

Chapter 1

Introduction

Migrants¹ have collectively organized at all times and in all places. Although migration scholarship and politicians in Europe neglected the active engagement of migrants during the first decades of post-war immigration, this attitude slowly changed throughout the 1980s (Miller 1981, *International Migration Review* 1985). Today, migrant organizations are attracting increased attention as an issue of social science research as well as in public debates as a crucial element of migrants' settlement, integration and transnationalism. In urban places and cities in particular they are considered vital elements of society and they are addressed as such by public authorities. They are thus one element in understanding the processes associated with migration and the ways societies deal with it. This book is interested in the process of accommodation of migrant organizations in European cities. It specifically asks how the city context shapes this process.

This book presents empirical case study evidence from new immigration cities in southern Europe and revises the literature on northern Europe's more established immigration localities. Research is still very scarce on the former, with most insights on migrant organization and mobilization in Europe resting on studies focusing on the latter. In analysing and contrasting both, new insights in the process of accommodation of migrant organizations can be gained. Not only can new empirical cases reveal dynamics different from those discovered by earlier studies, they may also serve to point to so far neglected factors which also shape migrant organizations. This can help to revise empirical knowledge and theoretical concepts which so far rely on the more established places. Among other aspects, migrant organizations in recent immigration cities are strongly oriented towards the receiving country, whereas processes of collective formation in other European places often displayed strong orientation toward 'homeland' issues at the point of emergence. It becomes clear throughout this study that this is shaped by very different contexts.

Scholarship on migrant organizations has put great attention on the determinants and shaping forces of migrant organization, participation and mobilization. Rather than one single theory, a number of approaches have been developed trying to explain the formation as well as the social and political action

1 This book will use the term migrants as a generic term for people who take up residence in another country. It will employ the terms immigrants (or emigrants) when referring to people in this specific condition of entry or stay in a country different from their place of birth or origin (or exit from this country). The same applies to policies which address these persons from that perspective.

of migrant organizations. While at the beginning, scholars paid most attention to the characteristics of the migrant community, throughout the 1990s the role of the state and its political institutions entered the focus. From this perspective it emerges that the political–institutional environment strongly shapes the formation and action of migrant organizations. Political–institutional contexts differ from place to place, which makes it necessary to focus on particular cities, not without acknowledging that influences from multiple institutional levels are playing out there. It is one of the main arguments of this book that city contexts relevant to the study of migrant organizations include local and national institutions, and that these concern integration as well as immigration regulations and policies. The other main point is that only by applying a transnational perspective that does not establish a conceptual dichotomy between migrant organizations engaging in the ‘host’ or ‘home’ country are we able to understand which contexts contribute to which processes. Against this background the book shows the different ways the processes of accommodation have taken in European cities.

The discovery of migrant organizations in European cities

Throughout history and across world regions migrants have organized in many different forms of voluntary associations. They founded mutual aid and benefit societies, first aid institutions, nationalistic political associations, cultural clubs, religious communities, advocacy groups, hometown associations and secret societies (Park, Miller 1969 [1921], Moya 2005). Such (formal) organizations are the visible sign of new collective formations and the active engagement of migrants to improve their situation and follow their interests. Early research on the dynamics and consequences of international migration which emerged at the beginning of the twentieth century in the US, in particular from the Chicago School of sociology, from the beginning considered these immigrant institutions crucial to the understanding of processes of migration and social change (Park, Miller 1969 [1921], Warner, Srole 1947).

In the study of post-war migration in Europe, migrant organizations did not appear on the research agenda until the 1980s, when migration scholars started to address migrants as political objects and subjects (*International Migration Review* 1985). Throughout the first decades of post-war migration, the dominant view insisted that migrants were rather passive and apolitical, while research concentrated on social and economic issues, in line with the ways legal frameworks generally conceptualized them (Miller 1981). When settlement was recognized, research started to problematize the existence of growing populations with limited citizenship status within European societies. Scholars began to investigate the social, civil and political rights available for migrants across Europe and to analyse how migrants mobilized on the grounds of existing rights and attempted to expand them further (Miller 1981, *International Migration Review* 1985, Rex, Joly, Wilpert 1987, Layton-Henry 1990). Additionally, their social roles and

the welfare functions they fulfilled became topics of interest during this time as they were slowly becoming actors in social service delivery in many European countries (Jenkins 1988).

Today there is a new interest in migrant organizations and collective mobilization in relation to integration and participation of migrants within receiving societies (Koopmans et al. 2005, Schrover, Vermeulen 2005b; see the special issue of JEMS Schrover, Vermeulen 2005a). Newer research also exists on the transnational and origin-country related activities of migrant organizations in Europe, even though the major part of scholarship on transnational migrant organizations is still to be found in the US literature (Portes, Escobar, Walton Radford 2007, Portes, Escobar, Arana 2008). Yet, most research either concentrates on the orientations and activities directed toward the receiving or the origin side. Combining both is one of the aims of this book.

Different perspectives on the role and relevance of migrant organizations exist and this may partly explain the academic and political interest. First, the relevance of migrant organizations is a matter of dispute. Widespread assumptions sustain the limited role of migrant organizations when it comes to the expansion of the rights and recognition of newcomers in the context of reception, settlement and integration (Guiraudon 1998: 277, Penninx, Martiniello 2004: 152). No small part of the debate disputes their role and relevance altogether due to their often unclear relationship with the broader migrant community and with immigrants' integration. One reason for this is that the representativeness and membership relations of migrant organizations are often unclear. Data on membership is often difficult to get and it is also not always reliable. Therefore, it remains unclear what conclusions can be drawn from this data (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003: 23). In the cases investigated in Spanish cities that are presented later in this book, many members have a weak relationship with the public articulations of their respective organization and display rather a particular need for certain information, legal advice or job training which are offered to them in their condition as clients (for discussion and evidence see Chapter 4). Further, even under the difficult legal and social conditions which many migrants face in these places, a majority of migrants never enter into contact with any migrant organization, some have not even heard about their existence, whereas others rely on other types of organizations or public authorities, or do not receive any support at all (Díez Nicolás, Ramírez Latifa 2001). The relations between migrant organizations, their members and the broader migrant community and thus their representativeness are a contested issue in academic literature and among public authorities in their search for mediators and interlocutors *vis-à-vis* migrant groups. Migrant organizations should not be seen as representatives of certain communities per se and they do not necessarily represent larger groups in the stricter sense. In spite of these limitations, a broad literature documents the multiple functions migrant organizations fulfil for their members and beyond: the cultural and religious orientations they may give, the social services these provide, and the contributions they make for the advancement of the migrants' interests and their rights. Their engagements even

include mobilizations in support of those least likely to count on the necessary resources, i.e. the irregulars (see Chapter 4; see also Laubenthal 2007).

Second, even greater discussion ranges around the 'ethnic paradox' (Park 1969, Ballis Lal 1990, Faist 1996). The implications of this discussion will be treated more extensively in Chapter 2. Here suffice it to say that the idea of the paradox refers to the fact that although migrant organizations are frequently an expression of ethnic identity different from the mainstream receiving society, they nevertheless contribute to migrants' integration into this society. Despite the fact that some authors still consider migrant organizations as markers of ethnic distinctiveness and retention, and therefore a sign of failed integration and ethnic 'ghetto' formation, most authors seem to subscribe to the 'ethnic paradox' and point out that over time the contributions of migrant organizations favour integration, although under more culturally pluralist conditions. The more pluralist perspective guides much current research on migrant organizations where their supportive character is at the centre. The existence, number and degree or forms of migrant organizations and their public activities are now frequently taken as indicators of integration and also of a favourable political environment. Accordingly, the importance of migrant organizations seems widely shared, in particular regarding local integration. 'Homeland' ties and transnational activism are frequently seen in opposition to this. The dispute has seemingly evolved into a 'transnational' version of the paradox, moving from a concern around the implications of separate ethnic identities to a critical perspective on 'homeland' ties. Different from most available studies, the approach taken in this book follows a transnational perspective, allowing potentially simultaneous agendas related to situations on the side of reception and origin to exist. Whether these enter into conflict is therefore an empirical question.

The third issue that comes to the surface in the latest interest on migration organizations is that this interest is specifically reflected in many local studies. Cities are the places where internal and international migration concentrates. The implications of migration were subject to sociological inquiry already in the early twentieth century when more and more migrants from increasingly diverse places led to great social transformations in American and European cities (Simmel 1995 [1903], Park, Burgess, McKenzie 1968 [1925]). Today again, cities are being recognized as important sites for the social and political changes caused by migration and for research on them (Auriat, Rochet 2001, Favell 2001: 390, Glick Schiller, Çağlar 2009). As in early American research (Park, Miller 1969 [1921], Warner, Srole 1947), today in Europe the latest focus on migrant organizations is increasingly connected to the local. In particular (major) cities are gaining renewed prominence in this research (Rogers, Tillie 2001, Penninx et al. 2004a). Over the past decades processes of economic globalization and political-administrative decentralization have contributed to the strengthening of the role of cities and that of local governments. These changes brought new political and administrative competences and new challenges to be handled by the cities. Local levels of government have played a major role in addressing migrant populations in the

absence or reluctance of national responses in the early and today established local destinations in northern Europe (Penninx et al. 2004b: 3). In the newer destinations in the south their role seems even more pronounced (Tsuda 2006). This is at least partly related to the new forms of governance that have emerged over the past twenty years, with new non-state actors becoming part of it. Increasingly today, these newer actors also include migrant organizations. Non-state actors have become involved in local governance, consultation, decision making and social welfare implementation, although to different degrees in different places. In this situation, the formation and existence of migrant organizations in cities and localities has become an important field in the study of migration and integration. However, although most local studies are limited to the role of local institutions, the city context relevant to the accommodation of migrant organizations is not only a result of local politics. Immediate and mediated influences from higher levels of government also shape this process.

Migrant organizations are relevant actors to migrants as well as to the societies they interact with, whether in the receiving or origin country. Although their contributions for the integration of the wider migrant population have been questioned, given their often small size, the limited scope of outreach, and often scarce internal participation they have provided helpful support for migrants and have contributed to the advancement of their rights. Thus, they can be considered a vital element in modern pluralist societies and they are addressed as such by local and national public authorities. They are one important element in understanding the dynamics of migration and the ways societies deal with it. This book is interested in learning about these dynamics accompanying the formation and activities of migrant organizations and the ways societies – here the receiving society and in particular its political institutions – affect and address them.

The accommodation of migrant organizations

The majority of research on migrant organizations is guided by a perspective on the integration into the receiving society as some fixed outcome. It either discusses the role of migrant organizations for individual migrants or takes their existence and activities as signs of political and social integration. In contrast, this book is interested in the study of the process of their accommodation. In so doing, the study takes up the concept of accommodation from the Chicago School of sociology and in particular as elaborated by Robert Park. The concept of accommodation has not received great attention in the sociology and research of migration. Park himself noted that ‘the voluminous literature upon immigration deals but slightly with the interesting accommodations of the newcomer to his environments’ (Park, Burgess 1969, [1921]: 719). The processes of social adaptation of migrants have attracted more attention since that time, even if still not fully understood. The concept of accommodation itself though, has not acquired more attention or theoretical weight, although the term is now used with increasing frequency in social science

literature and European policy documents (see, for example, European Council 2004). Consequently the concept of accommodation shall be introduced here as a guiding perspective of this book.

Robert Park and Ernest Burgess introduced the term in their 'Introduction to the Science of Sociology' as one of the basic sociological concepts (Park, Burgess 1969). In addition, Park referred to it on another occasion as one of the stages of the race-relations cycle (Park 1964). In this model, interaction between races or between the newcomers and the established society evolve from contact over conflict to accommodation and eventual assimilation. Although many scholars have taken this cycle as crucial for the understanding of Park's sociological thinking, others argue that the teleological and inevitable character of the cycle culminating in assimilation is not necessarily the key to Park's theoretical understanding of social interaction processes (Ballis Lal 1990: 5, 41–2, Kivisto 2005: 7). Accommodation may be considered but one stage in the processes initiated by social contact between different groups and individuals. More importantly, the concept describes a form of social interaction involving changes and thus not static outcomes.

Accommodation is first and foremost a social process, related to sociologically transmitted changes. It is thus distinctive from adaptation which is a result of biological transmissions (Park, Burgess 1969: 664). The socially 'acquired adjustments' bring about 'an accommodation of differences through conflict' which are the basis of social organization (Park, Burgess 1969: 664). According to Park's understanding, this implies that modern society is characterized by diversity and diverse-mindedness rather than by like-mindedness which is to be found among animals. Accommodation thus results from conflict, or in other words, from conflictual social relations. Each resolution of a conflict leads to a new accommodation and a more – although always transitory – stable situation or equilibrium. Every new conflict issues a new accommodation. Concerning personal relations, Park and Burgess note that these tend to take a hierarchical form.

Accommodation is different from assimilation insofar as it seems less coherent and also less cohesive. 'Assimilation is a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups, and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life' (Park, Burgess 1969: 735). It is a slow, gradual and generally unconscious process. Accommodation, in turn, occurs more rapidly and consciously, but its results are also less stable or long lasting. Assimilation refers to a more settled situation of unity and a higher degree of social cohesion and societal integration. In contrast '[a]ccommodation may be relatively permanent, it may fall apart in conflict or resolve itself by assimilation. Only when assimilation occurs is the latent antagonism inherent in accommodation "wholly dissolved"' (Ballis Lal 1990: 44). It should be noted though, that assimilation refers to a process based on unity, not on uniformity or homogeneity. Diversity is central to Park's understanding of modern society, with assimilation describing the general frame of societal incorporation, including individualism and ethnic distinctiveness.

Such distinctiveness is then not so much an expression of ethnic groups in an essentialist understanding, but rather part of cosmopolitan dispositions involving shared traditions and diverging individual opinions (see Kivisto 2005: 8–9). ‘The unity thus achieved is not necessarily or even normally like-mindedness’ (Park, Burgess 1969: 737). Park was concerned with the degree of unity necessary for an inclusive society as a basis for a political community of democratic institutions.

This perspective brings Park and his colleagues close to the later emerging cultural pluralist paradigm, as Barbara Ballis Lal (1990) points out. At the same time, the survival of distinctive ethnic characteristics seems relatively unlikely in the long run, when cooperation continues and more and more common experiences are acquired by all members of the society. Rather, ‘the remaking of the mainstream’ seems to characterize this approach (Alba, Nee 2003: in particular Chapter 2). Since this is a matter of ongoing dispute and the degree of distinctiveness or homogeneity associated with assimilation is difficult to determine with precision, and moreover assimilation today seems to suggest uniformity or even coercion, one may argue that accommodation is a more appropriate perspective for modern societies as ‘composed of groups accommodated, but not fully assimilated’ (Park, Burgess 1969: 667).

In addition, assimilation is more strongly related to and occurs more easily within primary contacts, whereas accommodation builds upon secondary group contacts. This is what makes it particularly relevant in relation to migrant organizations.² In fact, the authors themselves state: ‘One of the most important factors in the process [of accommodation] [...] is the immigrant community which serves as a mediating agency between the familiar and the strange’ (Park, Burgess 1969: 719). Here, the text makes explicit reference to another study of the immigrant communities and institutions including migrant organizations within the Carnegie Corporation programme of the ‘Americanization Study’, which Robert Park conducted together with William Thomas and Herbert Miller (Park, Burgess 1969: 719, Park, Miller 1969). Migrant organizations are not only mediators for the broader migrant communities. They can themselves be considered an accommodation. In this sense, Barbara Ballis Lal (1990: 107) argues

2 Park did also refer to assimilation in secondary groups. In fact, he was particularly concerned with the ‘Racial Assimilation in Secondary Groups’, as the title of his *American Journal of Sociology* article from 1914 shows. However, therein lies the fundamental problem: neither Black Americans nor Asian immigrants such as the Japanese were given the opportunity to assimilate. Where the ‘Negro’ was in close contact with the family which he or she served as a slave or servant, assimilation occurred. Where relationships were more distant or later became so after abolition of slavery, it failed. The increasing solidarity, self-consciousness and organizing among the Black community which took place in the following years then ‘must be regarded as a response and “accommodation” to changing internal and external relations of the race’ (Park 1914: 618). Finally, once a race has achieved its moral independency in this way, ‘assimilation will continue’, providing the necessary bonds for loyalty within one state. Loyalty, however, is only likely ‘insofar as the state incorporates, as an integral part of its organization, [these people]’ (Park 1914: 623).

that Park's thinking about immigrant institutions includes their consideration as adaptive mechanisms since these are located in American cities and influenced and to a certain degree produced by this situation. They are 'the products of the immigrants' effort to adapt their heritages to American conditions' (Park, Miller 1969: 120). By so doing, immigrant institutions are not only supporting individual and group accommodation and potentially assimilation (or integration) into the greater society, they constitute an adaptation to the new environment. Therefore, migrant organizations are a means and an expression of accommodation. Although both aspects are related, this study is particularly interested in the latter, considering them an adaptation or accommodation to the environment. What shapes the processes of accommodation of migrant organizations? Park himself does not offer a comprehensive framework for an analysis of contextual determinants in this respect. Although he puts considerable emphasis on the efforts and the character of the immigrant community in the comparison of different communities in the Americanization study, he nonetheless refers to 'opportunity structures' in his writings (Ballis Lal 1990: 93). These were predominantly structured by the economy and the labour market conditions offering opportunities to newcomers to improve their lives. 'This optimistic prognosis was shattered by the Great Depression of the 1930s when the promise of social mobility as a result of individual effort was contradicted by the realization of life chances which had more to do with international economic markets and political events outside individual control' (Ballis Lal 1990: 93). This situation is further aggravated by xenophobia and racism which Park and his colleagues highlighted as inhibiting forces to assimilation (Ballis Lal 1990: 94–5). In relation to the state Park and Burgess also note that 'coercive policies' as they had observed in relation to efforts of denationalization in Europe, that is, suppression of cultural minorities in European nation-building processes, failed. In contrast, more indirectly providing opportunities for participation is more likely to contribute to accommodation and eventually assimilation (Park, Burgess 1969: 740).

Different from the times and places Park was dealing with, the role of the state has become more particularly prominent in migration research in Europe throughout the last two decades. A broad literature has developed on the environment for migrants' accommodation in terms of state institutions. The analytical framework proposed in the next chapter links up to the approaches dealing with the role and shaping forces of the political–institutional context. As this study is interested in the process of accommodation, it looks at the political institutional contexts and the ways these shape the formation of migrant organizations and their activities and struggles in relevant fields of action and contention.

In comparison to integration or assimilation approaches, accommodation has one additional advantage in that it does not establish a theoretical opposition between migrants' engagements in the situation in the 'host' or the 'home' country. It allows for observing processes of collective formation and social and political action initiated with the arrival and potential settlement of migrants, whether this is directed toward the improvement of migrants' rights and interests in relation

to the receiving country or to the political, economic or social situation in the country of origin, or to both. So far, most research has concentrated on one side or the other.

In sum, this study applies the concept of accommodation for three reasons. First, it points to a process rather than to a particular outcome. Second, it places emphasis on the role of the environment in which this process occurs. In this respect, the study concentrates on political–institutional contexts. Third, accommodation is not exclusively directed towards integration (or assimilation) into the receiving country, but may also involve engagement with the places of origin. Consequently the concept is open for a transnational perspective.

One remark is necessary before proceeding further. Accommodation has become an established term in academia as well as in policy guidelines of some European countries and on the level of the European Union (European Council 2004). Here, the term is used to point out the mutual interaction between the receiving society and migrants and to the changing nature of society as a whole. Most often this implies a normative sense and to a lesser extent a theoretical concept (Zapata-Barrero 2004, Zapata-Barrero, Adamuz García, Martínez Luna 2002). This book uses the concept of accommodation as an analytical tool, not as a normative claim or assumption.

Research strategy and methodology

In the following chapters this book deals with migrant organizations in places of recent and established immigration in Europe. In its empirical part it presents primary research on migrant organizations in the two major Spanish cities, Barcelona and Madrid, and contrasts these with existing research on German and Dutch cities, more concretely Berlin and Amsterdam, and from British local cases. The aim of this proceeding is to contribute new insights into local dynamics, similarities and differences of migrants' collective formation within and across countries in Europe.

The empirical analysis uses a framework, presented in more detail in Chapter 2, that considers multiple institutional levels as constitutive for the city context. This framework comes out of the dialogue between theoretical approaches and the qualitative and more inductive primary research conducted in Barcelona and Madrid. Explanations and insights on the accommodation of migrant organizations, to date based on the northern European contexts of today's more established immigration, only partly resembled what this research found in the two new immigration cities. This is a result not so much of the difference in timing, but mainly because earlier migrations have been affected by different (political) conditions. In order to capture these processes a framework has been elaborated which partly differs from existing explanations in the field. This in turn seems helpful in order to better understand not only the accommodation in recent immigration places, but also brings to the fore more systematically some aspects

which can be observed in the established immigration cities. Most importantly this concerns the role of the immigration regime. Conditions of entry, stay and work for the early post-war migrants in European cities were very different from those that affect today's newcomers in the recent immigration cities. This is one important factor that influences the diverging processes of accommodation.

Contrasting city contexts

Comparative methods are well established in migration research. This has meant either to select on the basis of ethnicity and to compare various ethnic groups in one place, city or country (convergent comparison), or to make a selection based on structural constraints and opportunities of contexts and compare one ethnic group across these (divergent comparison) (Green 1991). These two ways of comparison reflect the main approaches in the study of migrant organizations. These are either concerned with the role of ethnic community characteristics or with that of political opportunity structures. Since the main question of this book is how specific city contexts shape migrant organizations, it contrasts different cities and can thus be considered divergent. At the same time, however, rather than taking one (ethnic or national) group as the element to be explained, the interest lays in the process of migrant organizing as such, and not that of a particular group (Green 1991). Accordingly, migrant organizations in the primary research were selected from different nationality backgrounds (see below); the same strategy is used in the revision of existing literature, at least to the extent this is possible (for instance the majority of literature on migrant organizations in Germany stems from research on Turks, and this specifically applies to Berlin).

Concerning contrasts of institutional contexts, the bulk of existing research that offers insights into local variations does so on the basis of comparisons across countries. Most commonly, studies investigate, for example, a French city as compared to a British one (Moore 2001, Garbaya 2000), a French and a Dutch city (Bousetta 1997) or compare the German and the Dutch capitals (Koopmans, Berger 2004). This research often uses local cases to analyse national differences. Only very few studies offer a comparison of selected cities in one country (Ireland 1994, Caponio 2005, Koopmans 2004). This research can show that even within one national setting, local governments differ in their responses to the challenges of diversity and in the interaction between authorities and migrants and their organizations.

Moreover, comparativists have argued in favour of within-country comparison for the significant local differences these may reveal resulting from diverse economic, cultural and political factors – an argument that has been developed with regards to Spain specifically (Linz, de Miguel 1966). In the face of recent decentralization and broader economic and political transformations that allow for more local and regional divergence, scholars in comparative politics have once more argued for comparing sub-national units (Synder 2001). In addition, in the critique of methodological nationalism, prominently reflected in migration studies,

limitations in the understanding of the diverse processes of migration and related social change are attributed to the sole focus on the national state as an institution and territory. This calls for putting more emphasis on scales below and beyond the nation state in the study of political institutions responding to migration and in relation to migrants' agency (Wimmer, Glick Schiller 2002). In line with these arguments and findings, this book makes use of city contrast in order to advance the understanding of migrant organization and their accommodation and to reveal the relevant elements shaping them.

Hence, the structure of the study presented here uses three different levels for contrast. First, it looks at differences (but also similarities) within one country (the Barcelona and Madrid cases); second, it concentrates on differences between cities across countries in established immigration places; third, it contrasts both results from recent and established places with one another. To achieve this, one main part of the study and presentation uses mainly primary data from Barcelona and Madrid and the institutional contexts playing out there. Here, similarities and differences emerge from contrasting both city contexts. The other main part revises existing literature using comparative research and single case studies of individual cities. This serves to point to differences across established European immigration cities due to varying institutional contexts. Less prominently reflected in the literature are similarities. A comparison of Berlin and Amsterdam, for instance, has found fairly similar patterns and agendas – although not overall numbers – among migrant organizations in the two cities (Vermeulen 2006). That study, as many others, attributes the observed similarities to the characteristics of the immigrant group, based on the comparison of one national group in different contexts. However, some similarities emerge from the background of shared characteristics of relatively stable guest worker immigration regimes. Thus, the fact that these organizations emerged from migrants who were guest-workers rather than the fact that they were Turks contributed to similar types and activities of the organizations. The role of the immigration regime becomes particularly discernible when contrasting this with the findings from new immigration places. Here, the high incidence and characteristics of irregularity among many migrants has led to the formation of different types of organizations.

Research design for the Spanish city cases

The first main part of the empirical study relies on the analysis of migrant organizations in the recent immigration cities of Barcelona and Madrid. It is based on qualitative empirical research and most data was collected in two longer field stages in 2006 and one shorter field trip in 2007. Further desktop and internet research on available documents and digital material has accompanied data collection. The core material is composed of around 45 interviews conducted with representatives from migrant organizations, public administration primarily from the local level, but also from national and regional agencies as well as with representatives from trade unions and non-governmental organizations

(see Appendix 2 on the visited institutions). Most migrant organizations as well as some other interviewees were visited twice, one time in the first stage and another time in the second stage of field research. These repeated visits often included the possibility to talk to different persons from one organization and thus to learn about the perspectives of various persons active in the organization. Further material includes annual reports, flyers, press releases and web-site contents by the migrant organizations as well as similar material from public authorities. Two sampling strategies characterize this research. First, in each of the two cities five migrant organizations were selected for in-depth research. This sampling follows the intent to reflect variation in nationality and peak of inflows from particular countries which can be observed in statistical data on annual inflows and growth of resident populations. Second, after the first coding and analysis of the collected data three fields of action and contention have been chosen for further in-depth research since these proved to be particularly insightful as regards the characteristics of the accommodation process in the new immigration cities. With this proceeding it was possible to reveal locally different accommodation processes emerging from local political-institutional contexts as well as from the differential influences of national policies in the different cities (for a more detailed description see Appendix 1 on methodology).

A few words on the use of existing literature on northern European city cases

The second main part of the empirical study in this book makes use of existing studies on migrant organizations in northern European cities. In addition, it uses other secondary literature on the relatively well documented elements of the political-institutional contexts which compose the explanatory framework proposed in this book. In relation to the migrant organization a number of insightful comparative research and case studies exist which include or concentrate on Berlin, Amsterdam and/or some British localities (generally those which developed an explicit multicultural approach in the 1980s). These studies have been undertaken from different theoretical perspectives. Available research often accounts for one of the elements proposed for the analytical framework of this book. Drawing on these different perspectives and their empirical insights allows for seeing some of the combined effects of the different elements which have so far not received systematic attention.

Structure of the book

Different perspectives and approaches have pointed to a number of different elements of the political-institutional context relevant to the accommodation of migrant organizations. Chapter 2 offers a theoretical discussion and introduces the analytical framework and related key concepts of this study in three main respects. The chapter starts with a more detailed discussion of the 'ethnic (now transnational)

paradox' already referred to and points to the implications the different perspectives have for the research on migrant organizations. In contrasting existing perspectives, this part introduces the transnational approach taken in this book. Often, migrants' engagement in integration and existing transnational orientations are conceptualized in opposition, while here the aim is to avoid (implicit) dichotomies. Although recent transnational migration research has revived the discussion around the relationship between integration and ethnicity and 'homeland' attachments, very little research considers the possibility of dual agendas of migrant organizations. The transnational perspective taken in this study does not oppose engagements for the political, economic or social situation in the origin country to those directed at the improvement of migrants' rights and interests in the receiving country or city. It is interested in learning about the different aspects of the process of accommodation and the contexts contributing to them.

The second section of Chapter 2 concentrates on the role of cities in relation to migration and migrant organizations and introduces the perspective on the city context as composed of influences from multiple political–institutional levels. For a long time, migration research has primarily concentrated on the nation state as its unit of analysis and, as a consequence, on national institutions. More recent research focuses on cities and local levels of government. Local levels are closest to newly arriving migrants and settling populations. They have often reacted to migratory inflows relative early. Most importantly, the transfers of authority and competence in the last decades have broadened the space of local action for public authorities. This leads to the fact that different cities provide different conditions for migrants and migrant organizations. In this respect recent research highlights the great variety of local responses to migration across and within countries. This points to the need to investigate migrant organizations in specific cities if we are to understand the processes of their accommodation. Still, national-level institutions also influence local actors. The bulk of research, however, either concentrates on the national level or, more recently, on local institutions. This study argues for the systematic analysis of the interplay of political institutions on multiple levels which play out in the city context.

The third and main section of the chapter goes into the literature on explanatory approaches in the study of migrant organizations. Different strands of theory have used partly different conceptual elements and operationalizations of the political–institutional contexts and opportunities. The framework applied in the empirical parts of this book combines four of those elements. It considers first, the approach and attitude of powerful actors, most importantly the government, on migrants' reception and integration and their organizations; second, the existing institutional patterns of state/society relations; third, the fact that these stem from multiple institutional levels (national and local); and finally, the immigration regime and the conditions of entry, stay and work it establishes represents the last element and the one which has been greatly neglected by existing research.

The following three chapters constitute the empirical part of the book. These cover examples from Spanish, German, Dutch and British city cases.

The empirical part gives more space to the Spanish cases which are dealt with in two chapters, since literature on political regulations, most notably on local levels, and on migrant organizations is still scarce for this country. The German, Dutch and British city cases are dealt with in one chapter. Here insights can be gained by contrasting across these cases and with the Spanish ones. Chapter 3 analyses the political–institutional contexts playing out in Spanish cities, of which Barcelona and Madrid were selected for in-depth study. The institutions of immigration and in particular the ways in which these contribute to and deal with irregularity, that is the absence of legal residence and work authorization among many migrants, is particularly relevant to the contexts in question. Various procedures and instruments contribute to the existence and maintenance of irregular statuses, while at the same time various procedures allow for ways to address and change this status, but also imply high fall-back rates. This situation is accompanied by a relative absence of state measures in the reception of the newcomers and their further integration. At the same time, relatively early on the state started to offer economic support and participatory structures for migrant organizations, most of which were in fact located in Madrid. On the local level, responses to the growing migrant populations can be observed in Barcelona and Madrid from early on. The cities strongly differ, though, including the ways in which they address migrant organizations. For instance, while Barcelona opened participatory channels in the mid-1990s, Madrid only established an immigration council as late as 2006. These differing contexts have meant very different conditions for newly emerging migrant organizations in both cities. Furthermore, the analysis in Chapter 3 includes newer local public policies promoting migrant organizations' transnational activities which emerge around the by now global debate on development–migration linkages, and are facilitated through Spain's decentralized development cooperation. These initiatives strongly contribute to transnational projects on the agendas of migrant organizations.

Chapter 4 shows how migrant organizations in Barcelona and Madrid are shaped by these contexts. It is divided into two parts of which the first analyses the formation and particularities of a selected number of migrant organizations from different national backgrounds. The second part concentrates on the activities in three fields of action and contention. Hence, the chapter describes their emergence and the common turning point that characterizes their formation in both cities. This turn is defined by the growing numbers of often irregular migrant inflows and the scant state support they receive. In this situation, the migrant organizations were primarily concerned with providing support to the newcomers, advising them in the application and renewal of work and residence permission, and other legal and social questions. At a relatively early point in time, this situation was augmented by access to public funding from national and/or local level governments as well as the formal participation in consultative councils. This, however, differs strongly in the two cities. Most of the Barcelona-based organizations investigated have not received large amounts of funding, but are nonetheless represented in the municipal immigration council. In Madrid, by contrast, some of the organizations based

in the capital are supported by local and national authorities with both contexts mutually reinforcing in terms of recognition, public funding, and participation.

As regards migrant organizations' activities and struggles in relevant fields of action and contention, the analysis considers social and political rights in the receiving places as well as transnational activities for situations abroad. Since the degree and the conditions of inclusion into subsidies and participation differ in the two cities, the intensities and forms of actions in these fields also differ. Further, the chapter describes notable overlaps of the fields of action. Political voting rights and claims for regularization have been articulated together in many instances. Based on the concept of 'citizenship of residence', regular and irregular statuses are often not clearly distinguished. Moreover, claims presented in formal participatory channels, informal meetings and demonstrations have fluid boundaries with the delivery of services which deal with the same topics, that is, contributing to the regularization of migrants' statuses and the improvement of their living conditions and rights. In addition, the chapter documents the increasing involvement in transnational projects among these actors. The analysis puts particular emphasis on transnational development cooperation, since this is strongly promoted by institutions in the receiving context.

Chapter 5 brings together existing literature on migrant organizing in local places in Germany, the Netherlands and the UK. Here as well differences in policies from country to country and from city to city contribute to the different characteristics of migrant organizations. Germany, for instance, is characterized by a rather restrictive attitude towards migrants and migrant organizations as well as the lack of state support to the latter on the national level. The city of Berlin, in contrast, has been more open to migrant organizations since the early 1980s and has thereby shaped their numerical growth and their activities. In the Netherlands, multicultural or ethnic minority policies both from the national and the Amsterdam city levels have strengthened a wide spectrum of organizations where interest articulation is high on the agendas in line with the role attributed to them. The UK displays a generally more localized picture of migrant organizations, which are also more strongly integrated in welfare policies and non-state actor service delivery. Existing studies also reveal a number of similarities among migrant organizations in northern European cities. Most frequently these are related to group factors and community characteristics. However, some similarities in policies, most strongly at the early stage of guest worker and post-colonial migration, are also responsible for similar patterns among migrant organizations. These came out of the immigration regimes and the conditions of migration, as well as of the relative ignorance on the side of public authorities which migrant organizations encountered at the beginning in northern Europe, especially in the German and Dutch capital and less so in British localities. Relative security in labour market and social realms, expectations of return and few (public) resources first led to cultural and 'homeland'-oriented associations, especially in Berlin and Amsterdam. Over time, greater concerns with migrants' situation in the receiving society evolved, and here differences became more pronounced across local

contexts. Nonetheless, some similarities remain, which become particularly visible in contrast to the situation in recent immigration localities. Generally, a decline in origin country-oriented activities over time has been observed in most places. So far, transnational ties have often been considered as opposed to engagements with receiving societies, and few studies have systematically analysed transnational activities or the possibility of simultaneous agendas. More recently, empirical studies reveal the existence of transnationalism and in addition document its compatibility with the will to and efforts towards integration into receiving society among some migrant organizations. Differences across European localities in the degree of transnationalism are again related to different policy approaches. Supportive approaches on migrant organizations and migrants' rights are linked to less extensive transnational agendas. However, given the emerging debates on migration–development linkages and related policies in particular on local levels all over Europe, migrant organizations in some places may also strengthen their transnational work, at this stage only few indications exist in this respect, though.

The conclusion of this book contrasts the findings from the recent and the more established immigration localities and discusses the question whether there is a 'transnational paradox'. It points to the different ways the accommodation of migrant organizations in European cities has taken concerning their formation, their evolution as well as their local and transnational activities and struggles.

www.ashgate.com www.ashgate.com www.ashgate.com www.ashgate.com www.ashgate.com www.ashgate.com www.ashgate.com www.ashgate.com www.ashgate.com www.ashgate.com