



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 DISCURSIVE POLITICAL
OPPORTUNITIES (WP1)**

Description of study, released data and codebook

**Document prepared by
Pietro Castelli Gattinara*, Manlio Cinalli⁺, Marco Giugni[§] and Laura Morales***

***University of Leicester, ⁺ Sciences Po Paris, [§] University of Geneva**

Revision: FINAL VERSION [Jan 2015]

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)	

1. Introduction and citations

This Study description and Codebook document outlines the goals and methodology of the data collection relating to Discursive Opportunity Structures. The document describes the characteristics of the released data and lists all the variables 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 aggregate (city) level through a claims-making analysis of newspapers in each of the following nine European cities: Barcelona, Budapest, Geneva, London, Lyon, Madrid, Milan, Stockholm and Zurich.

How to cite this document:

Castelli Gattinara, Pietro, Manlio Cinalli, Marco Giugni and Laura Morales. *LOCALMULTIDEM and MDE Discursive Political Opportunities (WP1): Description of study, released data and codebook*. Leicester: University of Leicester, 2015.

How to cite the data:

Cinalli, Manlio, Karin Borevi, Géraldine Bozec, Marco Giugni, Tamas Kohut, Laura Morales, Katia Pilati, Paul Statham, Luca Varadi, Noé Wiener. *LOCALMULTIDEM and MDE Discursive Political Opportunity Structures 2004-2006 (WP1) Dataset*, [Computer file]. Leicester: University of Leicester [Distributor], 2015.
(<https://thedata.harvard.edu/dvn/faces/study/StudyPage.xhtml?studyId=92801&tab=files>)

Related publications:

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

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.

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*, 40, 397-422.

Additional documentation:

Cinalli, Manlio. *LOCALMULTIDEM and MDE integrated report on Discursive indicators (WP1) Deliverable #D7_b*, 2008.
(<https://thedata.harvard.edu/dvn/faces/study/StudyPage.xhtml?studyId=92801&tab=files>)

Cinalli, Manlio, Tamàs Kohut, Luca Vàradi, Elisa Rodríguez, Laura Morales, Noé Wiener, Katia Pilati. *LOCALMULTIDEM and MDE city reports on Discursive indicators (WP1) Deliverable #D5_b*, 2008.
(<https://thedata.harvard.edu/dvn/faces/study/StudyPage.xhtml?studyId=92801&tab=files>)

2. Project Description

The Project

1 Project acronym	Localmultidem
2 Project name	Multicultural Democracy and Immigrants Social Capital in Europe: Participation, Organisational Networks, and Public Policies at the Local Level
3 Contract number	CIT5-CT-2005-028802
4 Abstract	<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>
5 Keywords	Immigrants, political integration, immigrants' associations and networks, host society
	Study Frame
6 Unit of analysis	A claim
7 Universe	All claims contained in selected newspapers per city

8 Participating cities

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

“Sister” Cities:² Barcelona (Spain), Geneva (Switzerland) and Stockholm (Sweden)

Partner Institutions

9 Principal investigators and 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:

Bo Bengtsson. University of Uppsala, Sweden

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

Marco Giugni. Université de Genève, Switzerland

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.

3. Goals and Methodology

3.1. Aims and scope

Amongst the starting hypotheses of the LOCALMULTIDEM project was the idea that public discourse impacts upon the forms and degree of migrants' civic and political integration. For example, the analysis of discursive frames might tell which groups are in a better position to become politically integrated within our local polities. To assess these expectations, the study of the impact of local discursive practices on immigrants' (and their descendants') political integration across our cities has been tackled through the analysis of 'discursive interventions' that can be found in reports of main newspapers, 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. More simply, protest event analysis takes protest as an indicator of the level of challenges to the political system, while 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 (Koopmans and Statham, 1999, Koopmans and Statham, 2000, Koopmans and Olzak, 2004, Koopmans, 2004, Giugni et al., 2005, Koopmans et al., 2005a).

In particular, the two approaches have been integrated by combining the quantitative rigor of protest event analysis with the sensitivity to discursive content of political discourse approaches. *All* forms of public claim-making have been analysed (this being a key difference with protest event analysis), including purely discursive forms such as public statements, press releases and conferences, publications, or interviews, alongside conventional forms of political action (for example, litigation and petitioning) and protest forms. At the same time, we have extended 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 parties, parliamentary, governmental and other state actors.

The dataset has uniformly been built through collection of discursive interventions in each city. As stated in the codebook section (below), each of these discursive interventions is characterised by a typical structure. Specifically, the structure of claims for our study has been 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 have thus focused on key variables that allow us to grasp the discursive interventions in the field of immigration and ethnic relations both at the national and at the local level. That is, all interventions were selected when referring to the country under study. Reactions abroad to claims occurring in the country of coding have been excluded, alongside with any other claim that has no reference to the country under study. Any statement by actors of the country made outside the country were coded, together with any other claim by any actor made in the country itself. Claims by international actors that take place in the country have also been

coded. Actor, object, addressee, and issue of the discursive intervention are the main variables for data collection and analysis. In addition, we have also coded some valuable information on the 'position towards the object' so as to evaluate which actors intervene more explicitly in favour or against the interests of migrants.

3.2. Unit of analysis

The units of analysis are instances of claim-making. Drawing on prior work by the MERCI project³, we have defined an instance of claim making (shorthand: a claim) as a unit of strategic action in the public sphere. As stated in the codebook, this 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*. This 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.).

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 had to 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 did not count as claim-making (see codebook for some examples). Verbs indicating action included, e.g., said, stated, demanded, criticised, decided, demonstrated, published, voted, wrote, arrested. Nouns directly referring to such action included, e.g., statement, letter, speech, report, blockade, deportation, decision. The occurrence in the newspaper report of such verbs or nouns was a precondition for the coding of a claim. Reports that only referred to "states of mind" or motivations were not coded (see codebook for some examples).
- (2) Collected claims had to be 'political', in the sense that they had to relate to collective social problems and solutions to them, and not to purely individual strategies of coping with problems (see codebook for some examples).

Statements or actions by different actors were considered to be part of one single instance of claim-making if they took place at the same location in time (the same day) and place (the same locality) and if the actors could be assumed to act as strategic allies. For such cases, our coding scheme allowed for 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 were considered to be two separate claims. In case of repeated statements or announcements, each one was coded as a separate claim.
- Statements by different speakers during a parliamentary debate or a conference were considered to be part of one instance of claim-making as long as they were substantively and strategically compatible. That is, different speakers were taken together if they all expressed a similar point of view (see codebook for additional examples).

³ <http://www.wzb.eu/en/research/migration-and-diversity/migration-and-integration/projects/mobilization-on-ethnic-relations-citizensh> (last accessed on 26/02/2015).

3.3. Sampling rules

Each team selected a widely distributed high quality city-based newspaper (or an equivalent national newspaper with a local section, when a good option was not available at the city level) so as to guarantee full comparability across cases.⁴ Sampling was done on the basis of the selection of a fixed number of days per week for the whole 2006 year.⁵ Thus, we coded all relevant claims reported in the Monday, Wednesday, and Friday issues of the selected newspapers:⁶ La Vanguardia (Barcelona), Népszabadság (Budapest), Tribune de Genève (Geneva), Guardian (London), Le Progrès (Lyon), El País (Madrid), La Repubblica (Milan), Dagens Nyheter (Stockholm), Neue Zürcher Zeitung (Zurich).

Coding focused on political claims relating to immigration, migrant integration, and racism and xenophobia within all main news sections (with the exclusion of 'editorials', 'sports pages', 'culture and entertainment pages', and various 'specials'). Our codebook also established that for migrants' and extreme right organisations and groups, the coding would also include claims that are not related to immigration issues (e.g., homeland political issues in the case of migrants, or claims on the Nazi regime or the Holocaust in the case of the extreme right). This was done to obtain some valuable information about specific types of collective actors.

The entire newspaper issue was read throughout its main news sections; that is, we have not made use of electronic searches through key words. If an issue did not appear, the next available issue was taken. If the latter was already part of the sample, the next issue not part of the sample was taken. As stated in our codebook, claims reported in the issue consulted and which had taken place up to two weeks before the date of appearance of that issue were also coded (but only if they had not already been coded). In order to have a significant number of claims, we collected data covering the entire year 2006.

3.4. Notes on the data for London

The data for the city of London was retrieved from a previous project on claims making and migration issues conducted by the British team (the MERCI/Asylum project). Although the imputed data is highly comparable to the one collected by the Localmultidem teams, a number of variables could not be coded for London due to the differences between the two coding schemes.⁷ In particular, the following variables are missing for London in the aggregate data file: variables on object actors (OBJIDEN, SOBJIDEN OBJNAT); variables on the thematic focus of claims (FOCUS, SFOCUS); nationality or ethnicity of minority or migrant actor (NATMIN); summary and scope of criticized actor (SCRITAC, CRITSCOP). In addition, the variables reporting the title of articles (TITLE), party affiliation (PARTY1, PARTY2) and name or description of the actors (ACTOR1, ACTOR2) are coded in a slightly different format compared to the rest of the dataset.⁸

⁴ The only exception refers to the British case. The Guardian is a national newspaper that does not produce any kind of 'local section'. The British team decided to rely on the Guardian due to the substantial overlapping between the local and national spheres of their case, since London is the capital city of Britain, is the most long-standing destination of migration and focus of attention relating to minorities' integration in the British context, and provides the context for the mobilisation of national actors in what is a very centralised field of contentious politics.

⁵ The British team coded claims for the year 2004 (and not 2006 as it was originally planned) as relevant articles were of more immediate availability.

⁶ The sample and coding of La Vanguardia and El País included the Sunday issues (available for Spanish newspapers).

⁷ For all other discrepancies in the coding of claims in London, please consult the integrated report on discursive opportunities (Deliverable #D7_b) and the city reports on discursive indicators (Deliverable #D5_b), or contact Manlio Cinalli coordinator of Workpackage 1.

⁸ All discrepancies in the data are reported on a variable by variable basis in the Codebook below.

4. Codebook⁹

4.1. 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

⁹ 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 et al. (2005b).

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.

4.2 Sampling rules

All claims are coded which are reported in the Monday, Wednesday, and Friday issues of the selected newspapers (plus Sunday editions for Spanish newspapers). The ideal newspaper is a widely distributed high quality city-based newspaper. However, this ‘ideal paper’ is not available in all our local cases. Each team selects 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’, ‘sports 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

circular reasoning and blurring dependent and independent variables, all claims by migrants should be excluded from the sample when the discursive opportunities in the local polity for the political integration of immigrants are to be analysed. These analyses will be restricted to non-immigrants actors.

The entire newspaper issue must be read throughout its main news sections, avoiding electronic searches based on keywords. If an issue did not appear, the next available issue shall be taken. If the latter is already part of the sample, the next issue not part of the sample shall 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.

4.3 List of variables

Identification of city: CITY

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: SISSUE, SSISSUE, FIELD, ISSCOP, FOCUS, SFOCUS, POSIT

Object actors: OBJIDEN, SOBJIDEN, OBJNAT

4.4 Detailed description of variables

Variable **CITY**

Variable label 'city'

Value labels

1 'Barcelona'

2 'Budapest'

3 'Geneva'

4 'London'

5 'Lyon'

6 'Madrid'

7 'Milan'

8 'Stockholm'

9 'Zurich'

Variable **IDCLAIM**

Variable label 'identification number of claim'

Variable **DATE**

Variable label 'date of claim (yyyymmdd)'

Note to coders: 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**¹⁰

Variable label ‘title of article’

Value labels (string variable, 255 characters)

Variable **DESCR**

Variable label ‘short description of the claim’.

Value labels (string variable, 255 characters)

Note to coders: 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”.¹¹

Variable **ACTOR1 / ACTOR2**¹²

Variable label ‘name or description of first actor’ / ‘name or description of second actor’

Value labels (string variable, 50 characters)

Variable **SACTOR1 / SACTOR2**

Variable label ‘summary first actor’ / ‘summary second actor’

Note to coders: In case the organisation or group identifications 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’¹³

20 ‘legislatives’¹⁴

30 ‘judiciary’¹⁵

¹⁰ London: the variable TITLE reports a short summary of the content of the news story.

¹¹ E.g. “ Non-Christians have been banned from walking in some areas by the mayor of Rovato” would be better rewritten into “The mayor of Rovato has banned non-Christians from walking in some areas”.

¹² Unlike other cities in the dataset, the variables ACTOR1/ACTOR2 for London do not report the first and family name of the actor, but only his institutional affiliation and role in the institution/organization (e.g. ‘leader’).

¹³ 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”.

¹⁴ 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.

¹⁵ E.g., European Court of Justice, public prosecutor, individual judges, juries.

- 40 'police and security agencies'¹⁶
- 50 'state executive agencies specifically dealing with migrants'¹⁷
- 60 'other state executive agencies'¹⁸
- 70 'political parties'¹⁹
- 80 'unions and employees'²⁰
- 90 'employers organisations and firms'
- 100 'churches'²¹
- 110 'media and journalists'
- 120 'professional organisations and groups'²²
- 130 'minority organisations and groups'
- 140 'antiracist organisations and groups'²³
- 150 'pro-minority rights and welfare organisations and groups'²⁴
- 160 'general solidarity, human rights and welfare organisations'²⁵
- 170 'racist and extreme right organisations and groups'²⁶
- 180 'radical left organisations and groups'²⁷
- 190 'other civil society organisations and groups'²⁸
- 999 'unknown actors'²⁹

Variable **PARTY1 / PARTY2**

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

Value labels (string variable, 50 characters)

¹⁶ E.g., police (incl. aliens' police), military, secret service, Interpol, NATO. Note: the Police Union is coded as a union.

¹⁷ State here includes the supranational level (e.g., UNHCR).

¹⁸ E.g., ILO, WHO, social aid office, school authorities.

¹⁹ 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.

²⁰ Includes the general categories "workers" and "employees".

²¹ 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".

²² 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.

²³ 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..

²⁴ 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.

²⁵ 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.

²⁶ Includes vague descriptions such as "skinheads" or "right-wing extremists".

²⁷ 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).

²⁸ Does not include vague categories such as "neighbours", "local citizens", "youth", etc.

²⁹ 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.

Variable **ACTSCOP1 / ACTSCOP2**

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

Note to coders: 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'³⁰
- 2 'supra- or transnational: other'³¹
- 3 'foreign national: migrant homelands and exile'³²
- 4 'foreign national: other'³³
- 5 'bilateral'³⁴
- 6 'national'³⁵
- 7 'subnational'³⁶
- 8 'national or subnational'³⁷
- 9 'unknown: no organisation'³⁸

Variable **NATMIN**³⁹

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

Value labels (string variable, 50 characters)

Note to coders: 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'

³⁰ E.g., European Parliament, European Trade Union Federation, European Association of Turkish Academics.

³¹ E.g., UNHCR, World Council of Roma and Sinti, Amnesty International, International Council of Voluntary Associations, Helsinki Watch. Includes national branches of transnational organizations.

³² 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.

³³ 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.

³⁴ Bilateral organizations between countries.

³⁵ 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.

³⁶ 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.

³⁷ 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).

³⁸ This code is used for all claims for which no organisation or institution has been mentioned.

³⁹ London: variable not available.

Note to coders: Because the codebook allows for multiple codes 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'⁴⁰
- 30 'verbal statement'⁴¹
- 40 'meetings'⁴²
- 50 'judicial action'⁴³
- 60 'direct-democratic action'⁴⁴
- 70 'petitioning'⁴⁵
- 80 'demonstrative protests'
- 90 'confrontational protests'⁴⁶
- 100 'violent protests'

Variable **SADRES**

Variable label 'summary addressee of claim'

Variable **SCRITAC**⁴⁷

Variable label 'summary criticised actor'

General note: SADRES and SCRITAC use the same categories as the SACTOR variables, with the exception of code 999, which here stands for 'no addressee' and 'no criticised

⁴⁰ 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").

⁴¹ 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".

⁴² 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).

⁴³ Refers to appeals to the judiciary (e.g. filing lawsuits), not actions by the judiciary (the latter appear as repressive measures, statements, or decisions).

⁴⁴ Probably exclusively relevant to the Swiss context: launching, collection and presentation of signatures in the context of referendum and initiative campaigns.

⁴⁵ Includes petitions, other form of signature collection (outside direct-democratic contexts) and letter campaigns.

⁴⁶ 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).

⁴⁷ London: variable not available.

actor', respectively. These variables are used to code the addressees of claims, i.e. the actors to which the actors refer in their claims.

Note to coders: 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.

Value labels

- 10 'governments'
- 20 'legislatives'
- 30 'judiciary'
- 40 'police and security agencies'
- 50 'state executive agencies specifically dealing with migrants'
- 60 'other state executive agencies'
- 70 'political parties'
- 80 'unions and employees'
- 90 'employers organisations and firms'
- 100 'churches'
- 110 'media and journalists'
- 120 'professional organisations and groups'
- 130 'minority organisations and groups'
- 140 'antiracist organisations and groups'
- 150 'pro-minority rights and welfare organisations and groups'
- 160 'general solidarity, human rights and welfare organisations'
- 170 'racist and extreme right organisations and groups'
- 180 'radical left organisations and groups'
- 190 'other civil society organisations and groups'
- 999 'no addressee/no criticized actor'

Variable **ADRESCOP**⁴⁸

Variable label 'scope of addressee'

Variable **CRITSCOP**⁴⁹

Variable label 'scope of first criticised actor'

General note: ADRESCOP and CRITSCOP have the same categories as the ACTSCOP1 and ACTSCOP2 variables, with the exception of code 9, which here stands for 'no addressee', 'no criticized actor'.

⁴⁸ London: variable not available.

⁴⁹ London: variable not available.

Value labels

- 1 'supra- or transnational: European'
- 2 'supra- or transnational: other'
- 3 'foreign national: migrant homelands and exile'
- 4 'foreign national: other'
- 5 'bilateral'
- 6 'national'
- 7 'subnational'
- 8 'national or subnational'
- 9 'no addressee / no criticized actor'

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

Variable label 'summary issue, 3 digit codes'

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

Variable label 'summary of SISSUE, 2 digit codes'

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

Variable label 'policy field, 1 digit codes'

General note: SSISSUE and FIELD were created through recoding of SISSUE after data collection was completed.

Value labels

0 'NO ISSUE'

1 'IMMIGRATION, ASYLUM, AND ALIENS POLITICS'⁵⁰

10 'immigration, asylum, and aliens politics'

100 'general evaluation or policy direction'⁵¹

101 'institutional framework, responsibilities, procedures, costs'⁵²

102 'migration prevention in homeland countries'⁵³

103 'entry and border controls'⁵⁴

⁵⁰ 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).

⁵¹ 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".

⁵² 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".

⁵³ 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".

- 104 'registration and internal control'⁵⁵
- 105 'recognition, residence rights, legal status and permits'⁵⁶
- 106 'access to welfare services and the labour market'⁵⁷
- 107 'expulsions/deportations'⁵⁸
- 108 'voluntary return'⁵⁹
- 109 'other specific issues'

2 'MINORITY INTEGRATION POLITICS'

- 20 'minority integration general'
 - 200 'general evaluation or policy direction'⁶⁰
 - 201 'institutional framework, responsibilities, procedures, costs'⁶¹
- 21 'minority rights and participation'
 - 210 'general evaluation or policy direction'⁶²
 - 211 'naturalisation and citizenship'⁶³
 - 212 'political rights and participation'⁶⁴

⁵⁴ 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").

⁵⁵ 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".

⁵⁶ 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".

⁵⁷ 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".

⁵⁸ 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".

⁵⁹ E.g., "homeland governments should motivate foreigners to return", "set up re-integration programs for asylum seekers willing to return".

⁶⁰ 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.

⁶¹ E.g., "more resources for state agencies dealing with foreigners", "creation of a federal office for foreigners' questions".

⁶² E.g., "equal rights and chances for foreigners".

⁶³ 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").

- 213 'social rights and participation: labour market'⁶⁵
- 214 'social rights and participation: education'⁶⁶
- 215 'social rights and participation: health and welfare'
- 216 'social rights and participation: language acquisition'⁶⁷
- 217 'social rights and participation: housing and segregation'⁶⁸
- 218 'social rights and participation: police and judiciary'⁶⁹
- 219 'social rights and participation: other/general'
- 220 'cultural rights and participation: education'⁷⁰
- 221 'cultural rights and participation: religion'⁷¹
- 222 'cultural rights and participation: (recognition of) group identity/differences'⁷²
- 223 'cultural rights and participation: other/general'⁷³
- 224 'other rights and participation'
- 23 'discrimination and unequal treatment'⁷⁴

⁶⁴ 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".

⁶⁵ E.g., "introduce quotas for foreigners in certain professions". See also the footnotes to "education" and "police and judiciary".

⁶⁶ 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".

⁶⁷ 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".

⁶⁸ E.g., "set limits to the percentage of foreigners in city districts".

⁶⁹ 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".

⁷⁰ E.g., (OBJIDEN as "specific ethnic or national group, OBJNAT as "Turks") "introduction of Turkish as a second foreign language next to English".

⁷¹ 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).

⁷² 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".

⁷³ 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.

⁷⁴ 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

- 231 'general evaluation or policy direction'⁷⁵
- 232 'discrimination in politics'
- 233 'discrimination in the labour market'
- 234 'discrimination in the education system'
- 235 'discrimination in health and welfare services'⁷⁶
- 236 'discrimination regarding housing'
- 237 'discrimination in the police and judiciary system'⁷⁷
- 238 'discrimination: other specific issues'⁷⁸
- 25 'minority social problems'
- 252 'crime'⁷⁹
- 253 'political extremism and violence'⁸⁰
- 254 'other'
- 26 'interethnic, inter- and intraorganisational relations'⁸¹
- 261 'inter/intraethnic relations'⁸²
- 262 'inter/intraorganisational relations'⁸³

- 3 'ANTI-RACISM'
- 30 'racism in institutional contexts'⁸⁴
- 300 'general evaluation or policy direction'
- 301 'racist and extreme right language in politics'⁸⁵
- 302 'police racism and violence against minorities'⁸⁶
- 303 'racism in other state institutions'⁸⁷

"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.

⁷⁵ E.g., "combat discrimination of foreigners", "introduce and anti-discrimination law".

⁷⁶ E.g., "abolish special enquiries when foreigners apply for social welfare".

⁷⁷ E.g., "abolish registration of foreigners in a special police register".

⁷⁸ 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".

⁷⁹ E.g., "tougher line with criminal foreigners". Note that demands for expulsion of criminal foreigners are coded in "immigration and aliens politics".

⁸⁰ 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".

⁸¹ Interethnic here refers to relations between different minority groups, not between minorities and the majority group.

⁸² 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.

⁸³ 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..

⁸⁴ 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.

⁸⁵ E.g., "fight the use of racist language by politicians which paves the road for the extreme right".

⁸⁶ E.g., "dismantle the voluntary police reserve because of its repeated involvement in racist and extreme right incidents".

⁸⁷ E.g., "combat extreme right tendencies in the Bundeswehr".

- 304 'racism in non-state institutions'
- 31 'non-institutional racism, xenophobia and extreme right tendencies in society'⁸⁸
 - 310 'general evaluation or policy direction'⁸⁹
 - 311 'moral appeals'⁹⁰
 - 312 'social and educational responses'⁹¹
 - 313 'countermobilisation'⁹²
 - 314 'protection of minorities against violence'⁹³
 - 315 'extreme right parties: alliances and exclusion'⁹⁴
 - 316 'repression: political responses'⁹⁵
 - 317 'repression: judicial responses'⁹⁶
 - 318 'repression: police responses'⁹⁷
 - 319 'repression: other'⁹⁸
 - 320 'other specific issues'
- 4 'GENERAL XENOPHOBIC CLAIMS'⁹⁹
 - 40 'xenophobic claims'
 - 400 'xenophobic claims'¹⁰⁰

⁸⁸ 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.

⁸⁹ 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.

⁹⁰ E.g., "tolerance", "dialogue between Germans and foreigners", "solidarity with foreigners".

⁹¹ E.g., "a better social politics", "civil education and information of the public".

⁹² 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.

⁹³ E.g., "police should protect asylum seeker centers better against attacks".

⁹⁴ 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 (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).

⁹⁵ 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.

⁹⁶ E.g., "judges do not sentence the perpetrators of extreme right violence harshly enough". Also claims by the extreme right against such repression.

⁹⁷ 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.

⁹⁸ E.g., "exclude members of extreme right organizations from the civil service". Also claims by the extreme right against such repression.

⁹⁹ 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".

¹⁰⁰ E.g., "Deutschland den Deutschen, Ausländer 'raus!", also antisemitic claims (which then get OBJIDEN "specific ethnic or national group" and OBJNAT "Jewish").

- 6 'ACTOR CLAIMS MINORITIES'
- 61 'homeland politics'
 - 610 'pure homeland politics'¹⁰¹
 - 611 'politics of country of residence with regard to homeland issues'¹⁰²
- 62 'other minority claims'
 - 621 'World War II/Holocaust'¹⁰³
 - 622 'other'

- 7 'OTHER CLAIMS RE: EXTREME RIGHT'¹⁰⁴
- 71 'general, unspecific claims, extreme right'¹⁰⁵
 - 710 'general, unspecific claims'
- 72 'World War II, Third Reich, etc. , extreme right'¹⁰⁶
 - 720 'World War II, Third Reich, etc.'
- 73 'nationalist and revanchist claims, extreme right'¹⁰⁷
 - 730 'nationalist and revanchist claims'
- 74 'extreme right opposition against political opponents'
 - 741 'anti-left claims'¹⁰⁸
 - 742 'claims against the established right'¹⁰⁹
 - 743 'general anti-establishment claims'
 - 744 'other'
- 75 'mainstream political issues, extreme right'¹¹⁰
 - 750 'mainstream political issues'
- 76 'electoral competition: purely tactical claims, extreme right'
 - 760 'electoral competition: purely tactical claims'¹¹¹
- 9 / 99 / 999 'Unclassifiable or unspecific claim'

Variable ISSCOP

Variable label 'scope of issue'

Note for coders: This variable refers to the geographical and/or political scope of the claim. Scope here refers to the actors, actions, legislation or conventions that are implied

¹⁰¹ E.g., "stop repression of Kurds in Turkey", "against Kurdish attacks on Turkish targets in Germany".

¹⁰² 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".

¹⁰³ E.g., "remembrance of the victims of the Holocaust" (without any reference to present-day extreme right, otherwise code as 312).

¹⁰⁴ 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).

¹⁰⁵ E.g., "the national right should unite", "the Republikaner will challenge the established parties in the upcoming elections".

¹⁰⁶ 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".

¹⁰⁷ 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".

¹⁰⁸ E.g., "down with the Red front!".

¹⁰⁹ E.g., "against Politbonzen", "fight the corrupt political system".

¹¹⁰ 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.

¹¹¹ See the footnote to category 315.

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 in its 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'¹¹²
- 1 'supra- or transnational: European'¹¹³
- 2 'supra- or transnational: other'¹¹⁴
- 3 'foreign national: migrant homelands'¹¹⁵
- 4 'foreign national: other'
- 5 'bilateral'¹¹⁶
- 6 national
- 7 subnational
- 8 'national or subnational'

Variable **FOCUS**¹¹⁷

Variable label 'thematic focus: verbal and physical combined'

General note: This variable adopts the same values as SSISSUE. 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

¹¹² The number of cases here should be identical to that for the zero category of SSISSUE. I.e., every verbal claim should have a score on scope.

¹¹³ 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).

¹¹⁴ 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.

¹¹⁵ E.g., "Improve the rights of ethnic Germans in their countries of origin", "Measures against the persecution of Roma in Eastern Europe".

¹¹⁶ 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".

¹¹⁷ London: variable not available.

Note for coders: 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.

Value labels

- 10 'immigration, asylum, and aliens politics'
- 20 'minority integration general'
- 21 'minority rights and participation'
- 23 'discrimination and unequal treatment'
- 25 'minority social problems'
- 26 'interethnic, inter- and intraorganisational relations'
- 30 'racism in institutional contexts'
- 31 'non-institutional racism, xenophobia and extreme right tendencies in society'
- 40 'xenophobic claims'
- 61 'homeland politics'
- 62 'other minority claims'
- 71 'general, unspecific claims, extreme right'
- 72 'World War II, Third Reich, etc. , extreme right'
- 73 'nationalist and revanchist claims, extreme right'
- 74 'extreme right opposition against political opponents'
- 75 'mainstream political issues, extreme right'
- 76 'electoral competition: purely tactical claims, extreme right'
- 99 'repressive measure'

On the basis of **FOCUS** a variable **SFOCUS** (label: 'summary thematic focus')¹¹⁸ is constructed with the same categories as **FIELD** (one-digit code).

Variable **POSIT**

Variable label 'Position of claim towards issue'

Note for coders: 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 the achievement of which implies deterioration in the rights or position of migrants or minorities receive code -1, no matter the magnitude of the deterioration. The -1 value is also attributed to claims that 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 the realisation of which implies an improvement in the rights and position of migrants (regardless of magnitude) receive code 1. This value is also attributed 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 be coded as follows: -1 if the repressive measure is directed against minorities, +1 if the repressive measure is directed against xenophobic and extreme right individuals and groups. The following categories of

¹¹⁸ London: variable not available.

claims are coded as missing (9) because they cannot be positioned on the –1/+1 scale: certain 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).

Value labels

- 1 'anti-minority/xenophobic/extreme right'¹¹⁹
- 0 'neutral/ambivalent/technocratic'¹²⁰
- 1 'pro-minority/antiracist/anti-extreme right'¹²¹
- 9 'unclassifiable'

Variable **OBJIDEN**¹²²

Variable label 'identity of object of claim'

General note: This variable records 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.

Note for coders: 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" are coded 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 hyphenated identities between racial or religious identities and the country of residence. For instance: "British Muslims" are "Muslims" for OBJIDEN, "British" for OBJNAT; and similarly for "British blacks".¹²³ Hyphenated 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 français d'origine algerienne" would be coded 91 in

¹¹⁹ 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".

¹²⁰ 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 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.

¹²¹ 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".

¹²² London: variable not available.

¹²³ 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.

OBJIDEN, then “Algerian” in OBJNAT. Other types of hyphenated 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”.¹²⁴

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)¹²⁵
- 13 ‘(im)migrants’
- 14 ‘allochthonen’
- 15 ‘asylum seekers’ (individual status)¹²⁶
- 16 ‘war refugees, ontheemden’ (collective status)¹²⁷
- 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’¹²⁸
- 24 ‘New Commonwealth immigrants/citizens’
- 25 ‘DOM-TOM immigrants/citizens’¹²⁹
- 26 ‘DDR-Vertragsarbeiter’
- 27 ‘Harki’
- 28 ‘ex-patriats/repatrianten’
- 29 ‘Commonwealth citizens (old and new)’
- 30 ‘family reunifiers/formers’

- 40 ‘RACIAL GROUPS’
- 41 ‘racial minorities/groups’
- 42 ‘black’¹³⁰

¹²⁴ Note that we ignore all other kinds of identification that may appear.

¹²⁵ 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.

¹²⁶ 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.

¹²⁷ 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”.

¹²⁸ 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.

¹²⁹ “Français des DOM-TOM” or “Français 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.

¹³⁰ 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.

- 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'¹³¹
- 66 'rastafarian'
- 67 'sikh'
- 68 'alevite'
- 69 'catholic'
- 70 'buddhist'¹³²
- 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')¹³³ summarises **OBJIDEN** by simply collapsing the subcategories into the main two digits-codes (i.e., the labels in capitals). The main two-digits codes, thus, are not used for **OBJIDEN** itself.

Variable **OBJNAT**¹³⁴

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

Value labels (string variable, 50 characters)

General note: This is a string variable that reproduces the specific discursive "labeling" provided in the newspaper piece (see variable NATMIN).

¹³¹ 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.

¹³² Includes subdivisions such as "shugden".

¹³³ London: variable not available.

¹³⁴ London: variable not available.

Note for coders on Object-related variables (OBJIDEN, OBJNAT): These variables are coded only for claims with a thematic field corresponding to values 10-40 in the variable FOCUS. 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).

Variable **PLACE**¹³⁵

Variable label 'place of claim'.

Value labels (string variable, 50 characters)

General note: This variable was added by some teams but not by all. It specifies the place where the claim was made.

Variable **SUNDAY**

Variable label 'Sunday newspaper (Spain only)'.

Value labels

0 'Monday, Wednesday or Friday edition'

1 'Sunday edition (Spain)'

REFERENCES

- Giugni, M. G., Koopmans, R., Passy, F. & Statham, P. (2005) Institutional and discursive opportunities for extreme-right mobilization in five countries. *Mobilization*, 10, 145-162.
- Koopmans, R. (2004) Migrant mobilisation and political opportunities: variation among German cities and a comparison with the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30, 449-470.
- Koopmans, R. & Olzak, S. (2004) Discursive Opportunities and the Evolution of Right-Wing Violence in Germany. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110, 198-230.
- Koopmans, R. & Statham, P. (1999) Challenging the liberal nation-state? Postnationalism, multiculturalism, and the collective claims-making of migrants and ethnic minorities in Britain and Germany. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 652-696.
- Koopmans, R. & Statham, P. (2000) Migration and Ethnic Relations as a Field of Political Contention: An Opportunity Structure Approach. IN Koopmans, R. & Statham, P. (Eds.) *Challenging Immigration and Ethnic Relations Politics*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Koopmans, R., Statham, P., Giugni, M. & Passy, F. (2005a) *Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe*.
- Koopmans, R., Statham, P., Giugni, M. G. & Passy, F. (2005b) *Contested Citizenship. Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

¹³⁵ Budapest, Lyon, Stockholm: variable not available.