



# **A presentation of the POLITIS interview database: Structure, quality and hypotheses**

**Carol Brown, Norbert Cyrus, Ruby Gropas,  
Ankica Kusic, Anna Triandafyllidou**

POLITIS

Interdisciplinary Center for Education and Communication in Migration Processes (**IBKM**)

Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg

Ammerländer Heerstr. 114-118/ Postbox 2503

26111 Oldenburg

[dita.vogel@uni-oldenburg.de](mailto:dita.vogel@uni-oldenburg.de)

## **POLITIS – a European research project**

### **Project information**

Populations of immigrant origin are growing and changing in Europe. POLITIS explores the potential of immigrants for the development of a civically active European society, starting with foreign students' perceptions of Europe and focusing on sustained social and political activities of immigrants. POLITIS is the short title for the research project "Building Europe with New Citizens? An Inquiry into the Civic Participation of Naturalised Citizens and Foreign Residents in 25 Countries".

The study is divided into 3 parts:

- Part I: A comparative literature review on immigrant civic participation in 25 member states
- Part II: A comparative analysis of foreign students' perceptions of Europe, exploring the potential of their ideas about Europe with the help of essays and focus group discussions
- Part III: A comparative analysis of more than 150 qualitative interviews with civic activists of immigrant origin in the EU to identify favourable and unfavourable biographical and national conditions for active participation

### **The POLITIS Working Paper Series**

POLITIS working paper series may include project-related contributions by all project partners. The main project researchers in the consortium constitute the editorial committee of the working paper series. It is editorial policy to secure quality standards while encouraging the discussion of results that are preliminary or limited in scope.

### **Funding Acknowledgement**

This research project has been funded by the European Commission in the sixth framework, priority 7, Citizens and governance in a knowledge based society.

[www.cordis.lu/citizens](http://www.cordis.lu/citizens)

### **Consortium**

Interdisciplinary Centre for Education and Communication in Migration Processes (IBKM)  
[www.uni-oldenburg.de/IBKM](http://www.uni-oldenburg.de/IBKM)

Hellenic Foundation of European and Foreign Policy (ELIAMEP) Athens. [www.eliamep.gr](http://www.eliamep.gr)

Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies. European University Institute (EUI) Florence.  
[www.iue.it/RSCAS](http://www.iue.it/RSCAS)

Churches' Commission of Migrants in Europe (CCME) Brussels.  
[www.cec-kek.org/content/ccme.shtml](http://www.cec-kek.org/content/ccme.shtml)

## **Abstract**

This paper gives an overview over the POLITIS qualitative interview database. It presents socio-demographic characteristics of the civically active immigrant interviewees and an assessment of quality of interviews. After a first reading of all interviews, the team discussed a number of hypotheses. Some of them are analysed in more detail with the database during the project, and others may be analysed later, or simply inspire discussion. The annex contains an overview over the interview coding scheme, attributes of interviewees and a list of interviewees with some attributes that may serve as a reference for finding information about quoted interviews in later papers.

## **Table of contents**

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. OVERVIEW OF MAIN SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF IMMIGRANT ACTIVISTS INTERVIEWED .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. INTERVIEW CONDUCTION AND DATA QUALITY.....</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1. GENERAL STANDARDS .....	11
3.2. SAMPLING .....	12
3.3. INTERVIEW CONDUCTION .....	14
3.4. TRANSCRIPTION .....	17
3.5. TRANSLATION .....	18
<b>4. WORKING HYPOTHESES AND COMPARATIVE DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>19</b>
4.1. MOTIVATIONS FOR BECOMING CIVICALLY ACTIVE .....	19
4.2. CIVIC ACTIVISM, CITIZENSHIP STATUS AND CIVIC ORGANISATIONS (ETHNIC OR MAINSTREAM) .....	21
4.3. RESOURCES.....	22
4.4. CONDITIONS CONDUCIVE TO CIVIC ACTIVISM.....	23
4.5. DISCOURAGING CONDITIONS TO CIVIC ACTIVISM .....	25
4.6. DISCRIMINATION, RACISM AND XENOPHOBIA.....	26
4.7. OTHER ISSUES: LANGUAGE, REGIONAL COMMONALITIES, AND GENDER.....	27
4.8. PROPOSALS FOR CHANGE .....	28
<b>5. CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>6. ANNEX 1 – FINAL POLITIS INTERVIEW CODING SCHEME.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>7. ANNEX 2: TABLE OF INTERVIEWEE ATTRIBUTES .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>8. ANNEX III: LIST OF INTERVIEWS WITH SELECTED INTERVIEWEE ATTRIBUTES .....</b>	<b>33</b>

## 1. Introduction

This working paper reports on 176 interviews with immigrant activists<sup>1</sup> that were conducted by POLITIS interviewers in all EU Member States, with the sole exception of Luxembourg,<sup>2</sup> during the period August 2005 to February 2006. The aims of this working paper are four-fold. First, it presents an overview of the main socio-demographic characteristics of the immigrant activists that were identified and interviewed in the context of the POLITIS project. Second, it informs about data quality, particularly with regard to interview conduction, transcription and translation. Third, based on an overview reading of these interviews, it introduces some preliminary hypotheses on the reasons that lead immigrants to engage in civic activities, while also referring to the factors that may discourage civic activism. Lastly, it puts forward some comparative dimensions between the EU Member States, that include old and new EU states, and small and large countries, with very different immigration histories, policies and experiences.

All interviews that were submitted by the interviewers followed a structure outlined in the POLITIS Interviewer Manual that was distributed during the first POLITIS Summer School (July 2005 in Delphi, Greece). This structure included a template with basic information on the immigrant activist (e.g. gender, age, profession, civic status, nationality, citizenship, education). Moreover, the interviewers were asked to attach an accompanying note to the transcribed interview with a brief paragraph on the interview setting and process ('interview protocol') and a short summary of the immigrant's profile. All interviews were transcribed in the language in which the interview was conducted and were translated into English by the interviewers. Each interviewer conducted between one and four interviews in their country of study or residence. This paper is based on a first analysis of the English translations of these interviews and the accompanying interview protocols. The entire set of interviews have been uploaded and coded in the MAXqda database (a computer assisted qualitative data analysis programme) that is shared by the POLITIS team.

This report is an intermediate step in the research process. It is important to note that this working paper constitutes a first attempt at putting forward a general set of hypotheses and at synthesising the initial impressions that have been derived from the interviews conducted for the POLITIS project. Many of the dimensions and issues raised here are to be extensively explored in a series of focused working papers and articles that will follow. This paper is by no means a thorough analysis; it serves the purpose of describing the database and communicating ideas for deeper analysis that are drawn from the first reading. In effect, the POLITIS team will engage in further detailed analysis of the interviews in the second half of 2006/early 2007.

The researchers asked themselves whether there seemed to be any recognisable patterns with regards to specific features of the opportunity structures and the enabling or discouraging conditions for civic participation in the receiving countries, differences between immigrants who have their original nationality or those who have naturalised, patterns with regards to the start of the first activity and/or with regards to the link between ethnic and mainstream activities. They

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Immigrant activist' is used as a short form for first generation immigrants that regularly and substantially devote time and energy to civic activities such as giving a voice to group concerns and organising solidarity and self-help – a broad concept that is explained in more detail in POLITIS Working Papers No.1 and 3.

<sup>2</sup> The POLITIS team followed up on different resources and in spite of repeated calls to try to find an interviewer in Luxembourg it proved to be impossible to find a suitable researcher in the available time-frame.

also considered any identifiable patterns of activity with regards to the country or region of origin (Africa, Asia, Europe or Latin America), or religion.

## 2. Overview of main socio-demographic characteristics of immigrant activists interviewed

176 immigrant activists were interviewed in the context of the POLITIS project, from 54 different countries. Some of their general characteristics regarding region of origin, gender, age, reason for emigration, educational level and employment, length of stay and citizenship status are included in the tables below.

**Table 1. Breakdown of immigrant activists interviewed for the POLITIS project by geographical region of origin<sup>3</sup>**

Geographic region of origin	Number of interviewees
Non-EU European countries	83
Africa	39
Asia	23
Latin America & Caribbean	19
Middle East	7
USA	4
EU Member State	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>176</b>

Source: POLITIS Interview Database

**Table 2. Breakdown of immigrant activists interviewed for the POLITIS project by gender and age range**

Gender Age			TOTAL
	Male	Female	
20-29	15	7	22
30-39	25	17	42
40-49	35	23	58
50-59	24	19	43
>60	6	5	11
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>176</b>

Source: POLITIS Interview Database

<sup>3</sup> The category non-EU25 European countries includes Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Georgia, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Turkey and Ukraine. The category Africa includes Algeria, Angola, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa and Tunisia. Interviewees from Bangladesh, China, Hong-Kong, Malaysia, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Vietnam are included under the category Asia while Latin America and the Caribbean groups persons from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru and Suriname. The wider Middle East includes Afghanistan, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria.

There were more men in the sample than women: about 60% of the immigrant activists interviewed were male and about 40% were female. The majority of the activists interviewed belong to the over-40 age group irrespective of gender.

The principal reasons for immigrating to their current country of residence were identified as for study (32.4%), for work or economic reasons (25.6%), or for marriage, a relationship or family reunification (24.4%). Although the POLITIS research did not specifically target asylum seekers, they were included in the population to be potentially interviewed, and the fourth most common reason for migration was with refugee status or seeking asylum (14.8%). A much smaller proportion migrated for repatriation (1.7%) or ‘other’ reasons (1.1%). Table 3 below provides a detailed breakdown of the reasons for migrating per Member State.

It is important to note that people frequently make the decision to immigrate for a multiplicity of interacting and interdependent reasons. Therefore the officially reported motives for migration do not always fully represent the individual migrant’s complete set of reasons to move. This becomes clear when looking at the ‘other’ reasons for migration. For instance, there were cases where the reasons for entry into the country were identified as tourism, or as benefiting from refugee reception quotas. However, a closer reading of the interviews suggests that the decision to leave the country of origin was due to the country’s unstable political or economic situation. Thus, there may be a difference between the officially stated and registered ‘purpose of entry and stay’ and the individual’s deeper motivations to emigrate.

It is also worth noting that some of the interviewees migrated initially to study but then stayed to work and settled down in the country of residence, either due to employment reasons or for personal reasons (e.g. marriage and family). Hence the ‘study’ category could be seen as a subdivision of a general economic migration reason. At the same time, the focus on civically active immigrants implies a sampling bias in favour of educated immigrants. Accordingly, immigrants who immigrated for education and studies are the largest group.

The overwhelming majority of the interviewees (79%) have a high education level, having completed tertiary (university or college) education. Indeed, this is the most obvious finding from the overview of the socio-demographic characteristics. Only three interviewees had a low education level, neither completing high school nor receiving formal occupational training. The vast majority of respondents were employed (81.3%), with a smaller number of students (7.4%), unemployed (4.5%) and retired persons (5.1%). However, it is important to note that this does not necessarily reflect their educational and employment status at the time of immigration. As already noted, some of them changed immigration status, and others improved their educational attainment in the receiving country.

**Table 3. Breakdown of immigrant activists interviewed for the POLITIS project by reason for emigrating and country of residence**

Country of Residence / Reason for Emigration	Austria	Belgium	Cyprus	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Malta	Netherlands	Poland	Portugal	Slovakia	Slovenia	Spain	Sweden	UK	TOTAL	
<b>Study</b>	4	6		2			2	10	5	3	3		3	2		1	1	3	1	1	2	3	2	3	<b>57</b>	
<b>Work/Economic</b>	2	1	1	2		2		1	1	3	2	1	11		3	1			5		1	1			7	<b>45</b>
<b>Marriage/Family/Relationship</b>	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	1	1	3	2	2	2	3			1	2	1	2			4	5	<b>43</b>	
<b>Asylum/Refugee</b>		1					5		1			7				1	3	1	2			2	2	1	<b>26</b>	
<b>Repatriation</b>									1	1				1											<b>3</b>	
<b>Other</b>							1					1													<b>2</b>	

Source: POLITIS Interview Database

**Table 4. Breakdown of immigrant activists interviewed for the POLITIS project by educational level<sup>4</sup> and employment status**

Educational level / Employment Status	High	Medium	Low	Unknown	TOTAL
<b>Employed</b>	116	23	3	1	<b>143</b>
<b>Student</b>	10	3			<b>13</b>
<b>Unemployed</b>	5	3			<b>8</b>
<b>Retired</b>	6	3			<b>9</b>
<b>Housewife</b>	1				<b>1</b>
<b>Unknown</b>	1	1			<b>2</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>176</b>

Source: POLITIS Interview Database

<sup>4</sup> High refers to university/college education, diploma or degree; Medium refers to high school certificate or formalised occupational training at technical school; and Low refers to no school leaving certificate or equivalent and no formalised occupational training.



An examination of citizenship status against the length of stay in the receiving EU Member State also suggests that there was a large majority of immigrant activists in this sample who had naturalised, followed by a significant number of activists with a secure residence permit. Indeed, the information (see Table 5 below) shows that the majority of civically active immigrants who were interviewed (64%) lived ten years or longer in the country of residence.

In this preliminary overview, we cannot ascertain whether this long-term stay indicates that there is a correlation between the duration of stay and the intensity or visibility of engagement (i.e. the longer the stay, the more civically active one becomes or the more visible the activities become). This is an issue that will be further explored in the in-depth interview analysis that will take place in the project’s next phase. It would be interesting to clarify if there is a correlation between duration of stay and participation: we can investigate if long-term immigrants started their activities only after some years of residence, or if they became active from the beginning of their stay, or even ‘imported’ their activism. If the engagement started after a delay this would indicate that structural factors (e.g. conditions in a particular country) have an impact, while engagement from the beginning of the stay would indicate that individual features (e.g. personality or motivation) are generally more significant.

**Table 5. Breakdown of immigrant activists interviewed for the POLITIS project by length of stay and citizenship status**

Citizenship Status \ Length of stay	Naturalised	Foreigner (Secure permit)	Foreigner (Conditional permit)	Undocumented	Unknown	TOTAL
5 or less	5	9	16		2	32
6 - 10	8	12	9		2	31
11 - 15	12	13	2	1	2	30
16 - 20	20	4			4	28
Over 20	46	5	1		3	55
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>176</b>

Source: POLITIS Interview Database

Naturalisation patterns seem to be country specific. They depend not only on the length of stay requirement for naturalisation, which, (for people that are not married to a citizen of the country of residence), ranges from 5 years to 10 or 12 years in some countries (e.g. Greece), but also on the country’s policy and attitudes towards citizenship, which may be liberal, considering citizenship as important to immigrant integration, or restrictive, reflecting an ethnic view of citizenship. Tables 6 and 7, below, present a country by country overview of the length of stay of the immigrant activists and an overview of their citizenship status.

**Table 6. Breakdown of immigrant activists interviewed for the POLITIS project by country of residence and length of stay**

Country of Residence \ Length of Stay (years)	Austria	Belgium	Cyprus	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Malta	Netherlands	Poland	Portugal	Slovakia	Slovenia	Spain	Sweden	UK	TOTAL
	<b>5 or less</b>		2	1	3			2	1		1	1	8	1			1		2	1			3	3	2
<b>6 - 10</b>		3	1	1		1		5	1	3	1	2	5				1	1		1		1	1	2	<b>31</b>
<b>11 - 15</b>	3	1		1		1	2		1	3	1		4	2	1		1	1	2		1	1	1	3	<b>30</b>
<b>16 - 20</b>	1	1			1		1	1	3	3	1		4	1		1	1		1	1	1	1	1	4	<b>28</b>
<b>Over 20</b>	4	3		1	1	2	6	5	4		2	1	2	3	2	1	2	2	5	1	1		2	5	<b>55</b>

Source: POLITIS Interview Database

**Table 7. Breakdown of immigrant activists interviewed for the POLITIS project by country of residence and citizenship status**

Country of Residence \ Citizenship	Austria	Belgium	Cyprus	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Malta	Netherlands	Poland	Portugal	Slovakia	Slovenia	Spain	Sweden	UK	TOTAL
	<b>Naturalised</b>	5	4	1	1	1	2	8	4	7	4	3	4	2	4	3	2	4	3	6	2	1	1	5	14
<b>Foreigner (secure permit)</b>	3	3		1		2	2	6	2	2		5	5	2		1		1	3	1	1	3			<b>43</b>
<b>Foreigner (conditional permit)</b>		3	1	4			1	2		4	2	2	4					2				2	1		<b>28</b>
<b>Undocumented</b>																	1								<b>1</b>
<b>Unknown</b>					1						2		5								1		2	2	<b>13</b>

Source: POLITIS Interview Database

Almost all interviewees are, or have been at some time, active on behalf of immigrants of their ethnic community or on behalf of immigrants or refugees in general. Our initial analysis suggests that in most cases, activists have been active in several fields in combination or at different times. For example, a substantial portion of immigrants interviewed have been politically active at the local policy level and at the same time they have been active in an immigrant or an ethnic minority organisation, or in a church. For a minority, civic activism was linked to professional activities, such as media, consulting or project work.

### **3. Interview conduction and data quality**

This section examines data quality. More specifically, it concentrates on the sampling methods and discusses the manner in which the interviews were conducted, transcribed and translated.

#### **3.1. General standards**

The POLITIS project did not collect quantitative data nor did it follow a classical approach to collecting qualitative empirical data: it collected interviews with civically active immigrants in an innovative manner by including third country short-term immigrants (student and doctoral researchers) in the interview conduction process. This creative and interactive collection process worked out well in general, but it was not without its difficulties and shortcomings. This section attempts to present the challenges that were met in this project and some resulting limitations.

The reliability of qualitative social sciences is principally based on an appropriate application of methodological standards of generating, processing and interpreting data within a plausible theoretical framework. Qualitative researchers underline that the plausibility of findings builds on the validity of the empirical material used for the analysis. Methodological transparency is a basic requirement for qualitative research projects. This is particularly true for a research project like POLITIS that follows a rather unusual approach: the empirical dataset consisting of 176 interviews was not collected by the researchers themselves, but by 63 interviewers of very diverse professional and cultural backgrounds, who identified interviewees in their country of residence. All interviews were taped, transcribed and, if necessary, translated into English by the interviewers. The English versions were integrated into a joint database.

The POLITIS project formulated the following minimum operational requirements for the inclusion of interviews in the dataset:

- Each interview had to be delivered along with a recording of the interview.
- The detailed written transcription that was submitted had to match the tape recording.
- A short description of the interview situation, a short summary on civic participation experience and a biographical note about the interviewee had to accompany the submitted interview.
- An English translation of the interview transcription, as literal as possible, had to be submitted.

The POLITIS project included only those translations in which these minimum standards were fulfilled into the MAXqda database. Accordingly, one interview was not accepted because the interviewer returned a translation of the interview but did not supply the tape recording or an

original transcription. One interviewer handed in three interviews with the original transcriptions and English translations, but only two recordings. He provided a plausible explanation for the loss of the third tape and it was decided that the interview could be included in the database. In the end, 176 cases which complied with the minimum operational standards were included in the POLITIS dataset.

The recruitment of external interviewers enabled the POLITIS project to generate a highly diverse dataset that allows for horizontal dissimilarity sampling (see POLITIS working paper 3 for more details). However, the intricacies of this method may have an influence on the quality and reliability of the data. In order to be aware of potential sources of error we analysed our data with regard to the following questions:

- Did the interviewers deviate from the selection of interviewees as set out in the POLITIS Interviewer Manual sampling guidelines?
- Did the interviewers conduct the interviews in accordance with the general standards of qualitative interviewing and the specific requirements of the POLITIS Interviewer Manual?
- Are the interviews transcribed according to the standards set out by the POLITIS project in the Interviewer Manual?
- Were the English translations of an acceptable quality?

While certain deviations mean that an interview will not be used for a particular aspect of the analysis, the interview may nonetheless be used for another area of analysis. For instance, an investigation into the impact of migration on activity chains necessitates a sample that consists of persons who emigrated as youth or adults, but not as children. Accordingly, interviews with people who migrated to an EU Member State as children (see section below on sampling) would not be included for this particular analysis, since they do not have experience in their country of origin. Nevertheless, their testimonies are interesting and relevant for other research questions, such as their assessment of encouraging and discouraging conditions for civic participation.

### **3.2. Sampling**

The guiding principle of the POLITIS project to recruit immigrant students and PhD-researchers to interview their compatriots turned out to be appropriate. Across all EU countries, the interviewing experience of these non-EU students confirmed that they had an advantage in identifying appropriate interviewees and gaining access to them. EU-students were more restricted in their choice of interviewees, and some of them experienced considerably more difficulties in accessing interviewees. But in these cases their personal experience in migration related activities or their own previous civic activism was useful in overcoming this obstacle.

Common national (or even linguistic or regional) backgrounds between the interviewer and interviewee facilitated access, or at the very least the awareness of activities of immigrant associations or immigrants in their country of stay. It was thus easier to identify appropriate candidates to interview. On some occasions, interviewer and interviewees had gone through the same or similar migration processes from the country of origin to the country of settlement. Furthermore, sometimes they may have known each other personally from common activities. Naturally in those cases, interviews took the form of informal conversation, rendering the interviewer's task easier and allowing more flexibility in guiding the conversation.

The background and civic experiences of the interviewers seem to have conditioned their selection of informants to interview in some cases, while in other cases interviewers stated that there was a high probability that other interviewers would have chosen the same interviewees, for example because there were not so many people of that immigrant background matching the selection criteria in a small immigrant community. In some instances, there is a similarity of profiles and biographies between interviewers and interviewees (e.g. in terms of attending the same church, or having the same level of education).

The impact of education and gender on the sampling were questions that were specifically discussed at the second Summer School. With regards to education, some interviewers admitted that their choice of an interviewee with a university education was influenced by their own university background. More interviewers declared that all, or most, civically active immigrants that they could have interviewed had a relatively high educational background. Thus, the sample has a bias towards highly educated immigrant activists, but there is also a certain likelihood that immigrant activists as a rule belong to the more educated part of an immigrant minority.

With regards to gender, the gender distribution of the sample does not mirror the gender distribution of the interviewers – the opposite is the case. While only one third of the interviewers were male, about two thirds of the interviewees were male. We asked interviewers at the second Summer School if it was more difficult to find female than male immigrant activists. The answers to this question revealed that this differs considerably between different immigrant nationalities and countries of residence. While some interviewers easily found two male activists and found it difficult to find a female activist, others were confronted with the reverse situation, finding two female activists easily and a male activist only with difficulty.

With respect to nationality, although in principle all interviews were to be conducted by student interviewers of the same nationality as the interviewees, in some countries it was impossible to recruit immigrant students. For this reason, the Baltic countries (Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia), Malta, Slovakia and Slovenia were covered by native graduate students with an interest in minorities or immigrants. In some cases, the informants appeared aware of the fact that the interviewee was a member of the ‘majority’ ethnicity. In most other cases, this was not an important feature in structuring interaction as there were probably other elements that brought the interviewer and the interviewee closer, such as their gender, their level of education, or a generational gap that neutralised the power relation between the ‘native’ and ‘immigrant’.

There are some interviews that do not fully comply with other criteria of the sampling guideline. As a rule, interviewers were expected to conduct interviews with civically active *first-generation* immigrants from non-EU countries. Due to problems in attempting to identify and approach active immigrants falling in this category, in nine cases the interviewees who were selected had immigrated to the EU as children. These interviews should not be used in the context of the research question on the influence of the migration process on the continuation or interruption of civic activism.

In two cases the interviewees were not third-country nationals. In one case the interviewee was originally a citizen of another EU country (a Belgian living in Portugal). The other case was a British woman born in Kenya who returned to the UK as an adult. In both cases the interviewees had undergone a cross-border migration trajectory and had become very active civically in the new country of residence. As the limitation to third country nationals was guided by the assumption that

this part of immigration is under-researched and of high future importance, it does not disqualify these two interviews for most questions in the analysis.

A further note needs to be made regarding the selection of civically active immigrants. According to the Interviewer Manual, the interviewers were asked to identify immigrants who ‘continuously and substantially’ devote time and resources to civic activism (Interviewer Manual: 5). Obviously, the level and intensity of civic involvement can only be subjectively evaluated. Overall, we consider that the sample includes immigrants with a rather extensive level of civic activism, though there are a couple of cases that might be debatable. For example, in one case the activism is confined to membership of the executive committee of an archaeological association that follows more personal than civic targets.

These observations mainly aim to raise awareness that some interviews are not suitable for all questions that are explored in the context of the POLITIS research. Therefore, a reasoned selection and careful assessment of appropriateness of cases for analysis within the dissimilarity sampling approach is necessary for every research question and will be undertaken in the subsequent POLITIS research papers.

### **3.3. Interview conduction**

An assessment of the quality of data in qualitative research is based on the appropriateness of the material in terms of the specific research interest. For example, a badly conducted interview (e.g. where the interviewer is unable to encourage the interviewee to talk about the relevant questions) may be inappropriate in terms of content analysis, but it may be appropriate data material for the analysis of failed interpersonal communication. In order to assess the appropriateness of data for a particular research question the process of gathering and generating data needs to be documented.

The POLITIS project aimed to receive interviews conducted in accordance with the basic standards of qualitative interviewing. Therefore, the project team prepared an Interviewer Manual and intensively trained the selected student interviewers during the Summer School in July 2005 in order to familiarise them with the basic standards of qualitative interviewing. The interviewers were instructed to stick to the interview guideline, to avoid closed or suggestive questions and to stimulate interviewees to talk and present stories about first-hand experiences. Therefore, interviewers faced the challenge of stimulating open narrations while maintaining the general topic of conversation and getting answers to all main questions. All accepted interviews show that the interviewers took up this challenge and sought a good balance.

A review of the collected data shows that the interviews differ in terms of quality. It is therefore important to discuss some of the factors that influence the quality of an interview. In this sense, the most significant aspects are the interviewer’s actions and the social dynamic between the interviewer and the interviewee. Although interviewers are trained to behave in a controlled manner and to avoid inputs that may influence or direct the interviewee, the relationship between the interviewer and the interviewee develops a social dynamic. The interviewees are influenced by their perception and social categorisation of the interviewer, and vice versa. Characteristics like educational level, age, gender, ethnic background, religious confession or political attitude may influence the interaction, (although they may not). Since interviewing is a social relation it is impossible to conduct ‘neutral’ interviews or to replicate the same situations for all interviewees. Accordingly, instead of eliminating influencing factors, qualitative research documents these issues

and takes their impact into consideration in the subsequent analysis. While researchers will use discreet text sections to get an overview of statements on particular aspects, they will always take the context - namely the interviewer questions - into account in the in-depth analysis.

In a number of cases, the interviewee had been provided with the interview questionnaire in advance upon request. This seems to have facilitated the interviewee in structuring the information that they wanted to share and in focusing or selecting the issues and aspects considered most important to them. Overall, however, it appears that this is not a factor influencing the quality of the interviews, as most interviewees were keen to share their personal experiences and stories and they were forthcoming in expressing their opinions on matters of immigration, xenophobia, participation and on their reasons for becoming civically active.

The Interviewer Manual appears to have been useful for the interview conduction and while most interviewers followed the instructions, some interviews reveal weaknesses. Three interviews deviate from the proposed interview schedule and although some relevant information was discussed, certain topics and questions were omitted. Another sensitive issue concerns the interviewing style. While some interviewers covered the entire set of questions in the Interview Manual on an equal footing, others tended to concentrate more on particular issues. Moreover, different personal techniques (e.g. frequent interruptions or little probing) affected the quality of the interview. There is also a variety in length among the interviews. This does not imply that some of the shorter interviews did not cover the entire set of issues. Equally, some of the interviews that were particularly lengthy covered additional aspects, which although enriching, were not directly relevant for the POLITIS project's research scope. In short, quantity and quality are certainly not related in these interviews.

A further note should be made with respect to the level of description and probing in the interviews. Some interviews appear less rich and detailed than others. In certain cases the reading of the translation suggests that issues of (cultural) politeness obstructed the interviewer in probing or questioning further. The ability to overcome this, or to phrase the questions in a 'polite' and non-intrusive manner, had much to do with the social skills and relevant experience of the interviewer (e.g. previous civic activism, or previous journalistic or interviewing experience). Hence the experience of the interviewer was a factor that had some affect on the quality of the interviews. This is relevant not only for the way the questions and answers were handled, but possibly also in the transcription and translation of the interviews.

The place where the interview was conducted influenced the quality of the interview in a number of ways. The majority of interviews were conducted in places familiar to the interviewees: either in a place of worship (e.g. church or temple) or in their workplace (e.g. office or restaurant), or in a public place that they frequented. In cases where the interview was conducted in a place that was familiar to the interviewee, then the interviewee appears to have been more at ease with the interviewing process and therefore launched into more a substantial discussion relatively quicker than in other cases. For example, one of the interviews was conducted in the gardens of a university. Since the immigrant activist was a former student of this university, he evidently felt at ease with the surroundings which facilitated the interviewer's task. In cases where the interview was conducted in the interviewee's workplace or home there were rather frequent interruptions and distractions (for example phone calls or interruptions by colleagues or the interviewee's family members). However, it appears that the interviewers were able to maintain the relationship and momentum, so these interruptions do not affect the flow or quality of the interview.

Interviews that were conducted between interviewees and interviewers who knew one another from before were in some cases even more insightful. This suggests that a previous personal relationship facilitated the flow of the questioning, not just because the interviewee may feel more comfortable during the process, but equally because the interviewer is more apt at (re)focusing on the core issues of the project rather than trying to sort through the personal stories that are potentially relevant. However, in one case the interviewer reported that a respondent already interviewed for her PhD project turned out to be much more reserved when interviewed a second time for the POLITIS project. The official European Commission frame seems to have had deterrent effects in this case. On the other hand, in some cases the official European Commission status eased and enabled access. One interviewer asked the project manager to send an official letter to a probable interviewee who agreed to the interview only after having received this formal request.

It must be noted that in certain cases although the interviewer and interviewee came from the same country, they belonged to different generations and to very different ‘waves’ of migration. In those cases, their migration experience and even their perception of the countries of origin and settlement were very different. This was often the case among Central Eastern European countries, where the interviewee was a long-term migrant who had come from a former Soviet Union or Balkan country to one of the newer EU Member States during the Communist times, while the interviewer was a much newer migrant having moved recently to the EU country for study. This type of generation gap proved to be quite fruitful as it gave the interview a sense of historical depth. It offers insight into the mutual exploration of the habits and conditions in the country of origin and how these have changed, their knowledge and views on the country of settlement, the knowledge they share about these issues and the things that they do not share because of the generational gap. From an identity and a migration analysis perspective, these interviews are of particular interest. In all other cases the existence of a generation gap between the interviewer and interviewee does not appear to have influenced the process of interviewing.

An additional factor that ought to be mentioned is that the interviewers are all graduate students, even if they are of different ages and with very different life histories. In effect, some are mature students with grown up children while others fall into the more typical cases of the young student pursuing a PhD or other graduate studies. This seems to have made the power relation within the interview less pronounced, as a student is unlikely to be perceived as speaking from a position of power. This, in our view, may have influenced the interview setting positively in terms of establishing an affinity due to their common traits (i.e. foreigners, or more specifically non-EU foreigners in an EU country). Moreover, as our data description above shows, most of our interviewees are also people with a tertiary level of education and generally with a successful professional life. These two features are likely to have made them feel more on a par and comfortable with the interviewer.

Gender also played a role in structuring the interaction between interviewer and interviewee. Where the two parties were of the same gender, especially so if they were both women, it sometimes happened that they spontaneously appeared to create a ‘we-feeling’ which facilitated the course of the interview and permitted more probing into the reasons leading to civic activism, the obstacles and the factors that have encouraged their participation in the receiving society.

The gender dimension was however also inserted in the project’s methodology from its inception, as the interviewers were asked to try to interview at least one female immigrant activist. This was initially considered pertinent in order to ascertain the extent to which gender sensitive issues may act as factors encouraging or discouraging civic activism. A preliminary reading of the interviews,



however, suggests that general personality traits matter more than gender. Gender may have a more influential dimension when in-depth analysis is conducted on various areas of activism.

Overall, the interviewees were very vocal and generous in sharing their personal experiences and trajectories. It could be argued that the overwhelming majority of the activists interviewed felt rather competent and comfortable with this kind of public speaking, not only because of their profession (e.g. religious leader, former diplomat, business-person, nurse, doctor), but also because of their leading role in the organisations they are involved in. In fact, many of the interviewees were either the founders of associations, or prominent figures within civic organisations. It therefore goes with their role and their position to talk to people about their activities, in order to encourage participation or fund-raising, or to lobby for specific issues (e.g. the organisation of events, funding and other types of support).

### **3.4. Transcription**

All interviews conducted in the context of the POLITIS research were recorded. Interviewers were asked to prepare a transcription of the tape recording according to basic transcription rules developed for the purpose of the POLITIS project. Transcribing is extremely time-consuming and arduous work. The transcription guidelines that were set out are rather modest, permitting the interviewers to be able to deliver their three interviews within a relatively brief time frame, while supplying the degree of information that was required for the subsequent analysis.

In order to familiarise the interviewers with these expectations, the transcription rules were explained in the Interviewer Manual and the interviewers received instruction in a special session dedicated to transcription during the POLITIS Summer School in 2005. Throughout the empirical stage, the POLITIS supervisors advised the interviewers and responded to questions related to transcription via e-mail. The supervisors were not able to read most incoming transcriptions as they were not familiar with the particular language, but they made some random comparisons to check whether tape, transcription and translation seemed to be plausibly related. The main function of delivering tapes and transcriptions were to make interviewers aware that their work could and would be checked if cases of doubt or problems should arise.

Consequently, the overall quality of the transcriptions is acceptable. Some differences concern the documenting of expletives like ‘uhm,’ or ‘ehh’ or ‘you know’. While some transcriptions contain all expletives, others contain only emphasised exclamations that were considered as meaningful. The level and quality of transcription is not sufficient for a conversational or hermeneutical analysis, which would require a more detailed transcription than is feasible or necessary for the POLITIS project. However, the level and quality of transcription serves the research purposes of the POLITIS project, which aims to analyse immigrants’ civic activism through an interpretation of their reflections and narratives.

### 3.5. Translation

The last operational methodological step was the translation of the transcriptions into English. The POLITIS dataset includes 176 interviews that were originally conducted in 33 different languages.<sup>5</sup> In order to create a common dataset for the POLITIS research project, English was identified as the common working language. Therefore, while all interviews had to be conducted in the mother tongue of the interviewee, or at least in the common language of the interviewee and the interviewer, the requirement that was made was that all transcriptions had to be accompanied by an exact translation into English. Translation was not necessary for a number of interviews that were conducted in English, as this was the common language of the interviewer and the interviewee.

Translation is a sensitive topic in two regards. First, the transferring of culturally contextualised concepts and patterns of meanings into another language may distort the meaning and produce false understanding. Second, translation requires certain linguistic competencies on the part of the translator and is therefore perceived to be a highly-qualified profession. Both problems are highly relevant within the context of the POLITIS research project.

Putting statements from distinct cultural backgrounds into one common language may create the impression that words referring to abstract or complex concepts, (including the sense of belonging to family, ethnic or social group), or evaluative statements concerning ethics or morals, may be summarised by the same meaning provided by English terminology. Within the POLITIS project, this problem seems to be mitigated by the fact that a lot of the material used consists of stories describing everyday experiences and revealing attitudes towards civic activism in the country of residence.

This translation problem is acknowledged, but we perceive it as principally linked to general issues of comparative qualitative research. As a rule, the acceptance of culturally contextualised concepts is inherent in comparative studies, and needs to be handled carefully and sensitively. Interviewers were encouraged to make ample use of footnotes to explain terminology that was specific to a particular country of residence or origin, or which they considered ambiguous. While all included explanations for country-specific abbreviations, the extent to which other terms are explained varies between the interviews. Researchers will make sure that they feel confident with the translation of specific segments when analysing texts. It should be noted that POLITIS does not intend to undertake a hermeneutical analysis, although this could be carried out if the original language transcripts were used.

A further matter has to do with the very different English-language proficiency of the interviewers who were in their overwhelming majority non-native English speakers (with the exception of three interviewers from the USA). The translation level of three interviewers has been assessed as particularly poor, and in another twenty interviews the language proficiency of the interviewee affects the quality and richness of the account to a certain degree. In a few of these cases, although the sense of the translation is clear, some details and the richness of the description could only be reconstructed by returning to the transcripts of the interviews.

Another issue concerning the ability to read the interviews has to do with matters of form and style. For example, some interviews have a very poor usage of punctuation (e.g. sentences run on for 10

---

<sup>5</sup> Albanian, Amharic, Arabic, Bulgarian, Cape Verdean Creole, Cebuano, Chinese, Danish, Dutch, English, Estonian, Filipino, French, German, Greek, Italian, Kinyarwanda, Kirundi, Latvian, Lithuanian, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Sinhalese, Slovak, Slovene, Spanish, Thai, Turkish and Ukrainian.

lines of text) or an overly-detailed transcription style (e.g. noting every ‘um,’ ‘ah’ and ‘er’). However, these are rather minor translation and transcription issues that do not pose any substantial problems in understanding the content.

To summarise, the overall quality of the interviews is appropriate for qualitative content analysis as is intended in this project. Further in-depth analysis will usually be restricted to a subset of interviews that will be selected with care and with recognition of the aforementioned limitations of the dataset.

#### **4. Working hypotheses and comparative discussion**

This section presents and explores initial hypotheses on the motivations for becoming civically active, on the relationship between civic activism and citizenship status and on the kind of associations within which these immigrants expressed their civic activism. It equally refers to issues of racism and discrimination that they may have encountered during their migration experience, as well as factors that appear to encourage or discourage civic activism.

During the interview conduction phase, three supervising researchers read all incoming interviews. This section is based on observations after a first reading. Thus, it should be read as a collection of ideas for deeper analysis, not as a result of analysis. In addition, efforts to structure observations more deeply with regard to theoretical perspectives will be left for later analysis.

##### **4.1. Motivations for becoming civically active**

The most common reasons noted by the immigrant activists as having motivated their participation in civic life in their country of residence include the following:

- To maintain a connection and attachment to their country of origin. Sentiments of loneliness, or the need to talk with people from their own country in their mother tongue, or even to cook food from their homeland or find out and discuss what is happening in their country of origin, were among the primary motivations;
- To inform about a particular issue relevant to their country of origin. This includes showing or explaining to the receiving society who they are, where they come from and what their country of origin is like. It also involves attempting to change negative representations regarding their nation and their country, or informing the general population of the hardships faced by their people due to the political regime or natural catastrophes that may have occurred in their country of origin;
- To interact with institutions to combat legal and social integration problems. This involves the legalisation of one’s status, access to the job market, access to education and health services etc;
- Closely related to the previous two reasons is the desire to combat discrimination, racism and xenophobia in the receiving society, through informing the population of the difficulties and challenges faced by particular groups (e.g. refugees and asylum seekers, or victims of trafficking);
- To stand up for oneself and one’s needs, or to contribute to changing things. Interviewees stressed that natives cannot know what immigrants’ experiences have been, what their

culture is, or what their needs are, even if they think they do. For this reason they see civic activism, including political activism, even in the absence of full voting rights, as a very important means through which to influence policy design and implementation and to obtain access to power (although very few mentioned the issue of power openly);

- In response to having been encouraged or invited to take part in a civic activity. In some instances, the idea of creating an association came up spontaneously from the individual or from another person. Others were encouraged by other civically active immigrants to become involved. In certain instances the immigrant participated passively in some activity, (e.g. attending a religious service), and were asked by others to join in creating a cultural association, or were asked to work for the parish or the church. Their activity may remain oriented towards religion, or it may take a new turn towards culture or politics;
- As a result of an inner need to be active socially and to provide assistance to people. Feelings of compassion and empathy were frequently expressed, as was the need to feel that they have done something for other people. This was motivated in some cases because the person knew what it was like to be a newly arrived immigrant or refugee and wanted to help fellow country people. In other cases, the importance of a culture of solidarity and of group spirit that exists in other countries was emphasised. It is worth noting that the culture of solidarity and group or family life is emphasised as a positive aspect by African immigrants and refugees. By contrast, people from former Communist countries emphasise their initial reluctance to get involved in voluntary activities and civic organisations because of their negative experience of compulsory ‘voluntary’ activism forced upon citizens in Communist regimes;
- Simply because the opportunity arose, through their work or through friends, to become involved. Through a chance event or circumstances they realised that they could achieve something important through civic activities, which could not be achieved individually;
- To avoid ‘ghettoisation’, to interact and to be included in the social life of the country of residence;
- To teach their children their language and culture of origin, in order to maintain a connection with their cultural and ethnic background (this was common with Chinese immigrants in different countries). This was not understood as a way of staying apart, quite the contrary, interviewees emphasised that this was a means for creating a bridge between the country and culture of origin (which was losing out in the second generation) and the country and culture of settlement (which is gaining ground among the second generation, but should not be leading to total assimilation);
- Some interviewed asylum seekers had outstanding biographies in that they turned their hardship into an asset. In Ireland in particular, it was clear that asylum seekers became active while waiting for the judgement of their application, as a way to show to the local society their wish to stay and their commitment to become integrated. This is indeed an exemplary case of civic activism as these people became interested in mainstream questions of concern at a time when they had no work, no secure status, and no roots in the country of settlement. This is particularly noteworthy given that their reasons for migration were persecution in their country of origin and to make a life for themselves and their families in the country of refuge;

- Last but not least, an important motivation in some cases was to help specific population groups in their country of origin (e.g. to fund children going to school in a specific region of Thailand).

#### **4.2. Civic activism, citizenship status and civic organisations (ethnic or mainstream)**

There is little reference to citizenship and naturalisation issues as such in the interviews. However, some distinguishing features may be highlighted with a closer reading of the interviews, indicating that access to citizenship of the receiving society may influence the kind of civic activity immigrants engage in.

Regardless of citizenship status, many immigrants point to the importance of having a say at least in local society and local politics, so as to feel integrated. Some are in favour of consultative institutions like advisory boards and other consultative bodies for immigrants. It was stressed that even though these do not give them any real political power, their existence is important because it provides them with a channel of formal communication with the government and local authorities. Through this, immigrants can express their needs, and can also get information on the kind of services that are available and that they are entitled to.

First of all we will discuss the case of immigrant activists that have taken the nationality of their country of residence. Many of them underlined that they took an active role on social and political issues because they are citizens of the country of residence and therefore feel entitled and justified to participate in social, civic and political activities. It was also emphasised that they took an active role not so much for the protection of their own rights, since they have citizens rights and did not feel discriminated against on a personal level, but mostly to represent their ‘fellow immigrants.’ Lastly, a sense of duty in encouraging an interaction between the immigrant and local communities, and of addressing potential anxieties or prejudices of the local community towards the ‘foreigner’ surfaced in a number of these interviews.

Overall, interviewees that have acquired the nationality of their country of residence were preoccupied with the same issues as interviewees that continue to have the nationality of their country of origin. However, we may look deeper into the question how a path from mainstream to ethnic associations appears in the accounts of naturalised interviewees. Two examples from the UK may illustrate this. One Russian-born activist in the UK explained that she had been actively involved in a mainstream association (the Red Cross) but that she had decided gradually to focus on the education needs of her community of origin because she felt that this was a population group that needed more support and that her work would have greater impact. Equally, a Malaysian-born British activist mentioned that although he initially became active on health-issues, he gradually became aware of the work he could do for minority groups and that he had an important role to play there.

One additional characteristic that may be mentioned is that immigrant activists who had acquired the citizenship of the country of residence seem to be more actively involved in initiatives, networks and organisations at the national level (such as in the British Conservative party) and are more familiar with the European level as well.

With regards to the type of organisation in which the interviewees are active, by far the majority of immigrants who have not been naturalised are involved in ethnic associations. Activists who focus their activities primarily on social and cultural activities appear to be mostly involved in ethnic

associations. In fact, as mentioned in the previous section on motivations for activism, in a number of interviews the activists stress the fact that they do not want to be ghettoised or separate from the native community. They do want to have a forum within which to celebrate their customs and traditions, or provide assistance and support to their own people. However, the need to create and nurture links with the receiving society remains an important aspect, in order to facilitate and improve the integration of their people in the country of residence, at both an individual and group level.

A few notable exceptions exist of immigrant activists involved in multi-ethnic networks or mainstream organisations. These were concentrated in Ireland and Greece either through their involvement in multi-ethnic or mainstream organisations, or through their participation in local government, political parties, or immigrant and refugee associations. It is an interesting question whether this may be due to the fact that these are new immigration countries, where immigrant activism has only really developed in the past five years or so, and where immigrant activists are still not very numerous. The immigrant activists in these countries are pioneers in many instances, and are therefore compelled to take on a number of roles in civic society, both in mainstream and ethnic organisations, in order to get things started or to take them forward.

For activists principally involved in activities with a more political dimension, (e.g. securing legal status, protecting or promoting human and civic rights for third country nationals, or combating exclusion and racism), then their involvement in national organisations or their collaboration with other ethnic associations within multi-national groupings, appears to make sense. This is the level at which they are more able to influence decision-making and perhaps even policy formulation. However, it appears that political activists lobbying for a particular political cause, such as the Kurdish issue, remain within ethnic organisations that function as a lobby-interest group.

Similarly, immigrants active in faith-related associations also have a more multinational outreach, since the determining factor is the religious denomination (e.g. Muslim, Christian Orthodox, Roman Catholic) and not the ethnic or nationality background.

### **4.3. Resources**

Almost all immigrant activists, regardless of their country of residence, underlined that their activism involved a significant investment on their part in terms of both money and time. Particularly in the starting off phases of their activism, for instance in setting up an association or enrolling new members, a high level of personal resources and commitment seems to be required by the individuals. Immigrants need to put not only significant time into their civic activities, but also significant material resources. These range from financial resources, to offering their car for transportation, or their home for the meetings. This effort is described as equally difficult regardless of the type of civic activity, the country of residence or whether the individual is a citizen in the country or not. It was raised just as much by Russians and Chinese-origin British activists as it was by Nigerians in Malta, or Albanians and Ukrainians in Greece.

Some interviewees commented, albeit indirectly, on the relationship between their education and their civic activism by noting that they first became active as students, either in their country of origin or their country of residence. For others, education was more indirectly relevant in that their ability to deal with problems (migration related or otherwise) in the country of residence made them more aware of the difficulties that less educated people from their own background faced, which

encouraged them to become active in voluntary organisations. In other cases, education was relevant because it made them suitable candidates for positions of responsibility, for example as members of church councils, managers of ethnic schools, or office bearers (e.g. presidents or secretaries) in immigrant or cultural associations. In summary, higher education was portrayed as an important condition enabling immigrants to become civically active. The ways in which education is relevant for civic activism will be investigated in more in-depth in the later analytical dimension reports.

A matter that was brought up in a large number of interviews, regardless of the country of residence or the country of origin of the activist, is that only a minority of the immigrant community becomes civically active or contributes to the work of the relevant associations. Regardless of whether the immigrants are from Russia, Brazil, Thailand or Bangladesh, the recurring theme was that the majority of immigrants either do not have the time, or the interest, to get involved in associations.

At the same time, there was repeated reference to the significant work of volunteers. The involvement of volunteers is usually triggered by the dynamism and commitment of a very small number of immigrant activists who form a core group that keeps the organisation active. It was stressed that there is a high turn-over among volunteers. Even though this was sometimes viewed as a dynamic characteristic of immigrant associations, there is also an underlying grievance with this, and it was repeated by the interviewees that it is not easy for most to find the required time and energy to devote to civic activities.

In a number of interviews there was even reference to resentment from their community towards certain immigrant civic initiatives. For example, an Asian activist mentioned that she had been criticised for her activities against child prostitution in her country of origin because this was considered as negative publicity. Meanwhile, a Romanian activist in Ireland explained that she felt that many Romanians were less keen to be associated with ethnic or national organisations which differentiated themselves, preferring instead to follow a ‘melting-pot’ route to integration, through mixing with the local population in order to fit in more easily.

#### **4.4. Conditions conducive to civic activism**

The interviewees were asked to identify the factors that may have served as conditions encouraging their civic activity. The most prominent reasons that featured in many interviews included the following:

- Previous civic activism, experienced personally or within their family. Many immigrants mentioned that they personally had been civically or politically active in their country of origin, or that family members in their country of origin had been civically active, and felt they could or should continue similar initiatives in the receiving country. Most had been active in student and youth associations, or in political or dissident organisations in their country of origin;
- Their educational and social background helped them in gaining legal or smooth entry into the country of residence, or facilitated them in acquiring regular or legal employment and a position that encouraged their engagement in civic activities;
- Negative experiences in their country of origin such as civil strife, oppression, or discrimination. For example, an authoritarian regime or dictatorship in the country of origin encouraged some activists to become human rights activists in the receiving country (this

was the case of some immigrants from Sierra Leone, Chile and Columbia). The wish to influence the situation in their country of origin, either by political activism or by charity work from the country of residence was also discussed by some;

- A negative situation or an existing need that is not served in the country of residence (e.g. help in the initial phases after arrival with status regularisation, help in the asylum-seeking process, assistance in finding a job, provision of information about HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases, or giving language lessons to children). In this context, some immigrants take the initiative to fill an institutional gap. With regards to the foundation of organisations, some immigrants argue that a more formal institution or structure is necessary to deal with specific authorities or issues in an effective manner. This is not only because an association can have more impact, as it is considered a more formal interlocutor than a single individual, also because it is easier to seek funding from public or private bodies as an official organisation than as an individual or informal group;
- Immigrants that have a very strong religious affiliation, regardless of faith, referred to this as a strong means through which to communicate with people, and provide support and direction. Religion seems to function as a strong triggering mechanism that provides justifications and substance to their actions and that encourages their civic activities.

One of the most interesting means to support immigrant associations was referred to in one of the interviews conducted in Spain. The interviewee underlined that it is not so much the financial resources from the state that supports their work; instead she referred to an ‘intangible’ resource as one of the most valuable means through which the Spanish authorities have supported their work. She explained that an agreement was made between the Spanish Ministry of Justice and associations in Spain whereby ‘conscientious objectors’ who choose to not undergo obligatory military service can offer community assistance by working for NGOs for twelve months. It was noted that these ‘human resources’ were even more valuable than financial resources because it brings young, usually skilled and educated individuals (e.g. those who have studied law, medicine, social studies, etc) into their organisations, who can offer assistance and expertise to the immigrants that these associations are trying to support. Moreover, such a scheme exposes nationals of the receiving country to the issues and concerns of the immigrant populations and permits greater interaction between the two population groups. Finally, such a scheme also raises the profile of the association with all the implications this might have in terms of membership participation, scope of action, consolidation of its existence, and interaction with local and national authorities and mainstream associations.

In another context, a legislative act was referred to as having proved critical in helping a person’s civic activity. The 1993 Community Care Act in the UK provided the framework within which one of the immigrant activists was able to form her organisation. Similarly, the fact that non-Irish nationals can stand for local elections was also pointed out as a factor that particularly encourages the participation of minority or ethnic groups, and the hope was expressed that eventually participation at the national level would also be opened.

One other issue that was brought up in a number of interviews is the different approach to the concept of participating voluntarily in social or communal activities (‘volunteering’) that seems to exist in the country of origin and the receiving country. Russian immigrant activists stressed that voluntary activities have a different connotation for persons who lived in the Soviet Union before its collapse. In the Soviet Union, NGOs were basically affiliated in some manner to the communist



party, and participating in the various activities was ‘strongly encouraged’ by the regime as an indication of commitment and patriotic duty. One interviewee actually underlined that he had preferred to stay out of any associations precisely because of contempt towards the political dimensions of civic activism that he had felt in the Soviet Union. He stressed that he had become active because of circumstances, not because he had actively pursued this, since his past experiences were rather prejudiced against these sorts of activities. On the other hand, interviewees stressed that the appreciation of voluntarism and civic activities in their country of residence encouraged them to become active. There are a number of examples of immigrants that received award and public recognition for their work.

Moreover, the interest of certain political parties in immigrant issues was brought up by a number of interviewees as having encouraged their activism, because there was an understanding that related issues were on their agenda and that progress was being achieved. Some immigrants referred to a more right-wing party, but most references were principally towards socialist or labour parties (for example in the UK, Portugal, Sweden, Ireland and Greece) suggesting a greater awareness in the positions of left-oriented parties on behalf of immigrant activists. In Greece specifically, the first non-Greek citizens (Albanian, Bulgarian and Serbian) to be elected to a national party’s council were with the socialist party. This was noted by the immigrants interviewed as ‘unprecedented’ and particularly ‘progressive’.

Access to voting rights, equal treatment and access to citizenship were repeatedly identified as core objectives and aspirations. This was justified by the need to feel more formally integrated in the society of the receiving country. In fact, there was a recurring statement in many interviews, particularly in relatively new immigration countries (such as in Greece, Malta, Spain, Portugal), that immigrants now feel part of the society of the receiving country and want to be seen as officially part of it too. Being able to vote was defined as a necessary development in a democratic society and an expression of a person’s willingness to participate in that society. Albanian and Bulgarian activists in Greece criticised the exclusion of immigrants and ethnic Greeks from local, national and EU politics, as did Cape Verdeans and Brazilians in Portugal. In addition, emphasis was placed on increasing information and awareness on the rights of foreigners and residents, both for the immigrant population and for the general population.

#### **4.5. Discouraging conditions to civic activism**

In terms of factors that are, or could prove to be, discouraging to civic activity, the following appeared as the most prominent:

- Little or no recognition or gratitude by their own community (‘you may find you get little or no thank you (...) that puts you down...’);
- When other members withdraw due to lack of free time or other reasons;
- Lack of funds and financial support from the state and/or local authorities make it difficult for many organisations to continue their activities;
- Other problems relating to a lack of resources (e.g. lack of a meeting place or appropriate equipment to engage into cultural or educational activities, or a lack of management support).

- Bureaucratic hurdles in dealing with public administration (e.g. in order to set up an organisation or apply for funds);
- The sense of being ‘on the margins of society’ discourages activism in any form; this was particularly noted with respect to illegal or undocumented immigrants who appear to be even more marginalised;
- The heterogeneity (e.g. ethnic or religious) that characterises the country of origin makes it difficult to organise as an immigrant group from a specific nationality, which sometimes results in a multitude of more ethnic-specific groupings (e.g. Romanian Catholics, Orthodox Romanians, Romanians of Hungarian nationality, Roma Romanians, etc).
- A significant number of interviewees indicate that they do not appreciate the work of other immigrant activists with different agendas (e.g. an Imam criticises the impact of activities in mainstream organisations on identity, faith and culture, while other interviewees criticise certain ethnic organisations as narrow-scoped and avoiding integration, and others complain that immigrant activists from particular backgrounds find it easier to get funding from local authorities).

Overall, interviewees had little to emphasise as discouraging factors and mainly mentioned these when specifically asked by the interviewer. Most of them generally acknowledged that their activity took up a lot of their free time, family time, and/or their social life. However, they did not consider this to be a discouraging condition.

#### **4.6. Discrimination, racism and xenophobia**

The issue of racism, xenophobia and discrimination is constant throughout almost all interviews, although we did not have any explicit questions on this topic. Across all EU Member States, instances of racism and xenophobia were recorded. The external appearance turned out to be a much stronger factor than nationality. For example, a black US-citizen shared experiences of exclusion and discrimination with Africans or Asians, while white US-citizens did not report such experiences. At the same time, immigrants from Latin American countries felt that Spaniards consider them ‘*sudacas*’ (a pejorative term used in reference to Latin Americans); a Russian immigrant in the UK noted that she had been accused of having ‘an Eastern European attitude’; Romanians felt that Irish regard all Romanians as Gypsies; and Albanian immigrants felt that the Greek mass media has nurtured a collective image of criminality associated with Albanians. At the same time, racist attitudes among different immigrant groups were also brought up in some of the interviews. For example, one immigrant activist was very critical of the racist attitudes of many Russian immigrants in the UK towards black or Muslim immigrants.

What differed are the ways in which racism or discriminatory views and practices take place in the various EU countries. In the UK for instance, many interviewees note that there is no overt racism and there is no institutional discrimination in terms of access to resources. However, there is covert racism or xenophobia (of the type: ‘why do we want all these foreign people here?’) and a hypocritical behaviour (‘they will say it behind your back while upfront they will praise your activity saying what wonderful job you are doing’). In Malta on the other hand, public and overt expressions of racism were noted as being rather frequent.

Most immigrants commented that there was an increasing popular reaction towards the increase in the number of immigrants in the countries they were living in. This sense of ‘threat’ was sometimes

expressed in stereotypically racist terms (i.e. based on colour) or on certain occasions was associated with prejudices of a more social kind, such as cultural stereotypes or media constructions (e.g. all people from this nationality are criminals, or employed in the sex-industry). Nevertheless, it must be noted that in all cases where discrimination is reported, it was never presented as a factor hindering civic participation and activism. On the contrary, it was seen as a motivation to become active.

#### **4.7. Other issues: language, regional commonalities, and gender**

Several interviewees of different origin and in different countries emphasised the relevance and importance of language issues. Some respondents underlined that learning or practising their mother tongue is an important reason to become active. More immigrants emphasised that the acquisition of the country of residence language is a vital and necessary pre-condition for successful integration.

With respect to patterns of activity, some broad dividing lines seem to appear with respect to the countries or region of origin. As a rule, immigrants from Latin-America referred to a classical modern concept of politics in explaining their engagement. They became active early on in their country of origin and locate their activities in the philosophy of the political contradiction of left versus right. The immigrants from former Socialist countries also seem to have started their active engagement at a younger age. These immigrants explained that they were engaged in civic activities without necessarily identifying with the political system, but because civic involvement was expected by the government. Others stated that they were active not in order to comply with official expectations, but in response to a personal need or individual accomplishment, for example because involvement in activities was a pre-condition for admission to further education.

Immigrants from China underlined their activity as a service for their community and the receiving countries, while immigrants from other Asian countries underlined a personal desire to support fellow people in need. Immigrants from Africa located their activity in the framework of combating racism and exclusion, and to support the development of the African diaspora in Europe and of society in their home country. Immigrants from Turkey and the Middle East seem to be concerned mainly with integrating immigrants in the country of residence. This stance may be related to the fact that these nationalities belong to the group of countries with guest-worker programmes and a longer residence. It is an open question if these patterns are imported, or if they are developed in response to the situation in the European countries under study.

Several of our female informants in Italy (of Albanian and Ukrainian nationality) started their emigration career as live-in maids ('badante'). Their difficult living and working conditions (being confined to a house with an elderly person, long working hours, limited language abilities, and a lack of frequent social contacts) often left them feeling lonely, isolated and desperate, which seems to have pushed them to become civically active. These women experienced nostalgia for their homes and families, and started to become active as a way of solving their own problems, to help others in a similar situation, and to prevent themselves from being 'driven mad'. More than one informant noted that once they became active they started speaking to people who gathered in informal open air meeting spaces (e.g. town squares) who were crying or looked lonely. They commented that the people they helped, just like themselves earlier, had even considered committing suicide because they were so desperate, helpless and did not know who to turn to. Several of the interviewees who started their emigration career as live-in maids then moved to other

types of employment, as cultural mediators, in local authorities or in non-governmental organisations.

#### **4.8. Proposals for change**

When asked to explicitly express their opinion on what they would like to address, or even change, if they were placed in a position of power in their country of residence, many immigrant activists emphasised the need to increase funding and to improve access to financial support. Others made proposals related only to the specific fields in which they are active (e.g. in the field of education or social work), which are not discussed in this overview.

The importance of the receiving country authorities seeking to understand the needs and priorities of the immigrant populations prior to formulating related policy initiatives was equally pointed out in a number of interviews. Taking an active role in discussions with local government and participating in local councils was deemed to be an important step towards integration in the receiving society.

General issues of immigration and immigration policy were also on the agenda of immigrant activists. For example, in Greece the issue of legalisation was stressed, as securing legal and residence status is the first step before immigrants can begin to address concerns of social or political integration. The legislative framework, a lack of social protection and a heavy, inefficient bureaucracy were identified as core obstacles to immigrants' integration in Greece.

### **5. Conclusion**

This preliminary and mainly descriptive overview of the POLITIS interviews reveals a set of very rich biographies and an intriguing set of material which needs to be analysed in depth.

Compared to other qualitative datasets, the number of interviews with immigrant activists is fairly high (176). The innovative data collection design has largely produced the expected outcomes. The dataset offers ample opportunities for comparing groups of interviews which are similar with regards to particular context conditions, and different with regards to others, as shown in section 2. The research team could contrast groups with regards to background conditions, such as immigration status or a shared mother tongue with the receiving country, or with regards to their main fields or trajectories of activity, and analyse the interviews in more depth. They could also begin with recurring statements and analyse whether they appear under similar or different context conditions. Several approaches to the analysis will be undertaken, depending on the questions to be investigated in more depth.

This initial overview of the material suggests that the dimensions we want to investigate in more depth, such as the role of citizenship in becoming active, the motivations of people who turn to civic activism and their prior experience in activism, are promising topics of research, although no clear patterns are yet visible. Education, language proficiency, prior activism, perceptions of duty and demand are also potential aspects for further analysis, as well as the ways in which civic activism was described as part of the immigrant's identity. We have not yet found any significant gender patterns, but will look into this in more depth later beyond this initial overview. With regards the shift between ethnic and mainstream activity, this seems to work both ways, and it will be worthwhile analysing the descriptions of changes in more detail.

In general, there are enough rich interviews to improve our understanding of these questions on the basis of this dataset. The quality of the majority of interviews is good with respect to sampling, interview conduction, transcription and translation, but the datasets also includes some interviews that show some shortcomings with regards to the one or the other aspect. The in-depth analysis will be conducted in awareness of problems with individual interviews that are useful for some questions and less useful for others.

The POLITIS team will engage in further detailed analysis of the interviews in late 2006 and early 2007. This report is an intermediate step in the process, to describe the dataset and synthesise initial impressions from the interviews. A series of analyses will be conducted to explore in more detail many of the issues raised here.

## 6. Annex 1 – Final POLITIS interview coding scheme

CODE	SUB-CODE	EXPLANATION / DEFINITION
Summary Information	Process Summary	Section entitled 'short protocol on interview setting/location and process'
	Activism Summary	Section entitled 'short summary on participant activism'
Migration History	Come	Statements about decision to come to receiving country how this was brought about.
	Stay	Statements about decision to stay in receiving country and efforts to realise this decision.
	Naturalise	Statements about decision to naturalise and efforts to acquire citizenship.
Civic Activity History	Origin/Prior	Statements about activities in country of origin or prior to arrival in receiving country.
	First/Early	Statements about first activity(s) in receiving country.
	Ethnic	Statements about activities in organisation or network explicitly mobilising around one ethnicity, e.g. with a single national, cultural or religious focus (could also be based on geographic region or shared language). Includes personal experiences of and opinions about these types of activities.
	Multicultural/ Migration Related	Statements about activities in organisation or network focusing on ethnic/migration issues involving more than one national, cultural or religious group (not dominated by the majority ethnicity nor any single minority ethnicity - e.g. refugee council, immigrant advisory committee, anti-racism forum). Includes personal experiences of and opinions about these types of activities.
	Mainstream/Majority	Statements about activities in mainstream/majority organisation or network (e.g. political party, trade union, church and welfare organisations), where the central focus is not ethnicity or nationality but a specific civic concern. Includes personal experiences of and opinions about these types of activities.

*Coding Scheme page 2*

Activation Process	Motivations	Statements about motivations for being active, both individual (e.g. making contacts, gaining experiences, gaining respect) and collective (e.g. desire to change society, in response to specific event in country of origin, in response to specific event in receiving country).
	Demotivations /Failures	Statements about failed efforts to become active. Reasons/times when person feels demoralised about their activity.
Resources & Personal Attributes	Material	Statements about practical resources (e.g. time, money, office space) which enable or inhibit activity.
	Social	Statements about relationships and social capital which enable or inhibit activity, (e.g. level of support from family and friends, social networks outside the immediate family).
	Personality/Skills	Statements about personal attributes/skills which enable or inhibit activity (e.g. language, communication, organisational ability). Includes identity/personality as reason for becoming active. (e.g. vocation/calling, strong sense of belonging to one group).
Societal Opportunity Structure	Public Policies	Statements about policies and conditions set by public bodies (e.g. anti-discrimination programmes, subsidies, local integration initiatives, legal restrictions, exclusionary policies) which enable or inhibit activity. Also includes organisations or individuals who have an impact on policy.
	Other Societal Circumstances	Statements about all other external circumstances related to societal opportunity structure (e.g. size of immigrant community, openness of local population, sense of exclusion, implicit racism/discrimination in society) which enable or inhibit activity.
Policy Proposals	Response	Proposals for policy changes made in response to reflective question 'if you were a political leader of this country...'
Gender		Statements about the role of women in civic activities or the influence of gender on activism. Includes statements about the involvement in women's associations.
Noteworthy Quotes		Any statements that are particularly original, eloquent, evocative...

## 7. Annex 2: Table of Interviewee Attributes

ATTRIBUTE TITLE	OPTIONS
Textname	Unique interview ID (number_interviewer name_interviewee initials_country residence_country origin) *see bottom of page
Textgroup	Country of residence (all EU member states except Luxembourg)
CountryOrigin	Multiple: for every nationality included in study
RegionOrigin	Africa North, Africa Sub-Sahara, Asia, Eurasia, Middle East, Eastern Europe, Former USSR, Latin America, North America, EU
Gender	Male, Female
Age	20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60&over
NationalStatus	Naturalised, Foreign national with secure/permanent residence permit, Foreign national with temporary/conditional residence permit, Undocumented immigrant (foreign national with no residence permit), Status unknown
ReasonEmig	Asylum/Refugee, Marriage/Relationship/Family Reunification, Study, Work/Economic, Repatriation, Other
YearsStay	5 or less, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, Over-20
MaritalStatus	Single, Married, Separated/Divorced, Widowed, Other (e.g. Partner, Engaged), Unknown
PartnerNationality	Multiple: for every nationality included in study, Not Applicable (N/A), Unknown
PartnerRegion	EU, Non-EU, Not Applicable (N/A), Unknown
Children	Yes, No, Unknown
Education	High (university/college education, diploma or degree), Medium (high school certificate, formalised occupational training at technical school), Low (no school leaving certificate or equivalent, no formalised occupational training), Housewife, Unknown.
EmploymentStatus	Employed, Unemployed, Student, Retired, Unknown
Employed	Yes/No
TypeEmployment	List professions as stated on template.
PrincipalActivity	Brief description of type of activity
SecondActivity	As above, plus N/A
Date coded	Month/day
Notes	Important notes regarding interview



## 8. Annex III: List of interviews with selected interviewee attributes

No. Interview	Receiving Country	Region of Origin	Gender	Residence Status at time of Interview	Years of Stay
1	Austria	North America	Female	Foreign (Secure)	11 to 15
2	Austria	North America	Male	Foreign (Secure)	more than 20
3	Austria	North America	Female	Foreign (Secure)	more than 20
4	Austria	Eastern Europe	Male	Naturalised	11 to 15
5	Austria	Eastern Europe	Female	Naturalised	11 to 15
6	Austria	Eastern Europe	Male	Naturalised	16 to 20
7	Austria	Eurasia	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
8	Austria	Eurasia	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
9	Belgium	Latin America	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
10	Belgium	Latin America	Male	Foreign (Secure)	06 to 10
11	Belgium	Latin America	Female	Foreign (Secure)	16 to 20
12	Belgium	Asia	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	06 to 10
13	Belgium	Asia	Male	Foreign (Secure)	06 to 10
14	Belgium	Asia	Female	Naturalised	11 to 15
15	Belgium	Eastern Europe	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	5 or less
16	Belgium	Africa North	Female	Foreign (Conditional)	5 or less
17	Belgium	Africa North	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
18	Belgium	Africa North	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
19	Cyprus	Former USSR	Female	Foreign (Conditional)	06 to 10
20	Cyprus	Eastern Europe	Male	Naturalised	5 or less
21	Czech Republic	Eastern Europe	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	5 or less
22	Czech Republic	Eastern Europe	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
23	Czech Republic	Eastern Europe	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	5 or less
24	Czech Republic	Former USSR	Female	Foreign (Secure)	11 to 15
25	Czech Republic	Former USSR	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	5 or less
26	Czech Republic	Former USSR	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	06 to 10
27	Denmark	Eurasia	Female	Unknown	more than 20
28	Denmark	Eurasia	Female	Naturalised	16 to 20
29	Estonia	Former USSR	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
30	Estonia	Former USSR	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
31	Estonia	Former USSR	Male	Foreign (Secure)	11 to 15
32	Estonia	Latin America	Male	Foreign (Secure)	06 to 10
33	Finland	Asia	Male	Naturalised	16 to 20
34	Finland	Asia	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
35	Finland	Asia	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	more than 20
36	Finland	Latin America	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
37	Finland	Latin America	Male	Foreign (Secure)	5 or less
38	Finland	Latin America	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
39	Finland	Middle East	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
40	Finland	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
41	Finland	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Naturalised	11 to 15
42	Finland	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Foreign (Secure)	5 or less
43	Finland	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Naturalised	11 to 15

List of interviews continued page 2

44	France	Eurasia	Male	Foreign (Secure)	more than 20
45	France	Eurasia	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
46	France	Eurasia	Male	Foreign (Secure)	more than 20
47	France	Africa North	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
48	France	Africa North	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
49	France	North America	Female	Naturalised	16 to 20
50	France	Eastern Europe	Female	Foreign (Secure)	06 to 10
51	France	Eastern Europe	Male	Foreign (Secure)	06 to 10
52	France	Eastern Europe	Male	Foreign (Secure)	06 to 10
53	France	Eastern Europe	Female	Foreign (Conditional)	06 to 10
54	France	Eastern Europe	Female	Foreign (Secure)	06 to 10
55	France	Eastern Europe	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	5 or less
56	Germany	Former USSR	Male	Foreign (Secure)	06 to 10
57	Germany	Former USSR	Male	Naturalised	16 to 20
58	Germany	Former USSR	Female	Foreign (Secure)	11 to 15
59	Germany	Eurasia	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
60	Germany	Eurasia	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
61	Germany	Eurasia	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
62	Germany	Africa Sub Sahara	Female	Naturalised	16 to 20
63	Germany	Africa Sub Sahara	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
64	Germany	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Naturalised	16 to 20
65	Greece	Eastern Europe	Female	Foreign (Secure)	11 to 15
66	Greece	Eastern Europe	Female	Foreign (Secure)	11 to 15
67	Greece	Eastern Europe	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	11 to 15
68	Greece	Eastern Europe	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	5 or less
69	Greece	Eastern Europe	Female	Naturalised	16 to 20
70	Greece	Eastern Europe	Female	Foreign (Conditional)	06 to 10
71	Greece	Eastern Europe	Female	Foreign (Conditional)	06 to 10
72	Greece	Former USSR	Male	Naturalised	06 to 10
73	Greece	Former USSR	Female	Naturalised	16 to 20
74	Greece	Former USSR	Male	Naturalised	16 to 20
75	Hungary	Eastern Europe	Male	Unknown	16 to 20
76	Hungary	Eastern Europe	Female	Naturalised	06 to 10
77	Hungary	Eastern Europe	Male	Unknown	06 to 10
78	Hungary	Former USSR	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
79	Hungary	Former USSR	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	11 to 15
80	Hungary	Former USSR	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
81	Hungary	Middle East	Female	Foreign (Conditional)	5 or less
82	Hungary	Eurasia	Male	Naturalised	16 to 20
83	Ireland	Asia	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	5 or less
84	Ireland	Asia	Female	Foreign (Conditional)	5 or less
85	Ireland	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Naturalised	5 or less
86	Ireland	Eastern Europe	Female	Naturalised	06 to 10
87	Ireland	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Foreign (Secure)	06 to 10
88	Ireland	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Foreign (Secure)	5 or less
89	Ireland	Asia	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
90	Ireland	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Foreign (Secure)	5 or less
91	Ireland	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Foreign (Secure)	5 or less
92	Ireland	Africa Sub Sahara	Female	Foreign (Secure)	5 or less
93	Ireland	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Naturalised	5 or less

List of interviews continued page 3

94	Italy	Former USSR	Female	Foreign (Conditional)	5 or less
95	Italy	Former USSR	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	06 to 10
96	Italy	Former USSR	Female	Foreign (Conditional)	06 to 10
97	Italy	Latin America	Female	Foreign (Secure)	11 to 15
98	Italy	Africa North	Female	Foreign (Secure)	16 to 20
99	Italy	Latin America	Female	Naturalised	16 to 20
100	Italy	Africa North	Male	Foreign (Secure)	06 to 10
101	Italy	Eastern Europe	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	06 to 10
102	Italy	Eastern Europe	Female	Foreign (Secure)	11 to 15
103	Italy	Eastern Europe	Male	Foreign (Secure)	11 to 15
104	Italy	Eastern Europe	Female	Unknown	06 to 10
105	Italy	Latin America	Female	Unknown	16 to 20
106	Italy	Eastern Europe	Male	Naturalised	11 to 15
107	Italy	Asia	Female	Unknown	more than 20
108	Italy	Asia	Male	Unknown	more than 20
109	Italy	Asia	Male	Unknown	16 to 20
110	Latvia	Former USSR	Male	Naturalised	16 to 20
111	Latvia	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Foreign (Secure)	11 to 15
112	Latvia	Former USSR	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
113	Latvia	Former USSR	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
114	Latvia	Middle East	Male	Foreign (Secure)	11 to 15
115	Latvia	Former USSR	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
116	Lithuania	Former USSR	Male	Naturalised	11 to 15
117	Lithuania	Former USSR	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
118	Lithuania	Former USSR	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
119	Malta	Africa Sub Sahara	Female	Foreign (Secure)	5 or less
120	Malta	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Naturalised	16 to 20
121	Malta	Middle East	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
122	Netherlands	Latin America	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
123	Netherlands	Latin America	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
124	Netherlands	Africa Sub Sahara	Female	Naturalised	16 to 20
125	Netherlands	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Naturalised	06 to 10
126	Netherlands	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Undocumented	11 to 15
127	Poland	Former USSR	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	5 or less
128	Poland	Former USSR	Male	Foreign (Secure)	06 to 10
129	Poland	Former USSR	Female	Foreign (Conditional)	5 or less
130	Poland	Asia	Female	Naturalised	11 to 15
131	Poland	Asia	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
132	Poland	Asia	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
133	Portugal	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Foreign (Secure)	11 to 15
134	Portugal	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
135	Portugal	Africa Sub Sahara	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
136	Portugal	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Naturalised	11 to 15
137	Portugal	Africa Sub Sahara	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
138	Portugal	EU	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
139	Portugal	Former USSR	Male	Foreign (Secure)	5 or less
140	Portugal	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
141	Portugal	Latin America	Male	Foreign (Secure)	16 to 20

List of interviews continued page 4

142	Slovakia	Former USSR	Female	Naturalised	06 to 10
143	Slovakia	Middle East	Male	Foreign (Secure)	16 to 20
144	Slovakia	Eastern Europe	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
145	Slovenia	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Naturalised	16 to 20
146	Slovenia	Eastern Europe	Female	Unknown	11 to 15
147	Slovenia	Eastern Europe	Male	Foreign (Secure)	more than 20
148	Spain	Latin America	Female	Naturalised	16 to 20
149	Spain	Latin America	Male	Foreign (Secure)	5 or less
150	Spain	Latin America	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	5 or less
151	Spain	Latin America	Male	Foreign (Secure)	11 to 15
152	Spain	Latin America	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	5 or less
153	Spain	Latin America	Male	Foreign (Secure)	06 to 10
154	Sweden	Former USSR	Female	Naturalised	16 to 20
155	Sweden	Former USSR	Female	Naturalised	06 to 10
156	Sweden	Former USSR	Male	Naturalised	11 to 15
157	Sweden	Africa Sub Sahara	Female	Unknown	5 or less
158	Sweden	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Foreign (Conditional)	5 or less
159	Sweden	Africa Sub Sahara	Male	Unknown	5 or less
160	Sweden	Middle East	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
161	Sweden	Middle East	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
162	UK	Former USSR	Female	Naturalised	5 or less
163	UK	Former USSR	Male	Naturalised	11 to 15
164	UK	Former USSR	Male	Naturalised	16 to 20
165	UK	Asia	Male	Naturalised	06 to 10
166	UK	Asia	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
167	UK	Asia	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
168	UK	Asia	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
169	UK	Asia	Male	Naturalised	16 to 20
170	UK	Asia	Male	Naturalised	16 to 20
171	UK	Africa Sub Sahara	Female	Naturalised	more than 20
172	UK	Asia	Male	Naturalised	more than 20
173	UK	Eastern Europe	Female	Naturalised	06 to 10
174	UK	Eastern Europe	Male	Naturalised	11 to 15
175	UK	Eastern Europe	Female	Naturalised	5 or less
176	UK	Africa Sub Sahara	Female	Unknown	11 to 15
177	UK	Asia	Male	Unknown	16 to 20