migration to Germany", "set up reintegration programs in Bosnia to stimulate refugees to return", the conclusion of a treaty between Germany and Turkey regarding the deportation of Kurdish refugees, "*Conclude city partnerships with Eastern European cities as a gesture of reconciliation*".

¹⁰² E.g., all physical attacks on migrants or minorities, "give social benefits to asylum seekers in kind rather than cash", "stop the misuse of asylum laws", "stricter measures against minority crime", "address the issue of Kurdish extremism", "punish airline companies who transport asylum seekers without a visa", "improve border controls", "create programs to stimulate the voluntary return of refugees".

¹⁰³ E.g., "create larger centres for the reception of asylum seekers", "distribute the costs related to the reception of asylum seekers more evenly among the federal, regional and local levels", "house Aussiedler in former Soviet army

1 'pro-minority/antiracist/anti-extreme right'¹⁰⁴
9 'unclassifiable'

This variable should provide a general indicator of the position of claims with regard to the rights, position and evaluation of migrants and minorities (and, conversely, of those who mobilise against them). All claims whose realisation implies a deterioration in the rights or position of migrants or minorities receive code -1, no matter if the reduction is minor or large. The -1 also goes to claims which express a negative attitude with regard to migrants or minorities (both verbal and physical) or a positive attitude with regard to xenophobic and extreme right groups or aims. All claims whose realisation implies an improvement in the rights and position of migrants (minor or major) receive code 1. This code also goes to claims expressing (verbally or physically) a positive attitude with regard to migrants, or a negative attitude with regard to xenophobic and extreme right groups or aims. Neutral or ambivalent claims, which are not necessarily related to any deterioration or improvement in migrants' position or rights and do not express a clear attitude with regard to migrants and minorities or their opponents receive code 0. Repressive measures without verbal claims should also be categorised on this variable: -1 goes to repressive measures directed against minorities, +1 to repressive measures directed against xenophobic and extreme right individuals and groups. The following categories of claims are coded as missing (9) because they cannot be positioned on the -1/+1 scale: actor claims of minorities (FOCUS 61 and 62); claims by the extreme right against political opponents, on mainstream political issues, and on tactical electoral issues (FOCUS 74-76).

Variable **OBJIDEN**

Variable label 'identity of object of claim'

Gives the identity of the object actor. The different ethnic and national labels are coded separately in the variable OBJNAT (see below). Thus, "Turks" receive OBJIDEN code 82 (specific ethnic or national group) and are then coded as "Turks" in OBJNAT.

For the different "mixed identity" categories, the following rule applies: status group, racial or religious identifications have priority in the OBJIDEN variable over national and ethnic identification. For instance: "Turkish Muslims" are coded as 62 (Muslims) in the OBJIDEN variable, and then as "Turks" in OBJNAT; "Bosnian refugees" as 16 (war refugees, see the footnote) in OBJIDEN, and then as "Bosnians" in OBJNAT; "Afro-Caribbeans" are coded as 45 (african) in OBJIDEN, and then as "Caribbeans" in OBJNAT; "Rußlanddeutsche" are coded as 18 (aussiedler) in OBJIDEN, and then as "Russians" in OBJNAT.

The same also applies for hyphen identities between racial or religious identities and the country of residence. For instance: "British Muslims" are "Muslims" for OBJIDEN, "British" for OBJNAT; same for "British blacks".¹⁰⁵

barracks", "strive for a common European solution to immigration problems", "xenophobic attacks are the work of 'blind criminals'" (ambivalent since it expresses a negative attitude with regard to the perpetrators but simultaneously refuses to take the matter seriously), "even right-wing extremists have the right to free speech" (refuses to curtail the freedom of speech of racists, but not from an anti-minority point of view). The latter example implies that claims against bans on the freedom of speech, demonstration and organisation of the extreme right should generally receive code 0, not -1. Claims in favour of such measures are coded 1.

¹⁰⁴ E.g., all statements against xenophobia, all physical attacks on right-wing extremists, "provide more information to the public on the situation of Aussiedler", "do not criminalise foreigners", "keep the constitutional right to asylum as it is".

¹⁰⁵ A partial identification with the country of residence should only be coded if the respective country appears grammatically as a substantive (as in "Black British"), or as an adjective to the ethnic identification (as in "Deutsche Juden"), not if it just indicates the geographic location of the organization or group.

Hyphen-identifications between the country of residence and homeland nationality/ethnicity are treated as follows: they all receive code 91 (specific hyphenated ethnic or national group) in OBJIDEN, the homeland ethnicity/nationality is then coded in OBJNAT. For instance “Indische Nederlanders” are coded 91 in OBJIDEN, then “Indonesian” in OBJNAT; “des francais d’origine algerienne” would be coded 91 in OBJIDEN, then “Algerian” in OBJNAT.

Other types of hyphen identities, which will be very rare anyway, will be ignored, e.g., “black Muslims”, “black asylum seekers” or “Muslim asylum seekers”. In cases where this applies, the priority rule for coding is: status group > religious group > racial group. I.e., the first example is coded as “Muslims”, the second and third as “asylum seekers”.¹⁰⁶

Value labels

5 ‘extreme right parties’

6 ‘other concrete xenophobic or extreme right organisations or groups’

7 ‘the extreme right, racists, xenophobes unspecified’

10 ‘STATUS GROUPS’

11 ‘foreigners/aliens’

12 ‘minorities’ (without specification)¹⁰⁷

13 ‘(im)migrants’

14 ‘allochthonen’

15 ‘asylum seekers’ (individual status)¹⁰⁸

16 ‘war refugees, ontheemden’ (collective status)¹⁰⁹

17 ‘quota refugees, kontingentflüchtlinge’ (permanent collective status)

18 ‘illegal aliens/immigrants, sans papiers’

19 ‘aussiedler’

20 ‘labour migrants, contract workers, saisonniers’

21 ‘EU citizens’

22 ‘non-EU citizens, third country nationals’

23 ‘Old Commonwealth immigrants/citizens’¹¹⁰

24 ‘New Commonwealth immigrants/citizens’

25 ‘DOM-TOM immigrants/citizens’¹¹¹

26 ‘DDR-Vertragsarbeiter’

27 ‘Harki’

28 ‘ex-patriats/repatrianten’

29 ‘Commonwealth citizens (old and new)’

30 ‘family reunifiers/formers’

¹⁰⁶ Note that we ignore all other kinds of identification that may appear.

¹⁰⁷ See the separate codes below for specified minority labels (racial, religious, ethnic). If more than one adjective to minorities is used (e.g., “racial and ethnic minorities”) than use this category.

¹⁰⁸ The difference between categories 15 and 16 is in the type of status. Normal “asylum seekers” or “refugees” (the terms tend to be used interchangeably) are those who claim the right to asylum on the basis of *individual* persecution on the grounds of race, religion, ethnicity, political belief or activities, etc. For this group, each case is decided individually and recognition likewise is on an individual basis.

¹⁰⁹ This group (for which the term “asylum seekers” is not often, and the term “refugees” mostly used) are given a collective right to residence for “humanitarian reasons”.

¹¹⁰ Categories 22-24 should only be used for general references to this type of migrants/minorities, not for specific identifications (e.g., “Jamaican”, “(French) Antillean”); these are coded along ethnicity.

¹¹¹ “Francais des DOM-TOM” or “Francais d’origine DOM-TOM” would be coded as a hyphenated identity. I.e., code 25 for IDENMIN, code 100 for NATMIN. Note that specific DOM-TOM identifications (Antillean, Guyanese etc.) are coded as “specific national or ethnic group” and then in NATMIN the respective specific code.

40 'RACIAL GROUPS'
41 'racial minorities/groups'
42 'black'¹¹²
43 'asian'
44 'coloured'
45 'black and asian'
46 'creole'

60 'RELIGIOUS GROUPS'
61 'religious minorities/groups'
62 'muslim/islamic'
63 'hindu'
64 'jewish/israelite'
65 'orthodox'¹¹³
66 'rastafarian'
67 'sikh'
68 'alevite'
69 'catholic'
70 'buddhist'¹¹⁴
71 'yezidic'
72 'christians (of minority origin)'
73 'winti'

80 'NATIONAL AND ETHNIC GROUPS: PURE'
81 'ethnic minorities/groups'
82 'specific national or ethnic group'

90 'NATIONAL AND ETHNIC GROUPS: HYPHEN HOMELAND-COUNTRY OF RESIDENCE'
91 'specific hyphenated national or ethnic group'

95 'migrants and minorities unspecified'
98 'not applicable: repressive measure'
99 'not applicable: claim outside the thematic field'

Variable **SOBJIDEN** (variable label 'summary identity of object of claim') summarises OBJIDEN by simply collapsing the subcategories into the whole tens (i.e., the labels in capitals). The whole tens, thus, are not used for OBJIDEN itself.

Variable **OBJNAT**

Variable label 'nationality or ethnicity of object of claim'.

Value labels: This is a string variable that reproduces the specific discursive "labeling" occurring in the paper (see variable NATMIN).

¹¹² Includes in English the prefix „afro“ as in „afro-caribbean“, which is decomposed into code 42 in OBJIDEN and then 'caribbean' in OBJNAT. Similarly, black african“ is coded as 42 for OBJIDEN and 'african' for OBJNAT.

¹¹³ Greek, Armenian, Russian, etc. orthodox. The respective national identifications are then code in OBJNAT: e.g., the Greek Orthox Patriarch is coded as 65 in OBJIDEN and 208 in OBJNAT.

¹¹⁴ Includes subdivisions such as "shugden".

These variables are coded only for claims in the thematic field (FOCUS1-3=10-40). The object is the group whose interests, position or physical integrity are, or would be affected by the realisation of the claim. This includes direct physical objects (e.g., of violent attacks), as well as objects of verbal claims. Only minority or migrant groups, or xenophobic and extreme right groups can be coded as objects (all other actors, when mentioned, are indirect objects, i.e., are coded in the addressee variables). If claims both have a minority or migrant object *and* a xenophobic or extreme right object, the priority rule is that the migrant or minority object is coded.

Depending on the level of detail at which the language of claims has been retained, it may not always be possible to retrieve whether a claim pertains to “foreigners”, “immigrants” or “minorities”. These are coded in a residual category 95. Proceed as follows: first give all claims code 95, then recode those for which you can identify a specific group label (e.g., illegal aliens, asylum seekers, Soviet Jews, Antilleans, Muslims, blacks). Probably, the 95 category will remain relatively large because our coding has not been detailed enough in this respect and/or because claims are stated in vague terms. This will be the case to an even larger extent for the OBJNAT variables, because nationality has often not been coded and/or claims do not refer to specific nationalities, but to a general status group (e.g., asylum seekers). Nevertheless, it is important to be able to select cases according to specific identity or national groups (e.g., all claims on Antillians, on war refugees, on Jews, or on Muslims).

The object is coded on the basis of the language of the claim, not some notion of ours of how the object should be properly classified. For instance, claims pertaining to a group of asylum seekers who have been refused recognition, and thus are now illegal, may be framed in terms of asylum politics or as a problem of illegal aliens. Or, the claim to stop immigration may also be framed as “stop the influx of foreigners”. In the latter case, we code OBJIDEN as “foreigners”, in the former case as “immigrants”.

Examples:

- A call for a change in asylum legislation: OBJIDEN is 15, no OBJNAT.
- A protest against the deportation of Kurdish refugees: OBJIDEN is 15, OBJNAT is “Kurdish”.
- A xenophobic arson attack against a Turkish family’s house: OBJIDEN is 82, OBJNAT is “Turkish”.
- An attack against a Nigerian asylum seeker: OBJIDEN is 15, OBJNAT is “Nigerian”.
- Skinheads beat up a “black man”: OBJIDEN is 42, no OBJNAT.
- Demand to allow the Islamic call to prayer: OBJIDEN is 62, no OBJNAT.
- Demand for easier naturalization (it does not say “for foreigners”, but it is obvious that the claim is relevant for foreign residents only): OBJIDEN is 11, no OBJNAT.
- Recognize Roma and Sinti as a minority: OBJIDEN is 82, OBJNAT is “Roma and Sinti” (the reference to minority is irrelevant here, the claim affects the interests of Roma and Sinti, not those of minorities in general).
- Ban the PKK: OBJIDEN is 82, OBJNAT is “Kurdish”.
- Demand for a better training of the police in how to deal with the extreme right: OBJIDEN is 7, no OBJNAT.
- Stimulate a dialogue between Germans and foreigners: OBJIDEN is 11, no OBJNAT.
- Set up vigils to protect asylum seeker centres against racist attacks: OBJIDEN is 15, no OBJNAT (i.e., according to the priority rule, asylum seekers are coded as object, not racists).

PRE-TEST SET OF NEWS

Instructions: all teams are required to do pre-test for inter-coder reliability assessment prior to start coding the real news pieces for their respective citizens. The articles to be used follow.

1

Copyright 2000 Guardian Newspapers Limited
The **Guardian** (London)

November 22, 2000

SECTION: Guardian Home Pages, Pg. 5

LENGTH: 439 words

HEADLINE: Straw admits tens of thousands of rejected asylum seekers at large

BYLINE: Patrick Wintour, Chief political correspondent

BODY:

The government has lost track of tens of thousands of asylum seekers in Britain and knows that hundreds of rejected asylum seekers recently housed in its flagship detention centre are still here, the home secretary, Jack Straw, said yesterday.

Mr Straw conceded ministers had no knowledge of the whereabouts of many of the 72,000 backlog of asylum seekers. Their addresses had only been given at the time of application for asylum.

However, Mr Straw claimed the money being poured into the immigration directorate was reforming a system on its knees under the Conservatives. The processing of new asylum applicants had risen to 3,000 a week this month, he said, representing an increase of 1,200 on the weekly average of the first quarter of this year.

He described the figure as an "extraordinary improvement" as applications were currently being lodged at the rate of 6,300 a month. He assured MPs on the home affairs select committee there were penalties and incentives for applicants to keep in touch with the immigration directorate through its reporting centres.

But Humfrey Malins, a Tory member of the committee, said the speed with which decisions were taken was neither here nor there if no enforcement followed through the removal of failed applicants.

He argued that Mr Straw conceded in 1998 that 19,000 applicants had gone missing, and on current trends this would rise to 115,000 by 2002.

Ministers have repeatedly refused to give figures on the numbers of asylum seekers who have been refused permission to remain in the country but have not been removed because they cannot be traced.

But Mr Malins told the home secretary: "You and I know the chances of them being removed is so low as to make the system a mockery."

He pointed to figures showing that of the 763 processed appeals at the Oakington camp in Cambridgeshire, only 28 had been allowed and only 231 removed or left voluntarily. He said that if Oakington was not working the government had no chance of meeting its target of

30,000 enforced departures per year by 2001/02. The last full year figures showed 7,910 asylum seekers were removed from the UK.

But Mr Straw insisted the government could achieve this significant increase through its pounds 600m investment in the immigration service, including an increase in detention places to 2,400. He said deportation was not easy because if someone came from a country where there was civil disturbance there was often no government with which to make arrangements for their return.

Special report on refugees in Britain at www.guardianunlimited.co.uk/ refugees

LOAD-DATE: November 22, 2000

Your use of this service is governed by [Terms and Conditions](#). Please review them.

2

Copyright 2000 Guardian Newspapers Limited
The **Guardian** (London)

November 24, 2000

SECTION: Guardian Foreign Pages, Pg. 17

LENGTH: 443 words

HEADLINE: Websites giving race-hate groups new lease of life, EU watchdog says

BYLINE: Ian Black, European editor

BODY:

Racism and anti-semitism has proliferated on the internet, spawning more than 2,100 websites, the European Union's racism monitoring unit reported yesterday.

Most of the sites are based in the US, but in Germany alone, the internal security service recorded the existence of 300 registered hate websites last year, up from 200 in 1998.

"What was proscribed, undercover, shameful and liable to prosecution in the past is today readily available and viewable on the net," the European monitoring centre on racism and xenophobia said in its annual report.

"Movements which were in decline in both Europe and the US have received a new lease of life thanks to the sites they have created."

Increases in violent racially motivated incidents were reported last year in France, Germany and Sweden, but differing definitions and statistical methods made EU-wide comparisons difficult, it said.

In Britain, racist incidents recorded by police rose by 66% to 23,050. This was believed to be a result of better recording and the wider definition applied to such incidents after the inquiry into the 1993 murder of Stephen Lawrence in London.

The report also said that racism in police and security forces was a problem across the continent. In Belgium, for example, one in nine violent incidents was blamed on police and gendarmes.

Beate Winkler, the centre's director, pointed to worrying discrepancies between official and

unofficial reporting of racist violence: the Netherlands figure was 200 incidents for 1999, but the Anne Frank Foundation estimated that the true number ranged between 800 and 8,000.

The EU centre had an uncomfortable few months this year because it is situated in the Austrian capital, Vienna, the target of unprecedented sanctions by all 14 other member states after Jorg Haider's anti-immigrant Freedom party entered government after doing well in national elections.

In the 1999 election campaign in Austria "a climate of fear and intolerance was . . . stoked up against the immigrant and Jewish community," the report said.

Jean Kahn, director of the Vienna centre, said he wanted anti-racism measures agreed in the EU's Amsterdam treaty - which was ratified in 1997 - fully implemented in all member states. And the chairman of the European parliament's citizens' rights committee, Graham Watson, argued that clear rules had to be set governing when a member state could be suspended for failing to meet accepted standards on democracy and human rights.

Some governments want this written clearly into the treaty of Nice, due to be drawn up at the EU summit on the Cote d'Azur next month.

LOAD-DATE: November 24, 2000

Your use of this service is governed by [Terms and Conditions](#). Please review them.

3

Copyright 2000 Guardian Newspapers Limited
The **Guardian** (London)

November 24, 2000

SECTION: Guardian Foreign Pages, Pg. 18

LENGTH: 50 words

HEADLINE: In brief: Church ban for non-Christians

BYLINE: Philip Willan, Rome

BODY:

The mayor of Rovato, northern Italy, has banned non-Christians from going within 15 metres of local churches. Roberto Manenti, a member of the anti-immigrant Northern League, said the ban responded to measures in other countries where access to certain areas is banned on religious grounds.

LOAD-DATE: November 24, 2000

Your use of this service is governed by [Terms and Conditions](#). Please review them.
[Copyright](#) ©2005 [LexisNexis Group](#) a division of Reed Elsevier (UK) Ltd. All rights reserved.

November 27, 2000

SECTION: Guardian Foreign Pages, Pg. 18

LENGTH: 72 words

HEADLINE: In brief: Race murder claim examined

BODY:

Chancellor Gerhard Schroder has urged the police in eastern Germany to solve the case of a six-year-old German-Iraqi allegedly drugged, beaten and drowned by neo-Nazis.

Three people were arrested last week, but the authorities in Saxony, who reopened the 1997 case under pressure from the boy's family, said that although it might have been a hate crime there was no evidence of links with the far right. AP, Berlin

LOAD-DATE: November 27, 2000

Your use of this service is governed by [Terms and Conditions](#). Please review them.

June 19, 2000

SECTION: Guardian Home Pages, Pg. 7

LENGTH: 564 words

HEADLINE: Racist gang beats man to death at club: Three soldiers held for questioning after group of eight punched and kicked victim as he lay unconscious and attacked his brother and friend

BYLINE: Keith Perry

BODY:

A man was beaten to death and two others were injured in a race attack outside a nightclub in Westbury, Wiltshire, early yesterday.

Glyne Agard, who is black, his brother and a friend were attacked by an eight-strong gang as they left the Reflections nightclub.

Detective Superintendent Gary Chatfield of Wiltshire police said that the three men had been

racially abused before being beaten as they left the venue shortly before 3am.

Mr Agard, 34, from Reading, Berkshire, is understood to have been kicked and punched as he lay unconscious. Para-medics were unable to revive him and he was pronounced dead at the scene. A post mortem examination showed that he had died from his head injuries.

His brother Stephen, 32, also from Reading, was yesterday in a stable condition in the Royal United hospital, Bath, with head, neck and chest injuries. The third man attacked suffered concussion, but was released yesterday.

Glyne and Stephen Agard and their friend had apparently been the subject of racial taunts in the nightclub before the attack happened.

Police arrested four men, three of them soldiers, who were being questioned last night. One of the four is black.

An army spokesman said the three soldiers arrested were from the Green Howards based at Battlesbury barracks, Warminster.

"There are three serving soldiers under arrest who are helping police with their inquiries," said the spokesman. Detectives are now studying closed-circuit TV footage from the club. More than 100 officers are working on the case in conjunction with Wiltshire's racial equality council. Wiltshire police described the attack as "racially-motivated, brutal and unprovoked". Det Supt Chatfield said: "We have spoken to his parents and his girlfriend and family. They are clearly distressed by events that have unfolded."

The murdered man's eldest brother said that Mr Agard had worked as a railway guard and had been a keen Arsenal football fan. He said: "He was quiet guy who was good humoured and lived for his football and work. Glyne was a gentle and kind guy. It was a pointless attack by drunken scum who are evil."

Westbury, with a population of 16,000, is normally a haven for tourists and pensioners with one of the lowest crime rates in Britain.

But one Wiltshire police officer, Detective Superintendent Martin Abbott, conceded that the number of reported race crimes had doubled in the past year in Wiltshire.

The chairman of the commission for racial equality, Gurbux Singh, said recently that the latest figures showed that the number of racist incidents in London alone was greater than that for the whole of Britain in the previous 12 months.

Scotland Yard said that race hate crimes had doubled in London to an average of 63 a day in the 12 months to April. The total, 23,346, of which 14,699 were violent offences, compared with 23,049 which had been recorded across the entire country in the 12 months to April 1999.

The sharp increase is not confined to the capital, where the bulk of racial crime is committed. West Midlands police said that so far this year there had been 1,500 incidents recorded, compared with a total of 1,000 in the period 1998-99.

Scotland Yard figures also showed that eight in 10 racial incidents were unsolved, although this year's clear-up rate of 21% was double that of the previous year.

The **Guardian** (London)

June 23, 2000

SECTION: Guardian Home Pages, Pg. 18

LENGTH: 1180 words

HEADLINE: We don't need immigrants to pay for our pensions: The crisis of the elderly is a myth made up by insurance companies

BYLINE: Martin Woollacott

BODY:

It is typical of the confused debate over immigration, and the connected and equally muddled debate over the ageing crisis, that the Dover tragedy is being used by some to demand a tightening of immigration controls and by others to advocate their loosening. There is much obfuscation over these demographic issues, which seem in part to be matters of technical calculation, but which in fact raise the deepest questions about the nature of our societies, about who we think people are, and about how to set the balance between the collective and the private.

The confusion is made worse by the fact that, according to the level at which the debate is pitched, the political right and the political left shift their positions. The linking of the arguments over the growing burden of the aged and those over immigration leads many to the conclusion that immigration is desirable because it will redress the discrepancy between a large older generation that has to be cared for and a shrunken younger generation that will have to do the caring. Those on the right endorse the first half of the argument but not the second, at least for public consumption. Those on the left, by contrast, ought to repudiate the overdone panic over an ageing population, driven as it is by privatisers and anti-welfare interests, but do not often do so. But the left at least when it is out of office does go on to endorse the desirability of immigration on such grounds because that fits with a tradition that puts value on freedom of movement and embraces multi-culturalism.

Much evidence suggests that the two linked propositions that industrialised societies face a crisis of ageing, and that a large flow of youthful immigrants would help us cope with that crisis, and would also be beneficial in other ways are far from proven. What kinds of national interests are being served by large-scale immigration? Two academics concerned with social policy asked in a recent Washington Post article. In an America which has taken in huge numbers over the past two decades that is surely a legitimate question. The article notes the extraordinary re-migration from congested California to more have left that state since 1990 than the entire population of Wyoming as an example of the kind of pressure on resources and space that ought to be taken into account, but often is not, when setting national immigration policies. In Australia, scholars such as Tim Flannery, impeccably liberal on racial and cultural questions, nevertheless feel that substantial immigration ought to end, because numbers are already near the limits which an ecologically constricted country can sustain.

In Paris this week a conference set up by an American thinktank will discuss the crisis of the elderly on the basis of a report suggesting that it is even more severe than previously thought, and that immigration is high among the solutions to be contemplated. Such arguments rest on flimsy foundations. Old age is a concept, not a scientific category. The conventions of what it is and when it begins change all the time. A simple redefinition of old age, putting its onset further on in life, would dissolve the statistics of the ageing crisis instantly. It might also make clear that the real problem is not old age but a labour market dominated by employers who want younger and more easily manipulated workers, unhindered by the baggage of family, occasional illness, and frequent obstinacy which older men and women inevitably carry with them. The difficulties older people face do not begin with retirement age but at some point much earlier in their lives when they become less desirable

to employers. Similarly, the business of providing them with support is not confined to pensions, but begins when they start to falter in the labour market.

As Phil Mullan points out in his illuminating recent book, the crisis of the elderly was defined largely by people pursuing an anti-welfare programme. It was elaborated within the context of the ideological and financial case for cutting back the welfare state.ⁱ The crisis became a pretext for advocating cuts in public spending of every kind on the old themselves, because they are costing too much, and on other welfare costs, since the old are supposedly soaking up too much of available resources.

If you check the sponsors of any meeting on the pensions crisis, you are likely to find the names of insurance companies and private health providers or precisely the organisations likely to benefit from a narrowing of state provision. Such a narrowing opens up what some see as the best kind of market, the kind which is driven by the anxieties of individuals stripped of the protections they used to enjoy. Mullan suggests that the worst

aspect of this approach is

the way it stokes inter-

generational conflict, dividing us into a tribe of the young and a tribe of the old or to which one might add a third tribe of immigrants. Difficulties which arise from the overall direction of society as set by powerful actors, especially business, can then be dumped on a single social group.

It is important to underline that the same movement in the labour market which makes even the best employers favour a younger and less secure domestic workforce also operates to create a demand for immigrant labour, including that of illegal immigrants. At least some low-grade work, of the kind that locals are supposed to refuse to do and migrants be happy to perform, used to be done in the course of training, as part of the drudgery necessary before rising to a more comfortable level. But, with the decline in training and the reduction of intermediate management levels, drudgery is now a niche in the labour market rather than a phase in working life.

There is thus a strong case for saying that the debate over ageing and immigration as conducted at present is something of a fraud, distracting from what should

really be at the centre of attention, which is the way the economic organisation of

society is more and more out of kilter with its supposed principles. This is not to say that there are no genuine problems arising from demographic change, but the exaggeration of those problems by those with a vendetta against the welfare state has been harmful. Nor is it to say that the industrialised countries should necessarily set their face against further substantial immigration. But it is to argue that the economic case for such immigration is thin and that there are significant ecological and other arguments of varying according to the country or continent concerned or against it. Leaving aside the distinct question of asylum, it might well be decided that in the interests of openness and diversity and stimulus, such immigration is nevertheless worthwhile. But that decision ought to be taken on its merits and not on the basis of a spurious picture of our societies and their needs.

SECTION: Guardian Home Pages, Pg. 9

LENGTH: 528 words

HEADLINE: Racist probation service shocks inspectors

BYLINE: Alan Travis Home affairs editor

BODY:

The probation service is infected by racism to "an unacceptable degree", the Home Office minister, Paul Boateng, said yesterday in the face of an official report showing that its approach to race equality has largely stood still over the past decade.

The chief inspector of probation, Sir Graham Smith, said he was "very disappointed" that his investigation had discovered a service that was suffering from complacency, having for years paid lip-service to race equality.

The probation inspectors who carried out the report as part of the government's response to the Stephen Lawrence inquiry were shocked by what they found.

The report said that white probation officers were uncomfortable dealing with black offenders, because they were terrified of being accused of racism. The result was that they produced pre-sentence reports, crucial in determining the penalty imposed by the court, which were of a poorer quality for black defendants than for white.

Mr Boateng said this could explain why defendants from ethnic minorities were given harsher sentences on average than white defendants.

Mr Smith said the report's findings were particularly depressing after the probation service had played a trail-blazing role on race equality work in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

The report said that many black probation staff had no confidence in the policies, while among some white staff the fear of being called racist outweighed fear of being found incompetent. While probation did attract significant numbers of black staff, few were employed at chief officer or other management level.

Too many black probation officers were failing in their initial year in the job, and those that did stay on lost out on promotion. A disproportionate number also faced disciplinary proceedings.

Mr Boateng said the fact that white probation officers felt uncomfortable dealing with black offenders must have an effect on the quality of pre-sentence reports and so of sentencing by the courts. "We already know there is a disproportionate number of black offenders and this is an indication that race equality is not just a problem for the police but for the whole criminal justice system."

The National Association of Probation Officers called for action. "The probation service pioneered equal opportunities and it is still well ahead of other agencies, but Napo is deeply concerned about the number of black staff failing their probationary year," spokesman Harry Fletcher said.

Sir Graham Smith said the inspectorate would follow up the report with all probation services being asked to review their equal opportunities policies and provide a progress report in October.

The report found that little common understanding existed across the 54 different probation services about what constituted racist behaviour. More than half the staff who completed a

questionnaire said they had experienced racist behaviour during their work, about half of it from offenders, but the other half from colleagues or others in the criminal justice system.

8
February 7, 2005

SECTION: Guardian Home Pages, Pg. 3

LENGTH: 703 words

HEADLINE: Clarke aims to steal Tories' thunder with tough immigration package

BYLINE: Alan Travis and Michael White

BODY:

The home secretary, Charles Clarke, will today pick up the Conservatives' election challenge on immigration when he announces that migrant workers seeking to enter Britain will have to pass a skills test, as part of a package of measures designed to tighten the law in response to voter pressure.

He will also announce, as part of his five-year plan, that measures are to be introduced to establish electronic forms of border controls, to ensure that those on work permits leave the country when their permits expire, and to restrict the rights of some to bring in dependants beyond their immediate family.

Labour strategists hope that the package will help them to neutralise one of the few issues on which the Conservatives enjoy a substantial and sustained opinion poll lead.

Though Mr Clarke's talk of driving out "people who are a burden" on society prompted some criticisms yesterday, the three main parties are all approaching this election-sensitive issue carefully.

They broadly agree on the merits of controlled economic migration, but disagree on how to handle asylum. Yesterday Mr Clarke ruled out matching the Tory plan to have a quota for the number of asylum seekers - 15,000 a year - allowed to stay in Britain.

But in an appearance on BBC1's Breakfast with Frost the home secretary did indicate fresh measures against those who falsely claim asylum.

Labour will also step up the deportation rate of those whose asylum claims are rejected.

Today he will unveil extra powers to deal with the people-traffickers who exploit migrants working clandestinely in Britain.

Today Michael Howard will shift the focus of what some politicians carelessly call the "asylum and crime" agenda to Labour's "charade" on prison sentencing.

A YouGov poll for the thinktank Migrationwatch claimed that 45% of voters see immigration as an issue that might affect their vote, and that 77% of voters disagree in varying degrees with claim that Labour has it under control.

But the aggressive language used by Labour ministers yesterday came at a price. The chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality, Trevor Phillips, expressed dismay at hearing Labour ministers claiming that migration had led to the "hospitality of the British people" being abused.

The former trade union leader Sir Bill Morris also cautioned against Labour and Tories getting into "a bidding war about who can be nastiest to asylum seekers".

Mr Clarke denies pandering to bigots by raising the question. "I reject that entirely," he said.

"I think that the issue of who does come into this country, and whether they are entitled to be in this country, who does settle here, and how we have border controls, is a perfectly legitimate aspect of public debate."

Mr Clarke confirmed that the basic outline of today's five-year plan for immigration and asylum will include these points.

- * A skills test and a points system to decide who should be given work permits. "We will establish a system . . . which looks at the skills, talents, abilities of people seeking to come and work in this country, and ensures that when they come here they have a job and can contribute to the economy of the country"

- * New electronic borders. Proper tests and electronic fingerprinting of everybody who gets a visa to come to Britain will be established by 2008. Identity cards will be introduced for all foreign migrants in the country for more than three months.

- * A limit on dependants who come with those on work permits to spouse and immediate children.

- * New measures to deal with people-traffickers.

- * A clampdown on those who come to Britain to make false asylum claims, and to ensure that they are removed once their appeals have failed.

Mark Oaten, the Liberal Democrat's spokesman, endorsed Labour's rejection of the Tory quotas plan for asylum. The jury was still out on the Home Office's ability to deliver an efficient asylum system, he said.

"For too long it has pandered to the right and not been positive about welcoming genuine refugees, while at the same time its systems have failed to act quickly enough when people try to abuse them."

Leader comment, page 17

LOAD-DATE: February 7, 2005

9

Copyright 2005 Guardian Newspapers Limited
The **Guardian** (London) - Final Edition

February 16, 2005

SECTION: Guardian Leader Pages, Pg. 23

LENGTH: 431 words

HEADLINE: Comment & Analysis: Migrants: Unhealthy obsession

BODY:

There is nothing wrong in principle in suggesting migrant workers should be required to undergo compulsory health checks. Indeed the first few lines of yesterday's press release from the Conservative party strive to set out some serious points: the rise of tuberculosis within the UK and the need to minimise public health risks. If they had been better researched they could have added some startling figures: a 25% increase of the disease in 10 years, with 7,000 new cases being diagnosed every year, two-thirds of whom were born abroad.

But the Conservatives' latest move was not prompted by health needs. It was motivated by party electoral needs. The first page of its four-page release gives the game away with its distorted assertion, set out in bold black type: "At the next election people will face a clear choice: limited and controlled immigration with the Conservatives or unlimited immigration under Mr Blair."

This is not the first time the Tory party has proposed such a scheme. Twenty months ago, they made a similar proposal, which included checks on asylum seekers too. The all-party parliamentary group on Aids countered that such tests would be impractical, expensive, unjust, dangerous and, for asylum seekers, a breach of the European convention on human rights. Little had been heard from the Tories on this issue until yesterday. Now, undaunted, they have repeated the old call, but now exempting refugees, children and pregnant women. This fails to answer the questions raised both by the MPs and by ministers, who have been running TB checks on people from high-risk countries for some years but have only found about 100 infectious cases out of 185,000 tests. An Institute for Public Policy Research report pointed out 15 months ago that unless ministers were ready to screen everybody, the only alternative was an enormously expensive pre-entry screening in migrants' home states. Alas, ministers have now been lured into this wrong option.

Contrary to Michael Howard's untrue assertion, immigration to this country remains strictly controlled. No one from outside the EU can come here to study or work without a permit. Many millions more need a visa just to visit. Some 40,000 are refused an extension, 50,000 are turned back at ports of entry, and another 200,000 are refused permission by British consulates overseas. Currently the calmest people in this bidding war between the two main parties remain the public. Despite the frenetic efforts of Mr Howard, public concern about asylum actually declined in last week's polls.

LOAD-DATE: February 16, 2005

Your use of this service is governed by [Terms and Conditions](#). Please review them.

10

February 21, 2005

SECTION: Guardian Home Pages, Pg. 8

LENGTH: 47 words

HEADLINE: In brief: Immigration net tightened

BODY:

A scheme aimed at stopping people-trafficking and illegal immigration is to be extended. The government said 15 extra airline liaison officers would be recruited to help the current 27 identify travellers without genuine travel documents before they set off for the UK.

LOAD-DATE: February 21, 2005

11

Copyright 2005 Guardian Newspapers Limited
The **Guardian** (London) - Final Edition

April 1, 2005

SECTION: Guardian Home Pages, Pg. 9

LENGTH: 516 words

HEADLINE: We need race minister to fight inequality, say campaigners

BYLINE: Tania Branigan and Ali Hussain

BODY:

Campaigners yesterday called for the introduction of a race minister as they launched a manifesto demanding equality for black and ethnic minority communities.

The initiative, organised by Operation Black Vote (OBV), is designed to push race-related issues higher up the agenda in the run-up to the election.

The manifesto calls for high-achieving schools, colleges and universities to have legally binding intake quotas for low-income black and ethnic minority children.

It urges parties to adopt all-black shortlists in areas with substantial ethnic minority communities and to outlaw the extreme right by banning any parties that contravene race or human rights laws.

The coalition - which includes organisations such as the National Black Police Association, the Muslim Association of Britain and the Society of Black Lawyers - hopes voters will use its manifesto and pledge card to press candidates on race issues.

It wants a race minister, equivalent to the existing women's minister. Karen Chouhan, of the 1990 Trust, said: "Tackling racism at a cabinet level, along with the other measures, will be a quantum leap forward."

Simon Woolley, OBV's director, said: "This election will be won and lost in urban areas. That's where we reside and have political clout. Never before in British politics has the black vote been so strong. Although we are a minority vote, in a tightly run race we hold the balance of power."

Mr Woolley said the younger generation was becoming engaged, with stars such as Ms Dynamite and members of So Solid Crew asking how they could help with the process.

The coalition has been registering voters around the country and will take its own battlebus on the road. It also plans to hold "question time" sessions.

OBV says there are 71 seats where ethnic minority populations exceed the majority at the last

election, and so could directly affect the outcome.

But electoral participation in many ethnic minority communities has been below the national average. Black and Asian voters have also supported Labour overwhelmingly in the past, although that loyalty has begun to break down.

The coalition points out that two-thirds of black people still live in the poorest areas of the country; that infant mortality rates are twice as high; and that black people are six times more likely to be stopped and searched by the police.

Demands in the manifesto include an apology for slavery and colonialism; concerted action to eliminate racial disparities in health and healthcare; and an end to "draconian" policies on asylum seekers such as forced dispersal and detention.

"Black communities don't have the luxury not to vote," said Lee Jasper, the chairman of OBV, and the London mayor Ken Livingstone's adviser on race issues. "With racism and in particular Islamophobia alarmingly on the increase, it is the duty of every black person to tell their political candidates that we demand that they sign up to an agenda for justice.

"Failure to do so will be punished at the ballot box."

12

Copyright 2005 Guardian Newspapers Limited
The **Guardian** (London) - Final Edition

April 11, 2005

SECTION: Guardian Home Pages, Pg. 1

LENGTH: 274 words

HEADLINE: Immigration tactic worries Labour

BYLINE: Patrick Wintour

BODY:

Labour has launched a last-minute fundraising drive among big donors to combat what is being described as an unprecedented level of Conservative spending.

Lord Levy, the chief Labour fundraiser, has been called in by Downing Street in an attempt to boost the party's £15m election war chest.

He is understood to be warning donors about the intensity of the Conservative attack and its drive on immigration.

Marginal Labour constituencies have been heavily targeted by the Conservative party, which has embarked on an aggressive advertising campaign to push home its get-tough message.

That was emphasised in a speech by Michael Howard yesterday. Playing what Tory strategists hope is his strongest vote-winning card, he warned that immigration was no longer under control. He said that the government was "playing fast and loose with our security".

"We face a real terrorist threat in Britain today - a threat to our way of life, to our liberties. Yet we have absolutely no idea who's coming into and leaving our country," Mr Howard said.

Lord Levy consistently generates about £4m a year for the party. He plans to build upon the £10m-£12m he has already aimed to raise to fund the election.

He met resistance from some potential donors after the controversy over Labour's draft poster campaign, which was accused of being anti-semitic.

Some of the party's bigger donors are Jewish.

Mr Howard's tough anti-immigration tone, as well as the party's surge in the polls, appears to have changed the mood.

Labour believes that the Conservative campaign is one of the best funded since the 1980s.

Frequently Asked Questions

Manlio Cinalli (FNSP-CEVIPOF, partner 3) & Marco Giugni (UNIGE, partner 2)

How to proceed with articles that report results from studies and investigations carried out by research projects/reports/statistics?

Claims can take three main forms:

- Political decisions (law, governmental guideline, implementation measure, etc.)
- Verbal statements (public speech, press conference, parliamentary intervention, etc.)
- Protest actions (demonstration, occupation, violent action, etc.)

All claims taking one of these forms are coded, provided that they fall in our field. In particular, claims are by definition politically and strategically oriented, i.e. they relate to collective social problems and imply a policy evaluation. This means that purely factual information, reports and their factual statistics, as well as editorials and commentaries are excluded. Similarly, simple attributions of attitudes or opinions to actors by the media or by other actors are also excluded.

Tricky example: “a study reports that people with non-Swedish ethnic background are discriminated against at Swedish hospitals, resulting in that immigrants often avoid seeking health care even if they are sick”. There is no claim by any actor here, unless we will find that results of this report are used from some actor (even if only the producers of report) to claim that “people with non-Swedish ethnic background are discriminated against at Swedish hospitals”. The statement “immigrants often avoid seeking health care” does not refer to any claim either, since it is something reported about immigrants and not a claim by immigrants themselves.

How to deal with ‘private’ and ‘individuals’ claims?

This type of claims are coded if they are political, in the sense that they relate to collective social problems. For example, a private citizen (‘individual/private’ actor’) may state that the election of Nyamku Sabuni as minister has an important value, that will have positive consequences for immigrants and their children living in Sweden. Another example may be a UK court ruling on the circumstance of an asylum-seeker (‘individual-private’ object): information would be coded only if actors involved referred to arguments that went beyond the individual case. One could also think about various actions to support undocumented families/individuals requesting for regularization. No doubt, these actions (which may also involve more complex forms such as supporting committees and public speeches) have a political dimension and relate to collective social problems.

Can claim-making involve “setencens” and “prosecutions”?

Yes, unlike the narrow definition of contentious politics that underlies studies of protest events, our definition of ‘claims-making’ includes political claims regardless of the form in which they are made (statement, violence, repression, decision, demonstration, court ruling, etc.) and regardless of the nature of the actor (governments, social movements, NGOs, individuals, anonymous actors, etc.). However, care needs to be taken when facing ‘combinations’ (for example, repressive measure and verbal statement, or the combination of protest and verbal statement). In this case, the

rule is protest > political decision > verbal statement > repressive measure. In other words, protest forms overrule verbal forms: a demonstration with statements is a demonstration. Likewise, a verbal form overrules a repressive measure: a court ruling accompanied by politically relevant statements is a verbal statement.

What to do when coding a ‘local’ claim that has acquired a national dimension in terms of visibility?

Here we need to put attention on the different parts of the claim. The scope of issues refers to the geographical and/or political scope of the issue. This is different from the scope of the actor, which refers to their organisational extension (the same can be said about ‘object’, ‘addressee’, etc.). For unorganized collectivities and groups, however, we have decided that scope should refer to that of mobilization.

Tricky example: ‘Squatters from Cachan’ (a little village outside Paris) will be coded as ‘national’ in occasion when their claims-making is about the ‘expulsion affair’ of October 2006.

When coding the actors (ACTOR 1/ACTOR2), what should one do if there are more actors than just two?

Unfortunately, our coding needs to be ‘essential’, and leaves room only to 2 actors even when more actors formulate together a claim. Experience also tells us that it is unlikely that we would end up with some significant information for analysis, should we code the rare instances when more than 2 actors are involved. In these cases, it is up to coders to decide what are the 2 ‘leading’ actors of the claim.

When coding NATMIN, what if there are two (or more) actors and they have different ethnic background?

This type of variable gives, if mentioned, the national or ethnic background of the first minority actor (ACTOR1). This variable aims to reproduce the specific discursive “labeling” occurring in the paper (it is a string variable).

When claims are mentioned in the article retrospectively, how far back can we go with the coding?

Claims are coded when they are reported in the issue consulted and took place up to two weeks before / or will take place up to two weeks after the date of appearance of that issue (obviously, ONLY IF they have not already been coded).

Tricky example from an article of 092906:” The Prefect of Loire took a deportation measure on September 6th regarding an Algerian migrant who is suffering from a genetic disease”. In this case, the ‘repressive measure’ is simply NOT coded.

What should be done in case where there is no date of the claim or event? Shall we use the date of the publication of the article?

If only a vague identification of date is reported, such as “last week” or “a few days ago”, the claim is coded as if it occurred 7 days earlier. If no indication of date is reported, the date of appearance of the newspaper is coded.

What is the difference between SADRES and SCRITAC?

This difference is NOT about ‘timing’ (for example, some coders thought that SCRITAC refers necessarily to the past due to the way that certain acts ‘were’ performed). Rather, SADRES refers to the addressee narrowly defined, i.e. the actor who is held responsible for acting with regard to the claim or at whom the claim is directly addressed as a call to act. In other words, this is the actor at whom a demand is explicitly addressed (usually, a state actor). SCRITAC refers to the criticized actors, i.e. the actor who is overtly criticized or mentioned in a negative way in the claim. Unfortunately, our codebook does not allow the coding of information referring to actors that are ‘positively’ criticized, that is, this information is lost.

Do code calls for a future demonstration? So do we code twice?: once for the call for demonstration, once for the demonstration itself?

‘Calling for’ a demonstration is a different claim than ‘demonstrating’ so we will need to code both claims, even our sensation is to code ‘twice’. More generally, some particular attention need to be put to decide whether we are indeed coping with different claims or not. In case of repeated statements or announcements, each one is coded IS a separate claim. If an actor enters the public sphere several times announcing at different points of time that it will held a meeting/demonstration, each time IS coded as a separate claim.

A different case is when information found in another article or newspaper issue refers to the SAME claim that has been coded previously. In this case, we DO NOT code a second time. In fact, we would also need to use information found in the second article to correct/complete claim from previous article. For example, claims that were coded but are found in a further issue of the newspaper not to have occurred will be withdrawn from the sample. Similarly, additional information found in another article regarding the same claim previously coded is used to complete the coding of that claim.

If the article didn’t mention to which party the actor belongs, shall we investigate it?

If PARTY is not specified but coder do know the affiliation through personal knowledge or through successive reports of the claim, she would need to complete the information.

In SACTOR we should codify the actor or its function/role?

Sometimes the same actor can be classified according to several characteristics, as for example, when identifying the party affiliation of a Minister. We have decided that the ACTOR variables should be used for the main characteristic/role/function as it is reported in the article. By default, the characterization as state actor prevails over the party affiliation. However, in case of organisation or

group identifications that fall into several groups at the same time, the following priority rules apply: 1) minority group identification, 2) extreme right and racist group, 3) antiracist and pro-minority group, 4) general solidarity, human rights and welfare groups, 5) all other groups. This implies that, for example, the Front National is coded as an extreme right group, not as a political party.