CIT5-CT-2005-028802

LOCALMULTIDEM

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

SPECIFIC TARGETED RESEARCH PROJECT (STREP)

PRIORITY 7: Citizens and Governance in a Knowledge Based Society

Deliverable no. 2:
WP2. Socio-Economic Indicators,
Guidelines for Data Collection

Due date of deliverable: 31 March 2006 (45 calendar days = 15 May 2006)
Actual submission date: 11 May 2006
Submission date of final revised version: 13 December 2006

Start date of project: 1 February 2006 Duration: 36 months

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable: MTA Etnikai-nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet (Hungary)

Revision: FINAL VERSION

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. RATIONALE OF WP2

The indicators gathered in WP2 will:

- provide background for sampling framework;

- provide a general overview about the immigrant population in the selected cities;

- provide us with contextual variables for the analysis of the data gathered in WP3 and WP4.

The hypothetical role of these indicators in the explanatory model of political integration in described more in detail on pp 3-5 of Annex I of the grant contract.

2. TIME FRAME FOR GATHERING DATA

The **compulsory part** of the data collection is to produce a one-time overview of the situation in each city. In order to achieve this, data from 2005 should be presented at each variable in the database and in the country report. If there are no data from 2005, the most recent data available should be used. In any case and at all variables the year and source of the data should be mentioned.

The **optional part** of the data collection is the creation of time-series where and when it is possible and necessary. It will be indicated at each variable whether this type of data is needed, and in what breakdown.

3. OUTPUT OF THE WORKPACKAGE

The deliverable on national (municipality) level should consist of two materials:

a. A dataset of cities (municipalities) with variables reflecting the size and characteristic of the immigrant population, in form of an excel spreadsheet.

b. a national report (one per municipality) according to the structure presented below.

The joint output shall be an aggregated database (SPSS) and a synthesis report of the city reports.

4. DEFINITION OF IMMIGRANTS USED IN THE PROJECT

In case of the **aggregated database** the common definition of 'immigrant' is ***foreign birth*** and/or ***foreign nationality***. When the data are available (as in the UK), teams should include "ethnic" membership as the basis for definition, so that the figures in the aggregated database include all ethnic population, this is regarded much more useful since for the UK our dependent variable is measured for "ethnic" populations in the population survey and not for "foreign" populations.

In case of foreign birth: If the place of birth is other than the country of current residence, the person should be considered immigrant. Latest census data from all countries involved in the project contain this information. Using this method would exclude second and third generation immigrants and include some locals who happened to be born abroad (descendants of expatriates or colonial officials, and in case of Hungary those who were born in former Hungarian territories now belong to the neighbouring countries).

In case of foreign nationality: If the citizenship differs from the default citizenship in the country of current residence, the person should be considered an immigrant. In all national population registers there are data on third country nationals and EEA citizens with valid residence permits. The possible source of bias is the inclusion of dual nationals (original citizens of the country of residence who naturalised elsewhere). The problem with these data sources is that they contain only the basic variables of age, sex (not in Hungary), place of birth, citizenship and address (not in the UK), therefore they are not suitable for further analysis.

The following table shows which are the most commonly used categories according to which we can gather comparative data for the aggregated database.

CATEGORY	SOURCE OF INFORMATION	NOTES
Foreign born	Census	Available in all countries
Foreign citizen	Census	No data for UK
3rd country nationals with permanent residence permits	Population register	Available in all countries
EEA nationals with residence permits	Population register	Available in all countries
Refugees	Population register	Data for Italy from the asylum registration

Until now there have not been identified any definition of Nth generation immigrants according to which data could be generated from existing statistical databases (census, population and alien registers), apart from the UK Census variable on race relations which has no equivalent in any other project country.

If in any country it is relevant to include Nth generation immigrants in the analysis and/or exclude certain nationalities on the basis of their social status (as suggested by the UK, French and Swiss teams) in order to work with a less biased set of data, these teams should gather data according to their own definition. This exercise should be made at national level, indicating the operational definition of ‘immigrant’ used for gathering data. Data should be gathered according to the same list of variables that all teams use, and it should take place **in addition to** and not instead of the data collection based on the ‘narrow’ definition. It would then enable us to compare the two approaches and draw further conclusions on the methodology of setting up and analysing comparative datasets. In case a country team goes for this option, I suggest preparing two separate spreadsheets according to the two different definitions of ‘immigrant’ they use.

In case of the **national reports** there is more freedom to use different categories of immigrants (including Nth generation, foreign labour force registers, education and health records, survey data etc.) but for the sake of comparability both the source of information and the operational definition that a particular source uses should always be there.

5. UNITS OF LOCALITY

Data should be gathered on the population of the following cities:

COUNTRY	CITY
Hungary	Budapest
UK	North-inner London
Switzerland	Zurich
France	Lyon
Italy	Milan
Spain	Madrid

6. VARIABLES (INDICATORS) OF THE AGGREGATED DATABASES

The following indicators (variables) should be available in the aggregated database (2005 data mandatory, the rest only if available). Remember that all these indicators must be collected referring to the LOCAL level.

Number of variable	**Item**
1	Total number of population in 1990
2	Total number of population in 1995
3	Total number of population in 2000
4	Total number of population in 2005
5	Number of females in 1990
6	Number of females in 1995
7	Number of females in 2000
8	Number of females in 2005
9	Number of population aged 0-15 in 1990
10	Number of population aged 0-15 in 1995
11	Number of population aged 0-15 in 2000
12	Number of population aged 0-15 in 2005
13	Number of population aged 16-24 in 1990
14	Number of population aged 16-24 in 1995
15	Number of population aged 16-24 in 2000
16	Number of population aged 16-24 in 2005
17	Number of population aged 25-64 in 1990
18	Number of population aged 25-64 in 1995
19	Number of population aged 25-64 in 2000
20	Number of population aged 25-64 in 2005
21	Number of population aged 65+ in 1990
22	Number of population aged 65+ in 1995
23	Number of population aged 65+ in 2000
24	Number of population aged 65+ in 2005
25	Number of immigrants in 1990
26	Number of immigrants in 1995
27	Number of immigrants in 2000
28	Number of immigrants in 2005

29	Number of immigrant females in 1990.
30	Number of immigrant females in 1995.
31	Number of immigrant females in 2000.
32	Number of immigrant females in 2005.
33	Number of immigrant population aged 0-15 in 1990
34	Number of immigrant population aged 0-15 in 1995
35	Number of immigrant population aged 0-15 in 2000
36	Number of immigrant population aged 0-15 in 2005
37	Number of immigrant population aged 16-24 in 1990
38	Number of immigrant population aged 16-24 in 1995
39	Number of immigrant population aged 16-24 in 2000
40	Number of immigrant population aged 16-24 in 2005
41	Number of immigrant population aged 25-64 in 1990
42	Number of immigrant population aged 25-64 in 1995
43	Number of immigrant population aged 25-64 in 2000
44	Number of immigrant population aged 25-64 in 2005
45	Number of immigrant population aged 65+ in 1990
46	Number of immigrant population aged 65+ in 1995
47	Number of immigrant population aged 65+ in 2000
48	Number of immigrant population aged 65+ in 2005
49-120	The same as 25-48 for all the three chosen ethnic groups
121	Percentage of total population aged 25-64 with primary or less education in 1990
122	Percentage of total population aged 25-64 with primary or less education in 1995
123	Percentage of total population aged 25-64 with primary or less education in 2000
124	Percentage of total population aged 25-64 with primary or less education in 2005
125	Percentage of total population aged 25-64 with secondary education in 1990
126	Percentage of total population aged 25-64 with secondary education in 1995
127	Percentage of total population aged 25-64 with secondary education in 2000
128	Percentage of total population aged 25-64 with secondary education in 2005
129	Percentage of total population aged 25-64 with tertiary education in 1990
130	Percentage of total population aged 25-64 with tertiary education in 1995
131	Percentage of total population aged 25-64 with tertiary education in 2000
132	Percentage of total population aged 25-64 with tertiary education in 2005
133	Percentage of immigrants aged 25-64 with primary or less education in 1990
134	Percentage of immigrants aged 25-64 with primary or less education in 1995
135	Percentage of immigrants aged 25-64 with primary or less education in 2000

136	Percentage of immigrants aged 25-64 with primary or less education in 2005
137	Percentage of immigrants aged 25-64 with secondary education in 1990
138	Percentage of immigrants aged 25-64 with secondary education in 1995
139	Percentage of immigrants aged 25-64 with secondary education in 2000
140	Percentage of immigrants aged 25-64 with secondary education in 2005
141	Percentage of immigrants aged 25-64 with tertiary education in 1990
142	Percentage of immigrants aged 25-64 with tertiary education in 1995
143	Percentage of immigrants aged 25-64 with tertiary education in 2000
144	Percentage of immigrants aged 25-64 with tertiary education in 2005
145-180	The same as 133-144 for all the three chosen ethnic groups
181	Percentage of total population employed (included self-employed)[1] aged 16-24 in 1990
182	Percentage of total population employed (included self-employed) aged 16-24 in 1995
183	Percentage of total population employed (included self-employed) aged 16-24 in 2000
184	Percentage of total population employed (included self-employed) aged 16-24 in 2005
185	Percentage of total population employed (included self-employed) aged 25-64 in 1990
186	Percentage of total population employed (included self-employed) aged 25-64 in 1995
187	Percentage of total population employed (included self-employed) aged 25-64 in 2000
188	Percentage of total population employed (included self-employed) aged 25-64 in 2005
189	Percentage of total population unemployed[2], aged 16-24 in 1990
190	Percentage of total population unemployed, aged 16-24 in 1995
191	Percentage of total population unemployed, aged 16-24 in 2000
192	Percentage of total population unemployed, aged 16-24 in 2005
193	Percentage of total population unemployed, aged 25-64 in 1990
194	Percentage of total population unemployed, aged 25-64 in 1995
195	Percentage of total population unemployed, aged 25-64 in 2000
196	Percentage of total population unemployed, aged 25-64 in 2005
197	Percentage of immigrant population employed (included self-employed) aged 16-24 in 1990
198	Percentage of immigrant population employed (included self-employed) aged 16-24 in 1995
199	Percentage of immigrant population employed (included self-employed) aged 16-24 in 2000
200	Percentage of immigrant population employed (included self-employed) aged 16-24 in 2005
201	Percentage of immigrant population employed (included self-employed) aged 25-64 in

[1] To be calculated as the population employed divided by the total population aged x-x in year X.
[2] To be calculated as the population registered as or claiming (if survey data used) to be unemployed divided by the total population aged x-x in year X.

	1990
202	Percentage of immigrant population employed (included self-employed) aged 25-64 in 1995
203	Percentage of immigrant population employed (included self-employed) aged 25-64 in 2000
204	Percentage of immigrant population employed (included self-employed) aged 25-64 in 2005
205	Percentage of immigrant population unemployed, aged 16-24 in 1990
206	Percentage of immigrant population unemployed, aged 16-24 in 1995
207	Percentage of immigrant population unemployed, aged 16-24 in 2000
208	Percentage of immigrant population unemployed, aged 16-24 in 2005
209	Percentage of immigrant population unemployed, aged 25-64 in 1990
210	Percentage of immigrant population unemployed, aged 25-64 in 1995
211	Percentage of immigrant population unemployed, aged 25-64 in 2000
212	Percentage of immigrant population unemployed, aged 25-64 in 2005
213-260	The same as 197-212 for all the three chosen ethnic groups
261	% Total population of Muslim origin in 2005
262	Increase immigrant population (number immigrants 1990/ n.immigr.2005)*100
263	Increase population due to immigration [(n.immig.2005-n.immig.1990) / (n.pop.2005 – n.pop.1990)] *100

7. STRUCTURE OF THE CITY REPORTS

National reports should include the above indicators in table format, for readability. This means producing tables that will be easily readable.

Thus, we will be commenting on the indicators collected for the quantitative data file in a more narrative fashion. In addition, there are other indicators for the reports that are not included in the aggregated dataset because they provide “background” information that is not relevant as and “independent/explanatory” variable in an eventual multi-level model of our dependent variables (political integration).

A template for the reports will be produced by the Hungarian team **by July 10**.

Part 1. Demography and migration

1.1. The size of the total city population, also specified according to age groups (0-15; 16-24; 25-64; 65 and above) and sex

1.2. Size of migrant population (absolute number and as a % of total population, and according to age groups and sex)

for ‘migrant’ use the following categories (if possible, all, separately):

- Foreign born
- Foreign citizen
- 3rd country national with permanent residence permit
- EEA national with residence permit
- Refugee

1.3. Size of population of the selected ethnic groups (absolute number and as a % of total population), total and if possible also according to age groups and sex

NOTE: 1.1-1.3 are based on the data gathered for the aggregated database, presented here in more details if possible (the categories at 1.2).

1.4. Annual population increase from immigration (percentages) both regarding the immigrant population as well as the total population (see table)

1.5. Estimate of number of undocumented migrants (give minimum, maximum, and if possible best estimate; absolute and as a % of total population). Please always indicate the source of information!

1.6. Size of Muslim population (absolute number and as a % of total population) definition of Muslim is according to the country of origin. If the person is a citizen of or was born in a country from the list below, s/he is to be considered a Muslim. Same definition stands for grand/parents of 3rd-2nd generation immigrants.

List of Muslim countries

AFGHANISTAN	GAMBIA	MALI	SUDAN
ALGERIA	GUINEA	MAURITANIA	SYRIA
AZERBAIJAN	INDONESIA	MOROCCO	TAJIKISTAN
BAHRAIN	IRAN	NIGER	TURKEY
BANGLADESH	IRAQ	NIGERIA	TUNISIA
BURKINA FASO	JORDAN	OMAN	TURKMENISTAN
BRUNEI	KUWAIT	PAKISTAN	UZBEKISTAN
CHAD	KAZAKHSTAN	PALESTINE	UNITED ARAB
COMOROS	KYRGYZSTAN	QATAR	EMIRATES
COTE D'IVOIRE	LEBANON	SAUDI ARABIA	YEMEN
DJIBOUTI	LIBYA	SENEGAL	
ERITREA	MALDIVES	SIERRA LEONE	
EGYPT	MALAYSIA	SOMALIA	

Source: CIA WORLD FACTBOOK (countries with 50%+ Muslim population)

Part 2. Other socio-economic indicators

2.1. Socio-economic integration

2.1.1. Unemployment levels among immigrants/minorities vs. unemployment in the total population (see definitions in Table above).

2.1.2. Employment levels of migrant population vs. employment levels in the total population (see definitions in Table above)

2.1.3. % of immigrants/minorities on social welfare

2.2. Educational participation

2.2.1. School dropout levels as % of children with immigrant background who leave secondary school without diploma (specify non-immigrant % as a comparison).

2.2.2. School segregation as two highest and two lowest primary schools (irrespective of public or private) in terms of % of children with immigrant background (mention standard deviation as well!).

2.3. Residential segregation

2.3.1. Two lowest and two highest city districts in terms of % of immigrants/minorities (districts should have at least 20,000 inhabitants; smaller-size units should be taken together to arrive at units of large enough size, mention standard deviation as well!)

NOTES:

- Always indicate the source of data at each point of the national report, as well as the definition of immigrant you use there.

- We define the locality as the physical city, which is not necessarily the unit of “local” government.

- In Part 2, where possible and applicable, you should specify the indicators for the particular ethnic groups that you selected for the population survey.