



**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

**LOCALMULTIDEM AND MDE  
POLITICAL OPPORTUNITY STRUCTURES (WP1)**

**Guidelines for data collection and list of indicators**

**Document prepared by Pietro Castelli Gattinara and Laura Morales  
University of Leicester**

Revision: FINAL VERSION

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

## Introduction and citations

This document contains the guidelines for the data collection of Political Opportunity Structures (POS) indicators and the list of the institutional POS indicators included in the dataset collected through Workpackage 1 of the Localmultidem project and through other related sister projects that formed part of the Multicultural Democracy in Europe (MDE) research network. This workpackage involved collecting information at the contextual (or macro) level through the use of secondary sources and interviews with political and administrative authorities. The document is divided in two main sections. The first section contains the main descriptive information regarding the Localmultidem project and partner institutions, as well as specific information on the structure of the data collected in WP 1. The second section contains the full list of indicators used to code institutional POS and the guidelines and instruction for the collection of the macro-level data.

### How to cite this document:

Castelli Gattinara, Pietro and Laura Morales. *LOCALMULTIDEM and MDE Political Opportunity Structures Indicators (WP1): Guidelines for Data Collection*. Leicester: University of Leicester, 2014.

### How to cite the data:

Cinalli, Manlio, Laura Morales, Géraldine Bozec, Ranji Devadason, Nina Eggert, Miruna Morariu, Amparo González, Katia Pilati, Virginia Ros, Ildikó Zakariás. *LOCALMULTIDEM and MDE Political Opportunity Structures Indicators (WP1) Dataset*, [Computer file]. Leicester: University of Leicester [Distributor], 2014.

### Related publications:

Cinalli, Manlio, Marco Giugni, and Alessandro Nai. 2010. "La partecipazione politica e la protesta degli immigrati. Una comparazione del ruolo delle opportunità politiche in nove città europee." *Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica* no. 40 (3):397-422.

Cinalli, Manlio, and Marco Giugni. 2011. "Institutional opportunities, discursive opportunities and the political participation of migrants in European cities." In *Social Capital, Political Participation and Migration in Europe. Making Multicultural Democracy Work?*, edited by Laura Morales and Marco Giugni, 43-62. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Morales, Laura, and Marco Giugni, eds. *Social Capital, Political Participation and Migration in Europe. Making Multicultural Democracy Work?* Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2011

Eggert, Nina. *The Impact of Political opportunity Structures on networks of Immigrant Associations: A Comparison of Two European Cities*. PhD Dissertation. University of Geneva and University of Trento, 2011.

González-Ferrer, Amparo, and Laura Morales. 2013. "Do Citizenship Regimes Shape Political Incorporation? Evidence from Four European Cities." *European Political Science*, 12 (4):455-466.

Nina Eggert and Katia Pilati. 2014. "Networks and political engagement of migrant organisations in five European cities." *European Journal of Political Research*, 53 (4):858–875. doi: 10.1111/1475-6765.12057

### Additional Documentation:

Bozec, Géraldine, Manlio Cinalli, Ranji Devadason, Nina Eggert, Laura Morales, Miruna Morariu, Amparo González, Katia Pilati, Virginia Ros, Ildikó Zakariás. *LOCALMULTIDEM and MDE city reports on the Institutional Political Opportunity Structures (WP1) Deliverable #5*, 2006.

Bozec, Géraldine, Manlio Cinalli, Laura Morales, Ranji Devadason, Nina Eggert, Miruna Morariu, Amparo González, Katia Pilati, Virginia Ros, Ildikó Zakariás. *LOCALMULTIDEM and MDE Integrated report on the Institutional Political Opportunity Structures (WP1) Deliverable #7*, 2007.

Eggert, Nina and Miruna Morariu. *LOCALMULTIDEM and MDE, Geneva city report on the Institutional Political Opportunity Structures (WP1)*, University of Geneva, 2007.

# Project Description

## The Project

<b>1 Project acronym</b>	Localmultidem
<b>2 Project name</b>	Multicultural Democracy and Immigrants Social Capital in Europe: Participation, Organisational Networks, and Public Policies at the Local Level
<b>3 Contract number</b>	CIT5-CT-2005-028802
<b>4 Abstract</b>	<p>The main objective of the project is to study the degree of political integration of the foreign-origin or immigrant population in several European cities, and therefore to study multicultural democracy at the local level. The research analyses the potential influence of four types of factors on political integration: immigrants' individual characteristics; immigrants' organizational structures; the structure of institutional and discursive opportunities, and the characteristics of the immigrant groups within the host society.</p> <p>The information has been collected at three different levels of analysis: (1) the contextual or macro-level, using secondary sources and interviews with political and administrative authorities; (2) the organizational or meso-level, through the study of immigrants' organisational structures and networks, carried out with surveys to immigrants' associations; and (3) the individual or micro-level, through a survey to immigrants residents of different origins (with a control group of national-born citizens). This document refers exclusively to the survey data collected at the individual or micro-level.</p>
<b>5 Keywords</b>	Immigrants, political integration, immigrants' associations and networks, host society
	<b>Survey Frame</b>
<b>6 Unit of analysis</b>	Immigrant groups in Budapest, London, Lyon, Milan, Madrid, Zurich, Barcelona, Geneva and Stockholm
<b>7 Universe</b>	Immigrants in general and ethnic Hungarians, Chinese and Muslims of mixed nationalities in Budapest; Afro-Caribbean, Bangladeshi and Indians in London; Moroccans, Ecuadoreans, Andean Mixed Group (Bolivians, Colombians and Peruvians) in Madrid and Barcelona; Filipinos, Egyptians and Ecuadoreans in Milan; Turks, Kosovars, Italians in Zurich; Kosovars and Italians in Geneva; Turks, Chilean and Kurdish Turks in Stockholm; and Tunisians, Algerians and Moroccans in Lyon.
<b>8 Ethnic groups</b>	Italian, ethnic Hungarian, Kosovar, Turkish (and Kurdish Turks), Moroccan, Bangladeshi, Algerian, Tunisian, Egyptian, Filipino, Ecuadorean, Indian, Chinese, Afro-Caribbean, Andean Latin American, Chilean, and mixed nationalities /ethnic groups

## 9 Participating cities

**Main Cities:**<sup>1</sup> Budapest (Hungary), London (UK), Lyon (France), Milan (Italy), Madrid (Spain) and Zurich (Switzerland)

**“Sister” Cities:**<sup>2</sup> Barcelona (Spain), Geneva (Switzerland) Stockholm (Sweden)

### Partner Institutions

## 10 Principal investigators and partner institutions

### Main Cities:

Laura Morales. Universidad de Murcia, Spain, and University of Manchester, UK

Marco Giugni. Université de Genève, Switzerland

Mario Diani. Università degli Studi di Trento, Italy

Manlio Cinalli. Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques, France

Endre Sik. MTA Etnikai-nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet, Hungary

Paul Statham. University of Leeds and University of Bristol, UK

### ‘Sister’ Cities:

Eva Anduiza. Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, Spain

Bo Bengtsson. University of Uppsala, Sweden

---

1 The research conducted in the ‘main’ cities was funded by the project LOCALMULTIDEM (6th Framework Programme of the European Commission).

2 Some other European cities joined the project and were funded by various national research institutions and foundations.

**LOCALMULTIDEM PROJECT, WP1:  
POLITICAL OPPORTUNITY STRUCTURES INDICATORS  
Final full version (October 2014)**

**NOTES ON THIS DOCUMENT:**

- This document includes all items that were used to measure Institutional Political Opportunity Structures as well as the instructions that were followed in order to code each indicator in the cities under study for Workpackage 1 of the Localmultidem project.
- The general aim of this workpackage is to capture the institutional political opportunity structure that can impact on immigrants' political integration at the local level. A special attention is given to the policies and institutions that are specifically related to local governments.
- Please double check with the city reports included in Deliverable #5 for a presentation of the general immigration situation in each city setting and all other relevant information to understand the rationale for the scores attributed to each indicator.

**NOTES ON THE AGGREGATE DATASET:**

- The aggregate dataset of Workpackage 1 of the Localmultidem project (excel format) provides detailed scores (sheet1) and summary scores (sheet2) for all the indicators of institutional POS in Budapest, London, Lyon, Madrid, Milan, Zurich, Geneva, Stockholm and Barcelona (and for selected urban areas within the cities of Lyon and London). For all cities, POS indicators are measured and apply to 2006.
- The dataset includes:
  - 36 individual rights indicators;
  - 22 group rights indicators;
  - 21 general POS indicators;
  - 20 Specific POS indicators (related to immigration and ethnic relations);
  - Aggregate scores for the 8 individual rights categories; 6 cultural/group rights categories; 2 general POS categories; 4 specific POS categories;
  - Dimension scores for the Individual rights dimension; Group/cultural rights dimension; General POS dimension; Specific POS dimension;
  - Overall mean scores across dimensions and summary scores (sheet 2)
- All items for the individual rights and the cultural/group rights dimension are split in GE (indicators representing the situation of the "typical" immigrant, understood in a 'statistical' sense, i.e. the most 'common' immigrant group or set of groups in each city) and G1, G2, G3 (indicators specific to each of the three ethnic/migrant groups studied in each city).
- For the integrated analysis, the French team of Localmultidem substituted the case of Italian immigrants (cf. Deliverable#5) with Moroccans. For Lyon, the dataset reports indicators for three immigrant groups: Algerians (G1), Tunisians (G2 and Moroccans (G3).
- General POS and specific POS indicators for Lyon and London include specific items at the level of the banlieu/borough area next to the ones computed for the overall city level.
- The last column of the aggregate dataset reports:
  - notes on the methods for the calculation of dimension and overall scores
  - notes on the scaling (1; 0; -1) and definition of specific indicators
  - notes on the items that are irrelevant for a specific group or indicator
  - notes on the level to which indicators apply for banlieu/borough areas in Lyon and London

## 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.

### 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.

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 Excel data file to be used as the template for data entry, which cannot 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 or other than a-b-c	Grounds include c but not d	No other than a-b

b) **Long-term residence permits (duration of validity:  $\geq 5$  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 <math>\geq 5</math> 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 <math>\leq 2</math> years</i>
8	Required minimum time of habitual residence Split: For each of the three groups	$> 6$ years	$> 4 \leq 6$ years	$\leq 4$ 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	$< 50$ %	$\geq 50 < 80$ %	$\geq 80$ %

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 $\geq 5$ 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: $\leq 5$ 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 &gt; 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 ≤ 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 %	≥ 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>	<p>After &gt; 5 years <i>or</i> upon certain conditions</p>	<p>After &gt; 3 ≤ 5 years</p>	<p>After ≤ 3 years</p>
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>	<p>&lt; 50 %</p>	<p>≥ 50 &lt; 80 %</p>	<p>≥ 80 %</p>

### 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> ( $\geq 1$ 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	<p>Access to social security, social assistance and healthcare for non-nationals</p> <p>a. minimum income support</p> <p>b. minimum housing support</p> <p>c. family and child benefits</p> <p>d. assistance in case of illness</p> <p>e. pregnancy and maternity care</p> <p>f. long-term care</p> <p>Split: For each of the three groups</p>	Less than core benefits <i>or</i> no access	<p>- Limitation to core benefits: a, d, e and f</p> <p>- or access to all benefits but with conditions of time of residence/of legal employment for one or some of them</p> <p>- or legal access but limited/no implementation</p> <p>- or legal access but possible negative consequences for immigrants (for example: risk of expulsion or permit withdrawal if welfare dependent)</p>	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 $\geq 5$ 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 $\geq 5$ 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 $\geq 5$ 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 groups 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	- 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	- Two-party system - Multiparty system		
64	Party(ies) in power in the city	- one party - a coalition of parties		
65	Party (ies) in power – National Level	- Right - Centre - Left <u>over the 10 past years</u>		
66	Party (ies) in power – Local Level	- 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	- 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.