Project [JLS/FRC/036]

"Living Together: European Citizenship against Racism and Xenophobia"

Decalogue & Final Comparative and Comprehensive Report

The Decalogue and the Final Comparative and comprehensive report has been elaborated with the coordination and academic assistance of external experts from the Complutense University of Madrid, who are the authors of the Spanish and the Final Comparative reports:

Mª Ángeles Cea D´Ancona
Miguel S. Valles Martínez

The project contemplated a series of phases and tasks, in which the different partners have been involved, later it is explained how and when they have intervened. The members of the "Living Together" transnational consortium and which contributed to the drafting of this report are:

SPAIN	Spanish Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (OBERAXE) – Ministry of Labour and Immigration, coordinating and leading the project.	
	Casa Árabe	
	Movimiento contra la Intolerancia (Movement Against Intolerance)	
	Cruz Roja (Spanish Red Cross)	
	Consorcio de Entidades para la Acción Integral con Migrantes (CEPAIM)	
	Diputació de Barcelona	
PORTUGAL	ACIDI - High Commission for the Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue	
	CIG - Commission for Citizenship and Gender Equality	
FINLAND	Ministry of the Interior	
	Finnish League for Human Rights	
THE NETHERLANDS	Erasmus University Rotterdam – Faculty of Social Science	
SWEDEN	Centre against Racism	
IRELAND	Equality Authority	

DECALOGUE

1. Identifying principles on which good or best practices should be based.
2. Naming and recognizing all forms of racism and xenophobia as problems.
3. Documenting and monitoring racism and xenophobia.
4. Identifying effective legal remedies, policy actions, educational programs and best practices approaches.
5. Fostering Mass Media role in promoting the respect of culture and the recognition of diversity.
6. Recognising the economic, social and cultural contribution of immigrants.
7. Designing public services taking into consideration the needs of society.
8. Promoting principles of respect and dialogue, seeing cultural diversity as enrichment.
9. Moving from stereotypes to "living together".
10. Seeing migration as an universal phenomenon. Europeans were immigrants. The reflective argument: emigration memory of current immigrant societies.

0. INTRODUCTION: AIMS, PARTNERS AND STEPS OF THE PROJECT

The transnational project *"Living Together: European Citizenship against Racism and Xenophobia* [co-financed by European Commission: Directorate-General Justice, Freedom, Security - Fundamental Rights and Citizenship EU Programme (2007-2009) - JLS/FRC/2007] tries to fulfil a main aim: the promotion of a European discourse of tolerance[1] based on the generation of conviviality and respect arguments, recognition of the difference and building a European citizenship away from any kind of racism and xenophobia.

For the development of this major aim, four specific aims were proposed:

1. To identify and analyze the main "*social believes*" (prejudices, stereotypes, fears of the citizenship) that are generating racist and xenophobic discourses, discriminatory actions and the legitimization of racist attitudes in European countries.

2. To detect and archive *tolerance discourse*, *models* and *conviviality mechanisms* that are being developed in these countries with the aim of getting to know diverse strategies to fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination due to ethnic or national origin; as a catalogue of "*best practices*" of tolerance and dialogue.

3. To elaborate a *Decalogue of citizenship, tolerance and dialogue* that summarizes common arguments of conviviality and respect for a *European citizenship*; in order to neutralize the racist and xenophobic discourses and be of help to diverse social agents.

4. To generate a transnational mechanism of surveillance and reaction to fight against *new racist discourses*.

---

[1] For a precise definition of the term *tolerance* it is recommended to consult the one annotated in the *Declaration of Principles on Tolerance* by UNESCO, 16 November 1995; where it is recalled the historical perspective of this key word.
http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13175&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

For the launching and attainment of these objectives, the transnational project contemplates a series of phases and tasks, in which the different partners are involved:

Spain:

- Spanish Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (OBERAXE) – Ministry of Labour and Immigration, coordinating and leading the project

- Casa Árabe, Movimiento contra la Intolerancia, Cruz Roja (Spanish Red Cross), Consorcio de Entidades para la Acción Integral con Migrantes (CEPAIM) y Diputación de Barcelona (Local Goverment of the province of Barcelona).

Portugal[2]

- ACIDI - High Commission for the Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue

- CIG - Comissão para a Cidadania e Igualdade de Género

Finland:

- Ministry of the Interior

- Finnish League for Human Rights

Netherlands:

- Erasmus University Rotterdam – Faculty of Social Science

Sweden:

- Centre against Racism

Ireland:

- Equality Authority

Being also predicted the collaboration of external experts for some of the tasks. All of which made necessary to have a common methodological document to undertake the different tasks in a coordinated way. The main activities implied in the project are classified in three phases:

Phase (I) Definition and design of common methodologies (February - March 2009) to be shared in the accomplishment of focused groups, the archive of good practices and the celebrations of national experts forums. Similar foreseen documents of the triple inquiry (general population, social agents and experts), and its compendium in a *Decalogue*. As external expert, the team[3] of the Complutense University of Madrid (UCM) assumed, in collaboration with OBERAXE, the elaboration of a draft of

---

[2] Although we make some references to Portugal or the Portuguese team in general, notice that the good practices' report and focus groups were all conducted by ACIDI, since CIG was not involved in the achievement of those tasks.

[3] Formed by professors Mª Angeles Cea D´Ancona and Miguel S. Valles

common proposal of methodologies for the transnational research, which was debated in the first meeting with all the partners for its ratification as a reference document. The special participation of the Dutch partner (University Erasmus de Rotterdam[4]) was foreseen to define and design a common operative methodology.

Phase (II) The research fieldwork (March-June 2009), whose budgetary and methodology was planned in the transnational project and was aimed to the attainment of the specific objectives 1 and 2 already referred. So each partner assumes (with respect to objective 1) the specific design, fieldwork, analysis and report of *focused groups* corresponding to its country in the transnational project; and (in relation to specific objective 2) the identification and archive of *good tolerance and conviviality practices* found in their country (as a pilot network of *case studies* and entities). The transnational project tries to put the bases of a common system for collecting discourses and initiatives to fight against racism and xenophobia.

Phase (III) Proposals of common arguments of conviviality and respect, recognition of the difference and construction of a European citizenship (July - November 2009). The working plan in this phase was related with objective 3 in the project. It was summarized in the elaboration of a Decalogue that collects common arguments of conviviality and respect towards the difference. For this purpose, it was expected that several nationals forums integrated by multidisciplinary experts and regional/local and civil society representatives take place (concretely, one in each of the following countries: Spain, Portugal, Finland, Sweden and Ireland). In the matrix project it was planned, too, that particularly the cities would contribute with *case studies* and concrete experiences for the construction of tolerance and conviviality speeches; and was also planned the collection of opinions from universities, NGOs, national/regional and local representatives, among others. It was also planned the interest to gather, in those forums, experts working proposals directed to public services (educational institutions, public health, etcetera), to build arguments, mechanisms that fight against racist and discriminatory attitudes and discourses; or proposals that might be used by NGOs to promote awareness raising campaigns, with a similar orientation; or proposals directed to mass media in order to avoid racist, xenophobic and discriminatory arguments and discourses.

---

[4] Concretely professors Dick Houtman and Leen Kemeling .

Every partner assumes, within this phase, the task of managing the composition of the national forum of experts in their country, considering the proposal of common methodologies. In addition, every partner has to elaborate the document of conclusions corresponding to the national forum and participate in the second meeting of transnational work subsequent to the forums, and finally collaborating on the elaboration of the Decalogue (*Decalogue on Citizenship, Tolerance and Dialogue*) considering the recommendations arisen in the forums.

REPORT 1: COMMON METHODOLOGY GUIDELINES

Once celebrated the kick off meeting of the Project (Madrid: 5-6/03/2009), the first proposal of a common methodology[5] was modified and re-elaborated including all the contributions related to the three fieldworks that constitute the transnational project. The following is an abridged version of a more extended common methodology document agreed by the project partners.

1.1. Common methodology for qualitative fieldwork (I): focus groups (FGs)

The general design for FGs.

The first proposal of the general design of FGs was already taken in the first project: the budget of a minimum of two groups by country. As a proposal of the UCM experts of extended the number of FGs as far as possible[6], it was finally increased till three FGs. For that reason, it must be noted the *exploratory character* of the present study in order to gather the main primary discourses existing in the native population of each country. Also it must be underlined the *pilot* character of this researching experience, and the challenge of comparability inherent to transnational projects such as the one where the FGs are done.

However, it is necessary to add two complementary methodological reflections, in order to avoid a partial or even unfair consideration of the transnational Project. On one hand, let us consider the *transnational* character of the *Living Together Project*. There is a pretension of *strategic sampling* at the European scale, combined with the major criterion of *heterogeneity* (analogous to *stratification* in statistical samples). For instance, the *LT Project* includes countries from Southern Europe (Spain, Portugal), in addition to the case of Ireland, with more recent migration processes apart from their socio-cultural specificity, and countries from Northern Europe (Finland, Sweden), with experience of singular social policies. That is to say, as national surveys do not assure a

---

[5] Elaborated by Mª Ángeles Cea D´Ancona y Miguel S. Valles Martínez (Complutense University of Madrid), with comments by Dick Houtman (Rotterdam University).

[6] Because that decision limits considerably the aim of the typological representation at the national scale, even in the logic of qualitative sampling (based on criteria of *saturation*, *strategic sampling, structural or theoretical sampling*, etc.) The conventional practice (in national studies) is around 8.

statistical representativity for the scale of regions composing each country, the transnational qualitative sample of the *LT Project* does not assure a typological or structural representativity either, mainly because of its small number of FGs. Although the first budgeted minimum number of two FGs has been finally increased till three, the optimum amounts more than double the number of six (in absence of budgetary constrictions)[7]. On the other hand, since the mentioned transnational project does not contemplate exclusively FGs (but also *case studies* of good practices and national experts and social leaders forums), it is also expected an additional compensation of the minimum fieldwork with FGs.

Finally, a common *proposal of a general design* of FGs was decided to be taken as a reference for the qualitative field to be implemented in each country. A first and theoretical specification of fundamental *axes of heterogeneity between-groups* was specified. It was intended to sample social positions, from which characteristic discourses are maintained, related to the processes of acceptance or rejection towards immigrant population by native people. It has helped to guarantee a certain degree of dispersion (heterogeneity) in the selection of a qualitative sample. The final proposal of *internal composition* or within-*groups heterogeneity*, for the minimum option of 3 FGs was as follows:

FG1: native population of **upper-middle social status**

- 4 female participants, 4 male, aged 35-55 (not more than two people of the same age quinquennium or five-year period).
- Half self-employed, half employee, autonomous and highly qualified professionals with university studies.
- Some with direct relation with foreigners or ethnic minorities (labour, neighbouring or friendship relation); and some without.
- Living in residential urban zones (of upper-middle class), not more than two people of the same residential zone, to favour the heterogeneity.
- Venue: capital city of the country involved as partner in the Living Together Project.
- Date: April-May 2009.

---

[7] In any case, it was agreed to keep open to *all forms of racism* and compensate the small number of discussion groups already planned in the budget of the project (a total of three FGs) with a minimum state of the art in each country, trying to give context to the new material and explore the tendencies. That is, a minimum review of qualitative and quantitative studies was suggested to favour both the contextualization and the historical perspective of the fieldwork made *ex novo* in each country for the *LT project*.

FG2: **young native population** of **middle-middle social status**

- 4 female participants, 4 male, aged 18-25 (not more than two people of the same age).
- Some employed in economic sectors of middle qualifications, and some full or part time students.
- Belonging to labour and neighbouring environments with moderate presence of immigrants.
- Living in *non-residential* metropolitan area *not degraded* either (not more than two people of the same zone, to favour the heterogeneity).
- Venue: capital city of the country involved as partner in the Living Together Project.
- Date: April-May 2009.

FG3: native population of **lower-middle social status**

- 4 female participants, 4 male, aged 35-55 (not more than two people of the same age quinquennium or five-year period).
- Precarious or low qualification workers with only primary studies, some (2 or 3) being unemployed at present.
- Labour and neighbouring environment with high presence of immigrants.
- Living in a degraded metropolitan area (not more than two people of the same zone, to favour the heterogeneity).
- Venue: capital city of the country involved as partner in the Living Together Project.
- Date: April-May 2009.

Moderation design decisions of FGs.

A key aspect in the accomplishment of FGs has to do with the determination of the style of the group moderation, more or less free or semi-directed. It was selected the free option, that consists of proposing the subject of *immigration* (mentioning as well the expression *ethnic minorities*) in the country and city where the FG was done; as well as its evolution in the last years. It was deliberately decided that the group faces the job of talking about a close subject from the beginning; allowing to observe the emergence of the discursive associations that each group freely establishes between this surrounding subject (*immigration and ethnic minorities*) and the social issues that the project focuses (of *living together* or not, tolerant or intolerant discourses). It was recommended for moderators in every country: never mention the words *racism* or *xenophobia*; and start the session like this: *"Let us talk about immigration and ethnic minorities in this country"*.

Regarding the **style of moderation** to be practiced during the whole conversational technique, it was proposed and agreed the following mixed style: free or unstructured during the greater part of the conversation (first hour and a half, more or less); and only afterwards (last half hour or three quarters of one hour) the moderator reads three specific sentences (each followed by group discussion), that were to be posed in all the countries. These are the three **phrases** for the moderator **to read literally** and ask the group to comment on them, one at a time:

1. *Skin colour is of great importance for living together.*

2. *Both immigrants and ethnic minorities get more (from the country they live) than they give.*

3. *Both immigrants and ethnic minorities should keep their identity and culture of origin.*

These sentences are thought as a sort of *probing tactics* in the focus group conversation; in order to provoke and observe the social discourses under *traditional* and *new* forms of *racism.*

Contacting and setting FGs guidelines and reminders.

The participants in a FG should not know each other. The channels or networks for contacting people could be both personal (family, friends, neighbours) and public ones (educational centres or religious associations, among others). It was also taken into account not to inform with detail about the main subject of the research at the contacting moment. It was proposed and agreed to indicate (to the potential contacts) that current affairs would be discussed, being necessary to have opinions of people with a similar experience and social situation.

The chosen place where the FG would take place has to combined conditions of privacy and calmness to facilitate both the conversation and the recording, besides conditions of *ideological or cultural neutrality* usual in this sociological technique. Habilitated professional rooms were recommended.

Common analysis and report guidelines of FGs.

It was agreed as a basic structure for the analysis and report (available by **30th June** 2009) of the focus group material gathered per country:

1. **Introduction**: the context of the country (social, political, economic, cultural…) and state of the art on racism (special attention to **qualitative studies** on population discourses).

2. Discourse analysis **group by group**.

3. Discourse analysis between or **among groups**, comparing ideological positions and main reasoning regarding the aims of the transnational project and results of previous studies.

4. **Methodological chapter**, detailing the effective sampling and main fieldwork incidences, etc.

1.2. Common methodology for qualitative fieldwork (II): catalogue of good practices of tolerance and conviviality

Unlike qualitative fieldwork I (FGs), where it was needed a greater specification of the corresponding qualitative methodology, in qualitative field II (*catalogue of good practices*, to be made since March to June, 2009) it was possible to think in a greater procedural freedom without risking the comparability of the gathered transnational materials. However, some recommendations of concept and method were given as a reference for the documenting and monitoring of good practices. The first and main one: to take objective 2 of the transnational project into account[8], familiarizing with some key words. The idea of a *catalogue* (of *good practices*) had to be retained. It was neither a census operation nor an inventory one; but a selection of diverse experiences of conviviality or fight against ethnic discrimination to be spread transnationally. The aim was not to get an ephemeral or seasonal detection and cataloguing, but to lay the foundations of a transnational institutional routine of perennial *archive* of good practices.

---

[8] That is: "Detection and file of *tolerance speeches*, *models* and *conviviality mechanisms* in these same countries to know diverse strategies to fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination based on ethnic or national origin; as a catalogue of "*good practices*" of tolerance and dialogue".

It was proposed as **a starting definition** of "best or good practices" those social interventions completed (or finished) to which may be attributed a special value for their results achieved in the field of multicultural tolerance. And to those practices that deserve being archived and disseminated so as to be replicated in other contexts. It was strongly recommended to take as a conceptual and operative reference the definition and experience of UNESCO on this matter, specially the UNESCO´s International Migration Best Practice Project[9]. That is, a successful initiative could be considered a BP if it has/is:

1. Demonstrable effects and/or tangible impacts
2. Creative / innovative (represent new solutions to social problems)
3. Sustainable effects (sustainability of BPs results along time)
4. Potential for replication (BPs act as inspirational guidelines to policies)

Although UNESCO considers that it is sufficient (for being considered a BP) to meet one of the mentioned criteria, it was proposed to select as BP only those initiatives meeting two criteria at least. And that those two should be the first (demonstrable effects) and fourth (potential for replication) criterion. As a way of making viable and coordinated this (re)search and archival activity, it was agreed the following five criteria or guidelines:

1. *Territorial scope*. A minimum of three initiatives or experiences judged as BPs from big cities had to be identified and filed; same number in middle towns, and three in rural areas.

2. *Entities or social agents*. Selected initiatives developed by different entities or social agents; i.e., a) public/political administrations or organizations, b) private organizations, c) NGOs, d) other associations and mass media.

3. *Areas*. Wishful-selecting of BPs from diverse areas such as: a) education, b) social services, c) housing/neighbouring and public spaces, d) labour context, etc…

4. *Time of implementation*. The experiences/practices finally considered as BPs had to be closed by 2008 for the latest.

---

[9] http://portal.unesco.org/shs/en/ev.php-URL_ID=3450&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

5. *Types of projects/initiatives*. The focus of our search and filing was on experiences aimed at improving intercultural tolerance and dialogue, the conviviality among cultures, countries, etc. Both consolidated practices and recent ones had to be identified.

It was also recommended, as a special reminder, to include experiences from private companies, the areas of sport, culture, and from policies of citizenship and participation; and to include experiences developed by the beneficiaries themselves; in other words, BPs from minority groups, not only ethnocentric ones.

A common template for archiving Best Practices (BPs) on intercultural tolerance.

As a basic and common template, for the coordination of this activity among the diverse countries and partners involved, it was agreed the next list of items of information to be collected, once an initiative has been identified and judged as BP:

1. Name of program or project
2. Territorial scope: Big City/middle-town/rural village or area
3. Country
4. Name of contact person
5. Address
6. Type of organization(s) involved, partners and related policies. Entities or social agents that developed or promoted the initiative: a) public/political administrations or organizations, b) private organizations, c) NGOs, d) other associations and mass media.
7. Categories of practices or areas to which the initiatives belong: a) education, b) social services, c) housing/neighbouring and public spaces, d) labour context, etc…
8. Summary/description of the initiative: a) Formulation of objectives and strategies, priorities; b) Situation before the initiative began; c) Description of the process (origin, development, …); d) Mobilization of resources; e) etc.
9. Time(s) of implementation or key dates: a) opening and closing dates; b) number of editions; c) etc.
10. Transferability (estimated, planned or implemented).
11. Sustainability (in financial, socioeconomic or cultural terms).

12. Results achieved (indicators of impact, facts, and data).

1.3. Common methodology for qualitative fieldwork (III): National Experts Forums and Decalogue of citizenship, tolerance and dialogue.

The working plan in this third fieldwork (July - November 2009) was related to the objective number 3 of the transnational project: elaborating a *Decalogue* with common arguments of conviviality and respect towards difference. Several Experts Forums had to be celebrated of a multidiscipline character and with representatives of different sectors from the social and political life. Concretely, one in each of the following partners: Portugal, Finland, Sweden, Ireland and Spain. The common criteria for the composition of national expert forums were:

- 1 expert from each capital city of the partner countries
- 2 experts from university or research centres
- 2 experts from NGOs
- 1 expert from national/ regional public administration
- 1 expert from the business sector
- 1 expert on mass media broadcasting or publicity campaigns
- 1 expert on trade unions activities
- 1 expert on political parties in the opposition

Other indications that were followed as a common reference for the composition of those *forums* were:

- Expert forums were aimed at producing new arguments favouring tolerance, resulting in a Decalogue on Citizenship, Tolerance and Dialogue.

- The capital cities of the countries involved had to contribute with *case studies* and their concrete experience about the way they faced the construction of a speech of tolerance and conviviality.

- To achieve a balanced representation in these forums, both territorially (North-South) and ideologically.

- To include a baseline for minority people, as a concrete way of making effective the diversity principle/approach.

- To think in terms of *holistic experts* to avoid (as much as possible) the bias of thematic experts.

As it was established in the matrix project, the proposals from national forums had to be of various kinds:

a) Proposals directed to the public services (educational institutions, public health), to build up arguments or mechanisms that fight against racist and discriminatory attitudes and speeches.

b) Proposals that might be used by NGOs to promote awareness rasing campaigns with a similar horizon.

c) Proposals directed to mass media to avoid racist, xenophobic and discriminatory arguments and speeches.

Each partner had to elaborate the document of conclusions of its national forum (*Conclusions report*) with recommendations (arisen from the conclusions generated in the forums) to the elaboration of the mentioned Decalogue (*Decalogue on Citizenship, Tolerance and Dialogue*).

The main conclusions were presented in the interim meeting celebrated in Stockholm (Sweden) on November 12th and 13th where each participant country presented the main results and conclusions form *FGs*, *national forums* and *best practices*.

REPORT 2: NATIONAL FOCUS GROUPS COMPARATIVE REPORT (FINLAND, SWEDEN, THE NETHERLANDS, PORTUGAL AND SPAIN)

The main results of focus groups discussions celebrated in Finland, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and Sweden (following the common methodology[10] designed for this project) are summarized in this report in a comparative and snap-shot manner. More detail of their composition and individual analysis may be seen in the particular documents elaborated by each country participating in this project.

In general terms, the position towards immigrants and ethnic minorities were marked by three main characteristics:

1) The ***socio-demographic profiles*** of the groups' components. Mainly their educational level, reflected in the arguments they expressed and the aspects they underlined. *Social desirability bias* was more present in respondents with a higher educational level (FG1 and FG2), according to previous studies (Krysan, 1998; Ross and Morowski, 1998; Cea D´Ancona, 2004, 2007, 2009; SORA, 2001; Coenders and others, 2003; Cea D´Ancona and Valles, 2008, 2009). Other determining factors were their economic level and job situation: being unemployed or having an insecure job (more present in FG2 -the younger population- and FG3, those with a lower social economic position).

2) Their ***experience of living together*** with immigrants and ethnic minorities. Positive experiences caused *xenophilia,* while the negative ones were underlined to justify the rejection of them. As it was said in FG3 celebrated in Spain, "there are people who say "Poor people!" But have you lived right next to them? Has it happened to you?" In this occasion it was expressed in order to justify rejection towards *Roma* (the traditional ethnic minority in Spain like in other European countries)[11]. In this research special reference to Roma was made in Portugal

---

[10] See the document "Abridged proposal of common methodology for *Living together Project*", by Mª Ángeles Cea D´Ancona and Miguel S. Valles (Complutense University of Madrid) and contributions by Dick Houtman (Rotterdam University), 30th March 2009.

[11] The three Spanish groups mentioned the Roma in a spontaneous manner. They were considered Spanish people, but not well integrated into the majority society, despite the long period of "conviviality";

and Spain; and in every country to Muslims (associated with fanaticism and fundamentalism). They were seen as the most culturally different social minority and their integration into European societies the hardest.

3) Their *feelings of competition* for jobs and public benefits. The perception of being discriminated when compared to immigrants or ethnic minorities was more present in FG3 and FG2 (due to the socioeconomic profile of their members). As it was said, it´s in times of *crisis* "when problems get worse" and the *benefits* of *immigration* are questioned. The claim that there should be **preference** for autochthonous over foreigners acquires a greater force in the area of access to jobs and public aids. An argument in line with the perspective of *symbolic racism* (Kinders & Sears, 1981; Sears, 1988, 1998, 2005) which is summarised in the explicit rejection of ***positive discrimination,*** already stated in previous studies (Colectivo IOÉ, 1995; Jackson, Brown & Kirby, 1998; Pérez Díaz, Álvarez-Miranda & González, 2001; González & Álvarez-Miranda, 2005; Cea D´Ancona, 2005, 2007; Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Cea D´Ancona y Valles, 2008, 2009, 2010). Its understanding considers the discourse of **competition** for limited resources, which was to prevail in the explanation of the *ethnic prejudices* proposed early by Allport (1954/1977) & Blumer (1958) and corroborated later on by other authors (Walker & Pettigrew, 1984; Giles & Evans, 1986; O'Sullivan & Wilson, 1988; Bobo 1988; Quillian, 1995).

The feelings of competition were expressed in statements such as "they should not be given the same preference", "They have priority over us" or even "they are making us racist". These statements were more common in low and lower-middle class people who *compete* with immigrants. But in the current economic crisis context these arguments are present in every socioeconomic status, although with some differences. Not forgetting the second factor mentioned: the experience of ***conviviality*** or ***living together***: "Most of us are racists when we live with them".

---

they have kept their idiosyncrasy. The rejection towards them was explained for being poor, receiving many public aids and having no desire to *integrate* into Spanish society (different customs and lifestyles). The same arguments were found in Portugal, where Roma were also seen as rejecting integration and squandering generous opportunities bestowed upon them by the State. They even get privileges and opportunities denied to the common Portuguese citizen. The general opinion was that they are society's parasites and that they do not make any efforts not to be discriminated.

The criticism of the *media* for the negative image they give of immigrants and ethnic minorities was highlighted. And the plea: "keep a balance!" between positive and negative news (not only referring to an increase in delinquency, gender violence or unemployment). The *criticism* was also aimed at the *laws* that over-protect immigrants; especially by people in competition with immigrants or ethnic minorities.

More of tolerance was expressed in Sweden and in Finland where **social desirability bias** was present in the three focus groups (mainly in FG1 and FG2, where their members took more care to express themselves in a politically correct manner; they wanted to behave in an acceptable way). Focus groups participants considered that Finns in general are xenophobic but the participants presented themselves as an exception to this. The others (even their parents) were more prejudiced, especially towards Russians.

Except for Sweden, in every country there were important differences in the discourses expressed in the focus groups celebrated, especially between FG1 and FG3, the two more extreme groups and by the reasons said before.

2.1. Discourses on immigration and ethnic minorities from focus groups with upper-middle class adults (FG1).

Let´s start pointing out the discursive nodes more recurrent in FG1. This focus group was composed by upper-middle class adults, the most favourable towards immigrants and ethnic minorities in particular. They were characterized by the predominance of elaborated discourses (either with or without *social desirability bias*), weighing the *pros* and *cons* of immigration, and by stressing the *need* of it both for economic and cultural purposes. But there are some differences among the countries as it may be seen in table 1, which summarizes their main features.

Table 1

DISCOURSES ON IMMIGRATION AND ETHNIC MINORITIES FROM FOCUS GROUPS WITH UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS ADULTS (FG1)				
Living Together Project (May-July, 2009)				
FINLAND	NETHERLANDS	PORTUGAL	SPAIN	SWEDEN
Positive attitude towards immigration in general

The discussion remained on a fairly abstract and general level, controlling their own comments and trying to be correct. But at the same time they accidentally slipped into talking about "blacks", "them" and "one of them"

The "problems" will be solved over time

Finland´s official institution will take care of immigration issues

Voluntary relationship with immigrants: friends

Main discursive nodes: *employment, adaptation* and the *correctness* discourse | Reluctant to express criticism on other cultures. They showed a greater culture tolerance

Ethnic diversity was celebrated: "life more colourful, diverse and exciting". Learning from others cultures

The "problem" with ethnic minorities is not cultural, but a problem of *social inequality, poverty* and *language deficiency.* But they agreed that in public debates, ethnic minorities' cultures are criticized and problematized

Cultural criticism provoked reactions that relativized these "problems" (using reflective arguments)

Typical expressions of gender inequality (scarves, *burkas,..*) were not seen as | Reluctant to generalize attributes to minorities. Speech in terms of personal qualities. But, as long as the discussion took place, some generalized and *intolerant concepts* appeared in the free speech

Although the main discourse showed openness to immigration, all participants mentioned factors that hindered this prospect

Frequent professional or personal contact with immigrants that share their socio-economic status

Differential treatment was explained as a result of *social economic stratification* (e.g. education), not due to phenotypic or cultural | *Heads and tails* of immigration, with the predominance of elaborated and politically correct discourses (to qualify negative statements)

Attribution to immigration of some of current *problems*, but diffusing its responsibility

Emphasis on *economic, cultural* and *educational* benefits of immigration

Prevalence of *class racism* over the *ethnic* and *cultural* one (their acceptance depends on their income level)

Repeated criticism of the role of the *media* in distorting the image of immigration

Identification of immigration with *wealth*, but final dominance of *critical discourses*: *delinquency, abuse of public* | All discourses were built on a dichotomy between individual tolerance and intolerant society

Individualism = unwillingness to generalize all immigrants into one group

Cultural essence discourse: connections between *culture* and *skin colour*

Blame: the societal structure which were seen to hinder individuals from expressing their full potential |

	problematic, if they are by a free choice

Rather than focusing on differences, they underlined the things that different cultures have in common (i.e., similarities between the end of Ramadan and Christmas celebrations)

Ethnic concentration was not seen as a problem in itself. It was understandable (reflective argument)

The term 'culture' was used in many different contexts, not just relating to ethnicity | differences

Cultural differences (religious values, ethic of work) constitute a hamper to conviviality

Positive effects of immigration: *multiculturalism* and the opportunities that it represents to Portugal at an *economic, demographic* and *cultural* level

Negative aspect: increasing criminality

The importance of phenotypic differences was denied and the role of education and the social status was affirmed | *aids, laws protect* them and the *lack of professional qualification* of immigrant workers

Immigrants more aware of their *rights* than their *obligations*: *abus*e of public benefits

Preference for the *native* over the outsider ("You should have more rights because you were born here and you have been making contributions to Social Security all your life")

Factors against their integration: *segregation, education and labour discrimination*

The use of the *veil* in schools does not help their *integration*. Restrict certain cultural and religious practices | |

Apart from the politically correct discourses, the use of **reflective arguments** both to neutralize cultural criticism and to understand the ethnic concentration has to be highlighted. For example, in the Netherlands the *cultural criticism* relating to the social position of women in immigrant's (Muslim) communities provoked reactions that relativized these "problems", by stating that Dutch women in the 1950s also wore headscarves, or that there are lots of orthodox Christian villages in which people are not free to choose marriage partners themselves. Furthermore, typical expressions of gender inequality (such as *headscarves*, *burkas* and not shaking hands) are not seen as inherently problematic, if the women decide to do it themselves (like in Spain):

"And when I think about the problems people have with headscarves, I can still remember a photo taken of the former queen Juliana wearing a headscarf. I also remember my mother always wore a headscarf when she went outside"; "Indeed, in the whole [province] of Gelderland women still wear headscarves. And if you would have looked at other provinces say ten years ago, you would have seen the same thing. Girls who had to wear long skirts and were not allowed to wear pants."; "Previously you also had to be a virgin when you married"

Rather than focusing on what is different, they tended to see the things different cultures have in common[12]: "At one moment I found out that the end of Ramadan celebrations are actually just like our Christmas celebrations. The whole family comes together; the children receive gifts and sometimes the adults as well. You have a nice meal with the family, wearing your best clothes. Well, that's the same as our traditional Christmas celebrations. There are lots of similar things and I think you just have to translate those things a bit". Later, on the topic of marrying off, it was said that "lots of fathers do not want to marry off their daughters anymore. Of course, there's always a certain group that does, but then I think, in Staphorst [Dutch orthodox Christian town] people aren't free to choose who they marry with either".

Or referring to *ethnic concentration*, something that is commonly seen as problematic, it was not seen as a problem in itself. Actually, it was very understandable. A woman said: "My parents have lived in the south of France and there were two more Dutch families living nearby. It was very cosy to actually stick together. Then you can just talk Dutch". Or, "I would not oppose a new [concentrated] Chinatown or Little Italy. Why shouldn't people who share a certain ethnicity live together?"

Another common characteristic was the prevalence of **class racism**: the *differentiation* of immigrants according to their social class or income level. It was more evident in Spain, Portugal and the Netherlands. As it was said in Spain: "Nobody has ever been worried about having an immigrant who is the child of someone who is Norwegian, British or French".

---

[12] In Portugal, although the participants in FG1 refused to generalize attributes to minorities (at the beginning), as long as the discussion took place, some more explicit positions were assumed and some intolerant concepts appeared. For instance, one female participant said, referring to Brazilians: "the values are different. They kill as easily as they would drink a glass of water, and that is just their nature…"

2.2. Discourses on immigration and ethnic minorities from focus groups with middle class young people (FG2).

Young people are another social group affected by politically correct discourses. Traditionally they have showed themselves tolerant and in favour of immigration and ethnic minorities. But the social context of economic crisis is arousing xenophobic discourses as it may be seen in table 2. In the Netherlands, for example, the FG2 was the only group where immigrants were criticized for alleged abuse of the Welfare State. However, other participants in this focus group countered this criticism by stating that immigrants do not come to abuse of their Welfare State arrangements, but for better job opportunities and a better future. In Spain, FG2 was the focus group where the negative repercussion of immigration in the labour market took on a greater emphasis. Immigrants were blamed for the increase in unemployment and lowering wages because "they work for less money" and this undermines job prospects for autochthonous who are seeking a job. Same arguments were expressed in Portugal and other countries. The term "problem" was used frequently when young people talked of immigration. The economic crisis also took up a major part of the group debate as it may be seen in table 2.

Table 2

DISCOURSES ON IMMIGRATION AND ETHNIC MINORITIES FROM FOCUS GROUPS WITH MIDDLE CLASS YOUNG PEOPLE (FG2)				
FINLAND	NETHERLANDS	PORTUGAL	SPAIN	SWEDEN
Image of themselves as tolerant and in that sense a new generation compared with their parents

The politically correct language was used in general and sharp generalisations were avoided

The word | Ethnic diversity was appreciated or celebrated

Positive aspects: contact with other cultures was seen as enriching and bringing more colours to life; and the necessity of labour-migration was emphasized

Negative aspects: | Discourse opened to personal relationships with people of other ethnicities, but they mentioned factors that hindered this prospect

Like FG1 they refused to generalize and denied | *Economic crisis* took up a major part of the group debate

It was the FG where the negative repercussion of immigration in the labour market took on a greater emphasis

Immigrants were blamed for | All of them were eager to discuss and express their non-prejudiced frame of mind in contrast to a prejudiced society (discourse of individual tolerance)

The most interaction with different |

"immigrant" sounded negative, while *"new Finn"* [uussuomalainen] seemed to be correct Attitudes affected by good and bad experiences with immigrants and others minorities Many of them had had personal contacts with immigrants during kindergarten, school or studies, which they felt had most affected their own attitudes Their parents had less experience; their attitudes were thus more reserved *Central discourses*: *employment* and *economic perspectives*; lack of *language skills* (barriers for working life and integration); *problems* associated with immigrants Finnish society was not referring as multicultural, but immigrants make Finnish food culture more diverse Immigrants´ problems were linked to a larger inequality in	abuse of Welfare State Other dominant themes: *western values* and *ethnic concentration,* which was seen as a *problem*: by living among "their own people", immigrants and ethnic minorities will not integrate with native Dutch Policies of active "ethnic mixing" in both housing and in education are enthusiastically received "Western values" was mostly about the position of women among ethnic minorities. Islamic culture was stated 'behind' in its development (compared with the secularized Christian culture) They criticized the "problematic" position of Muslims women especially in young people's contexts: they are "a new generation" They insisted on not to judge groups of immigrants on the (bad) behavior of one of them, unlike their parents	importance of phenotypic differences Mass media are responsible for the spread of negative immigrants´ images Affinity totally centred on Blacks Have frequent professional or personal contact with immigrants *Negative aspects*: immigrants increase unemployment, decrease in salaries and get more support from State Abuse of Welfare State: immigrants receive a greater share of welfare state social benefits than the Portuguese do State does not defend Portugal properly: it allows immigrants enter into Affirm the role of education and social status in the attitude towards immigrants and ethnic minorities	increasing *unemployment,* declining in wages (they accept low-paid jobs) and drawing public aids. The Government was blamed for allowing it They also criticized unemployed Spaniards who do not emigrate in searching for a job Like FG3, immigration was conceived positive for the employer ("with what you pay one professional, you can pay four immigrants"), but negative for the worker Like FG1, immigrants were considered workers of low professional qualification Their acceptance depends on their level of income: the so-called *class racism* **Racism** for their appropriation of public spaces and a bad conviviality with neighbours Criticism of the *mass media* for the high profile given to *"Latin Kings"*	cultural groups, and not merely professional settings Discourse of cultural fluidity: multiculturalism The highest awareness that cultural background is not simply an essence or a set of traits

society			Immigrants have to *adapt* and not to *impose* their culture on the majority	
Concentration of immigrants was seen as a problem				

Both good and bad experiences with immigrants and other minorities affect the attitudes towards them. In Finland, they built an image of themselves as tolerant young people, and at the same time are aware on the contradictions of their own thinking, which appear in their everyday encounters with immigrants. In The Netherlands, when the discussion was about making generalizations on the basis of the *skin colour*, several participants remarked they (the younger generations) did not judge whole groups of immigrants on the (bad) behaviour of one of them; their parents or grandparents did ("I think there is a big difference between our generation and the generation before us. I think the generation above will more easily judge on that [skin colour] basis. (..) I don't know how that happened, but I have the feeling we are more open-minded about that"). And in Portugal, although the first discourse showed openness to personal relationships with people of other ethnicities, almost all participants mentioned factors that hindered this prospect. As when, on the one hand, they stated that phenotype and cultural and religious differences weren't important, but on the other hand, they indicated that having a different "culture" or ethnicity made it harder for people to find common ground on their interests and ways of being. In Sweden, each of the participants argued that they personally did not have any prejudices, but that the surrounding society did (the discourse of *individual tolerance* like in Finland).

The so-called "second generation" was brought in a significant way (unlike the other FGs); probably because they had greater contact and proximity with the people who compose the "second generation" (in schools, universities, neighbourhood…). Central themes of discussion were: the *economic crisis* and their *employment* perspectives; the *concentration* of immigrants (or ethnic minorities), that do not favor the interaction with autochthonous; their barriers to working life and integration caused by the lack of language skills; their abuse of Welfare State and the defence of the *rights* of autochthonous as opposed to foreigners. The complaint expressed by the most reluctant fraction in Spain (for example) was that "the immigrants have more rights than Spaniards" (*reverse discrimination*), and that "all the benefits go to them". In contrast to

FG1, immigration was not seen as "necessary" for the country's economic development, but as damaging (unqualified labour which takes any job at all), and which only benefits employers. Nevertheless like FG1, contrary opinions were said: "if Spaniards really needed work they would act like the immigrants". There was a fraction of this FG more receptive to immigration that counterbalanced the previous arguments with positive ones: our ancestors emigrated; positive discrimination plays a social function of integration; there is also an unproblematic side of immigration (plurality of cultures and religions); immigrants are not to be blamed for this crisis.

2.3. Discourses on immigration and ethnic minorities from focus groups with lower-middle class adults (FG3).

Economic crisis was also present in FG3, integrated by lower-middle class adults. Actually they were most clearly characterised by arguments marked by *competition* and experiences of *conviviality* (difficult *living together*) discourses. Almost all of them had neighbours or colleagues immigrants or with foreign backgrounds. Both ingredients and their primary discourses may be appreciated in table 3, which offers a snap-summary of what they said during the focus group sessions.

Table 3

DISCOURSES ON IMMIGRATION AND ETHNIC MINORITIES FROM FOCUS GROUPS WITH LOWER-MIDDLE CLASS ADULTS (FG3)				
FINLAND	NETHERLANDS	PORTUGAL	SPAIN	SWEDEN
Plenty of everyday experiences with immigrants or persons with foreign backgrounds (neighbours or colleagues). Mainly involuntary relations Many of them had also regular dealings with the	The "problem" with immigrants and ethnic minorities is not their ethnicity or their 'culture', but their religion (Muslims) *Islam* was seen as an obstacle for the integration into Dutch society Diversity merely "tolerated" Adaptation to	Less openness and greater distrust. They focused on the *negative aspect* of immigration: increase of unemployment and criminality; decrease in salaries; abuse of public aids; State does not defend Portugal properly *Positive aspects*:	Primary discourses marked by a feeling of *discrimination* (competition) and the *experience of living together* in labour contexts and neighbourhoods *Lack of positive discourses* on immigration and emphasis on	They were also keen on asserting that they personally did not have any prejudices: the *discourse of personal tolerance* was invoked. But suggestions that they may all have hidden prejudices There was a

social office and had much knowledge of the social security system. These aspects were visible in the discussion *Discourse of threat*: immigrants exploit our social security system, threaten Finnish culture and demand being allowed to practice their own cultures to an unreasonable extent *Discourse of adapting*: immigrants' attitudes are crucial for a successful social integration; Finnish rules need to be obeyed without complaining and immigrants have to completely adapt into Finnish society *Discourse of cultural encounters* was centred on everyday life and the problems in them Immigrants perceived as an homogeneous group (constantly equated with Somalis and refugees) Work-related	Dutch culture was seen a very important issue: a prerequisite for being admitted into the country Typical expressions of gender inequality (headscarves, *burkas* and not shaking hands) were seen as totally incompatible with Dutch society Unique for this FG was their wish for a stricter maintenance of social order by the government. Problems with ethnic minorities' youth have become worse because the Law has not been enforced adequately The Government was also accused of giving (Muslim) immigrants too much space at the cost of native Dutch people	the labour force increase and the intercultural exchange A feeling of economic menace and *competition* – via migrants purportedly being willing to work for smaller salaries – is the most notable *negative aspect* The most valued dimension of *integration* is the *economic* one. For that reason, the Chinese and the Brazilians are the most integrated minorities, due to their participation in the labour market (commerce and restaurants) Hostility or closeness were attributed to justify their representations about some minorities Obstacles to conviviality: the bad behaviour of some ethnic groups (like in Spain)	negative and conventional stereotypes *Negative arguments*: immigrants know more their rights than their obligations; swallow public aids and subtract job opportunities The need of immigration for the economic development of the country was place in doubt; it benefits to employers and harms the workers. If some jobs are not covered by autochthonous is because immigrants accept conditions unacceptable nowadays for Spanish workers ("They leave us high and dry. We want to receive the wages we deserve") *Negative* impact of immigration on crime and neighborhood conviviality Critique to laws favouring the development of crime and immigration Combination of *critical* arguments and *self-critical-reflective* ones, counterbalancing	general fear of being perceived as racist in the Swedish society. People were likely to express tolerance-based opinions in public, while have a different set of views in private They also invoked the *discourse of cultural essence*, by taking it for granted that immigrants do belong to cultural groups and these groups do have distinct cultural expressions, which may or not be compatible with the Swedish legislation

29

immigration was not mentioned			the criticism of immigration	

The discourses pronounced in FG3 were characterized, first, by being abrupt and marked by a feeling of *discrimination* (competition) and the experience of living together with immigrants in neighbourhoods and labour contexts. They insisted on the authority that the fact of living together with immigrants confers to them: "You have to experience immigrants directly to talk with any authority". Second, by imposing cultural adaptation and defining the obstacles to conviviality in terms of behaviour of different ethnic groups. Third, by their desire of a stricter maintenance of social order by government.

More than in positive aspects of immigration (labour force increase, intercultural exchange), they insisted on negative ones: unemployment, criminality, decrease in salaries; public aids, laws protect them…. In the FG3 celebrated in Spain the negative arguments predominate to the point of someone exclaimed: "But there is absolutely no-one here going to defend people who aren't Spanish". Their discourse was critical towards immigration, although sympathetic and even compassionate at certain times. As in FG1 it was emphasized that immigrants know more their rights than their obligations; and like FG2, some of them stress the image of immigrants swallowing public aids and subtracting job opportunities: "They don't know about their obligations, but they know all their rights"; "They have priority over us". And the self-confessed *racism*: "I now say, "*They make you racist*", in reference to the *discrimination* felt when compared to immigrants or the experience of *conviviality*: "Most of us are racists when we live with them".

In Spain and Portugal, in order to justify their representations about some minorities, the participants seek legitimating upon perceived hostility or closeness to immigrants or ethnic minorities (both in Spain and Portugal):

> "They [Black] are very racist. They are very racist amongst themselves and with regard to us. They are more racist with us than we are with them"; "They [Ukrainians] are cold. They have no feelings, not even expressions"; "Mistrustful. Boy, they [Chinese] are really mistrustful" (FG3: Portugal)

But, at the same time this was the FG where the memory of the past as a strategy of approaching to the present of immigration was more recalled; notably in Spain.

2.4. Skin colour and living together focus-group discourses.

Since it was agreed to follow a mixed style of moderating FGs, after the free (or unstructured) style during the greater part of the conversation (first hour and a half, more or less), three specific sentences were read by the moderator in every country in order to be discussed. Three sentences that reveal different forms of racism: traditional, symbolic or modern and cultural one. Table 4 shows the main reactions or discourses before the first one: *"Skin colour is of great importance for living together".*

On being a typical expression of classic (or traditional) racism, not everybody is able to admit it in public immediately, although they agree with it afterwards. As Doty (2003) and Brücker *et al.* show, the racism based on *skin colour* still persists in Europe and it is the base for prejudice and discrimination. The first reaction is usually denying it, especially by the highest educated people, on being a direct expression of *racism*; but later they just admit it. It is usual to say that the *skin colour* is important for the society, in general, but it has no relevance for the person who is speaking, as it was said in FG1 celebrated in Finland ("it doesn´t matter to me personally, but in society at large does") or Sweden ("No, it has no relevance what so ever. For me personally, the people's skin colour is uninteresting" but the society is still racial prejudiced and discriminates by the skin colour: "skin colour affects the individual's possibilities in life"). In the Netherlands, all participants in FG1 agreed that *skin colour* should not be of any importance. However, some of them told about (non-white) friends who had had experiences in which they were judged on their *skin colours.* In Portugal and Spain the racial discrimination was more explained by economic factors (social economic stratification) than ethnic or cultural ones (*class racism*) as it may be seen in table 4.

Table 4

SKIN COLOUR IS OF GREAT IMPORTANCE FOR LIVING TOGETHER				
FINLAND	NETHERLANDS	PORTUGAL	SPAIN	SWEDEN
FG1 *(UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS ADULTS)*				
No matter to them personally, but "in society at large" it does The discussants considered themselves to be more open-minded regarding skin colour than their compatriots	No importance but *no-white* people have problems in Dutch society	Differential treatment is a result of *social economic stratification* (e.g. education) rather than of phenotypic or cultural differences	The *economic* factor overrides the *ethnic* and the *cultural* "Green, red or yellow… it´s the same" *vs.* the golden of money or social position: *"the money you have"* ("depends on the black") Gypsy´s rejection for being poor and not wanting to integrate ("not due to their color"; implicit admission of phenotypic traits)	No relevance, but it may not be shared by society Racial discrimination exists in the Swedish society Discrimination = a colonial legacy Connection cultural and phenotypic features
FG2 *(MIDDLE CLASS YOUNG PEOPLE)*				
Quite a trivial matter	Depends on if you know each other	Not important among the younger generation, but it is more important for their parents and grandparents	They repudiate immigrant-black-delinquent association and its cause: ignorance, superiority, classism, prejudice and the stigmatisation of certain cultures Criticism of linguistics uses negro-white: "why the Negro is called black instead of African?"	No relevance for them personally A way for people to assume someone is different The *mass media* should be more diversified to include immigrant journalists

			Xenophilia towards black vs. poor Latin	
FG3 *(LOWER-MIDDLE CLASS ADULTS)*				
No matter to them personally Dark skin colour is a sign of a different culture or background ("there's so much else that comes with it")	It's not an issue; it's about the person	Not important (but a marriage with a no-white person is not wanted: they would try to avoid it) They really smell bad	Cultural outstands *skin colour* (criticism to Muslims for their relationship to women) Reiteration of the bad smell attributed to black skin and Muslims Problematic conviviality of Gypsies ("for their way of being"): "the most racists" (with Latin, competitors in public aids)	They did not want to be racist (keep their opinions to themselves) Employment market is an arena where skin colour matters Racism and xenophobia were recognized

The social criticism to every expression of racism due to the skin colour seems to affect the denial that it is a relevant factor in the establishment of personal relationships; but for them personally, not for the society in general.

> "I think that we as Swedes keep our opinions to ourselves, or we talk behind closed doors about our racist opinions. We are very polite on the surface and treat everyone with kindness, because *we don't want to be perceived as ignorant*, so we try to treat people as though skin color doesn't matter, so that *no one can accuse us of being racist*" (FG3: Sweden)

> "Skin colour is not important, but if my son wanted a Black girl, I would mind about the skin colour. Perhaps I would try to prevent the marriage" (FG3: Portugal)

The admitted differential treatment towards ethnic minorities is mainly explained as a result of the socioeconomic stratification ("the money they have") more than of phenotypic or cultural differences. It was highlighted both in Portugal and Spain: the so-called *class racism*. In this way, the Roma's rejection was specifically explained for being poor and not wanting to integrate; not due to their colour. Unless in FG1. But the *ethnic racism* was also explained by common stereotypes that connect cultural and phenotypic features of the person.

> "We probably associate skin colour and cultural and religious values, attach them to it. It's not skin colour as such, the thing that we react to. Because they have a certain skin colour therefore they have certain values and think like this or like that about these things" (FG1: Sweden)

> "Being with Blacks doesn't bother me so much because I am already used to interacting with them and seeing them all the time. Now perhaps if a Muslim appeared…I end up being a little cautious" (FG2: Portugal)

Denigrating clichés of a racist nature were expressed, such as the references to the bad smell of the black skin or Muslims in Spain, and in Portugal referred to black people ("They have a bath in the morning, but then they sweat and they really smell bad…": FG3). In the second country, the conversation celebrated in FG3 ended up criticising Moroccans, Latin Americans and the Roma because of their lack of desire to integrate into society. The criticism extends to Muslims due to the way they treat women, their backwardness and intolerance in general.

Finally the critic to the *mass media* for stereotyping and making negative images of immigrants and ethnic minorities has to be stood out. In this occasion it was expressed during the FG2 celebrated in Sweden, where it was suggested to include immigrant journalists in mass media as a strategy to reduce *racism*. Idea also suggested in the *forum* celebrated in Spain: Immigrants ought to participate fully in society and the mass media ought to offer a better representation of the plural or diversified society.

2.5. Contribution/benefit ratio of immigrants and ethnic minorities to host societies: focus-group discourses.

The second phrase proposed to be discussed, *"Both immigrants and ethnic minorities get more (from the country they live) than they give"* (table 5), sums up a basic argument regarding peoples' misgivings about immigration and ethnic minorities. It is expressive of the *symbolic racism* as it was defined by Sears (1998, 2005): the antagonism towards ethnic minorities is explained by the resentment or attitude against positive actions. It is connected with *competition* as a determining factor of *xenophobia*. Table 5 abridges the main arguments expressed in every focus group session. They comprehends arguments insisting on the difficulty to measure "giving" and "getting" and statements expressing full agreement: "immigrants receive more than they provide" (FG3 in Finland, Portugal and Spain). Without forgetting the *relativist discourses*,

expressed in Spain ("it depends on the immigrant and their circumstances") and Sweden ("it always depends on the conditions surrounding that individual"); in both countries this more subtle consideration appeared in FG1. In the Netherlands, however, a similar cautious argument was verbalized by the youth ("It is better to analyse their contributions group by group": FG2).

And finally, the so-called *discourse of resentment*: the insistence on the immediate use of public aids, despite not having contributed any money. Although this discourse is usually more common among people that had to fight to get where they are in life, people whose social life has been in austere family atmospheres with very few public services and social benefits, it was present in all FGs celebrated in Spain. This social belief may be grounded in the collective memory of Spaniards that remember a past, no too remote, of a more precarious social situation previous to the generalization of the Welfare State.

Table 5

BOTH IMMIGRANTS AND ETHNIC MINORITIES GET MORE (*from the country they live*) THAN THEY GIVE				
FINLAND	NETHERLANDS	PORTUGAL	SPAIN	SWEDEN
FG1 (*UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS ADULTS*)				
A lengthy discussion about how to measure such "giving" and "getting" Many discussants considered what Finland gives more concrete, but the gains seemed much harder to concretize: contributions to the labour force, the gene pool, and the cultural scene More emphasis was laid on *economic*	People are making money out of them, because they provide so much cheap labour Immigrants *cost more* than other people, because they should be learnt Dutch and they're more often unemployed Focusing on the *cultural contributions* more than economic ones: not just the different kinds of *food* that are now available, but also	The idea was not expressed by the group	The immediate access to rights ("you have all the rights when you arrive") without having contributed to its funding was criticized: *discourse of resentment* The Spaniard is more envious than racist *Economic, cultural* and *demographic* contributions of immigrants were emphasized *Relativist*	Their contribution is *an individual issue*, not a group-based one: "it always depends on the conditions surrounding that individual" In the future we shall be in a great need of immigrants, due to the ageing population: immigration is *necessary for society*

contributions	different views on life *Ethnic diversity* is experienced as enrichment		*discourse*: "it depends on the immigrant and their circumstances"	Integration policies have failed: immigrants are having difficulties to enter into the employment market
FG2 *(MIDDLE CLASS YOUNG PEOPLE)*				
Rather unwilling to answer to this proposition directly Gains from immigration *Multiculturalism* to our *diet*	It is better to analyse their contributions group by group How it should be measured: financially or in terms of participation in society?	They are very often given advantages in everything: housing, facilities at university… ("A house: a Portuguese will always be behind, for example, a Roma in terms of priority. It's a fact")	They are given too many aids compared to Spaniards: "any immigrant receives <u>more aids on arrival</u>" Their lower economic level explains they get more aids They benefit from public services without having contributed to its financing: *social benefits abuse* Social benefits outweigh the immigrant's labour discrimination *Classism*: If the person is rich, "if American, e.g., it does not matter because he is American"	This sentence is an assumption that immigrants live off the welfare system Immigration changes society for the better: *multicultural diet*
FG3 *(LOWER-MIDDLE CLASS ADULTS)*				
Immigrants *clearly receive more* than they give They only listed things Finland might gain from immigrants, after the moderator had specifically asked them to do it	The first reactions were about refugees (asylum seekers). They cannot contribute in any way, because they are not allowed to work Immigrants should have jobs before being admitted	Immigrants and minorities receive more public aids and money: "Roma women are the first to receive money. Nowadays, you can see Roma with houses, which they have deprived many others of"	They don't pay taxes and are *the first* in getting public aids ("The browner you are, the more housing you get…") Criticism to *permissive laws* for permitting it *Agreement:* immigrants receive	They didn't agree with this statement. **N**o one wants to depend on welfare and it is a problematic situation for the individuals if they can't support

				more than they provide	themselves
					Immigrants want to work, not living on welfare

There may be more agreement on what immigrants and ethnic minorities receive than what they offer: public aids, unemployment benefits, housing and "living on welfare". Nevertheless, economic, cultural and demographic contributions were recognized. Especially, the cultural gains referring to our diet ("multiculturalism to our diet") and mainly among the youngest, but not only (FG1 in the Netherlands, for instance):

> "If there wouldn't be any immigrants, we wouldn't have Chinese restaurants out there or Japanese ones […] Indians, so it does in itself bring *multiculturalism to our diet*, for example. Finnish food is actually quite, tasteless […] and then, different kinds of music and such things […] food for the soul and stuff, if you don't always think about it so that they take our government money and all the money from the social office and that, so there's also a gain…" (FG2: Finland)

> "Yes, it just can't be something static. I heard that in Great Britain they say that the local dish nowadays is curry. It's not shepherd's pie, sausage, eggs and bacon for breakfast, it's Indian food that they now call real British food, it's the same in Sweden; things are always changing, inspiration and such" (FG2: Sweden)

2.6. Immigrants and ethnic minorities should keep their original identities and culture: focus-group-discourses.

The third sentence proposed (*"Both immigrants and ethnic minorities should keep their identity and culture of origin"*) was also mentioned spontaneously in the first part of the group discussion sessions. When they were asked for the third sentence directly, a conditional "yes" emerges as an initial reaction to the preservation of the identities and cultures of immigrants. Table 6, however, shows how rejection quickly appears among the adult groups to certain cultural practices that cannot be accepted by European society (particularly *ablation*), while among young people (more clearly divided into two opposing groups of opinion) the discourse of **cultural exchange** and **learning from each other,** defended through calls for mutual respect and the non-imposition of cultures and the example of gastronomic variety (this tolerance is more viable than the dictates of certain cultures about the way women should dress). In every country the immediate reference was to Muslims: *Ramadan* ("I cannot stop to go and pray"),

ablation (female circumcision) or veils ("it goes against the lay nature of western societies and women's independence"). And the insistence on the respect to other cultures, the western values and the human rights was also prevalent: "mutual respect to help conviviality between people of different cultures".

Table 6

BOTH IMMIGRANTS AND ETHNIC MINORITIES SHOULD KEEP THEIR IDENTITY AND CULTURE OF ORIGIN				
FINLAND	NETHERLANDS	PORTUGAL	SPAIN	SWEDEN
FG1 *(UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS ADULTS)*				
Agreement, stating that immigrants probably "fare better", if *they keep their own culture* and habits It is up to the immigrants themselves, whether they wish to *maintain their own culture*	Sympathy for the statement Apart from the contribution to more ethnical diversity, "you have to have respect for other people, because you have to be able to live together with them" "Respect for other cultures" and western values *Muslims*: apart from condemning female circumcision and marrying off unanimously, they were very tolerant and emphasized the importance of women's own choices in these matters	Muslims have completely different habits: "They only work part of the day, because of *Ramadan* (…) I cannot stop to go and pray"	Yes, conditional, to cultural permissiveness: "provided it doesn't vitiates the culture of the host country" Unacceptable cultural practices by Spanish society (*ablation, cutting hand*). Educational measures to fight them Controversy of fasting for *Ramadan*: affects performance at work and school Permissiveness of cultural difference in private areas, not in public and when it is contrary to human or constitutional rights Critique to imposition or lack of reciprocity	It is an individual choice whereas one should keep one's culture or adopt a new cultural way of life There might be positive effects from minority cultures remaining unaltered by the majority culture Identity also changes over time Holding onto culture is very much a part of nostalgia of one's life and thus a perfectly understandable choice
FG2 *(MIDDLE CLASS YOUNG PEOPLE)*				

Finland is sometimes too flexible, renouncing its own traditions so that immigrants would feel more comfortable	Dominant discourse: "they can keep their culture, as long as..", after which 'human rights' and 'living conditions' should be guarded against erosion The position of women was seen as an essential thing in Western culture Cultures are not static and will eventually adapt to each other. But a culture's core values *are* static and should be protected	They should maintain their culture, without interfering in the local culture	Yes, conditional: "respect" (mutual) and "certain limits" Positive discourse of *cultural exchange* ("we all benefit") and of *mutual learning* *Tolerance and* mutual *respect* to promote conviviality as a goal ("The point is to adapt oneself and take the best of each culture") Gastronomy as a difference benefit *Tolerance* more feasible when affects eating habits, less viable when it has repercussions on women Self-reflective indication: **respect** the use of Muslim veil ("in our culture until recently" prescriptive for women by Catholic Church) Overcoming religious monotheism-culturalism: "we have many more options", "that is a good thing brought by immigration"	They are part of your identity. If you were living in another country, although you could get new traditions, you would still want to keep the old ones because they are a part of your identity When Swedes are abroad, they only socialize with Swedes fellows: a way to justify the right for immigrants to socialize only within their groups
FG3 (LOWER-MIDDLE CLASS ADULTS)				
Irritation at special arrangements provided for immigrant workers: to arrange a prayer room for Muslim	Agreement with the statement but with objections: "yes, as long as they don't cause any trouble and they adapt a bit" *Burka* was not	The idea was not expressed by the group	Three conditions were imposed: 1) no conflict with Spanish laws, 2) respect to others, 3) minority not imposed to majority	Immigrant cultures enrich the society Each individual should keep their cultural identity ("everyone should

students at work	tolerated and *'no hand shaking'* was condemned They can have their own cultural practices and habits, but our western values that pertain to individual liberty, out of which the emancipation of both women and homosexuals arose, have to be respected		Explicit reference to the practice of ablation and the sacrifice of the Lamb (critique to *Muslim* culture) Discourse of an *assimilationist integration* towards conviviality (*adaptation* of them to us: "they must *adapt* to the country where they are") Rejection of customs in conflict with Spanish or international laws (*ablation, arranged marriages*) and dispute over other controversial uses (imposition of Muslim headscarf in schools) Distinction of public and private areas to preserve customs Complaint of neighborhood conviviality (the midnight norm, noisy immigrants) Insistence on: "preserve your identity, but if you respect the other's" Social reflectivity: "We'll also be rare for them, due to our customs". In Spain the same customs have not always prevailed	be proud of their names and culture") But at the same time it is admitted that immigrants must adjust to the culture they come to: "When I am abroad, I just *adjust to* that culture so that people can tolerate me"

A greater cultural tolerance was generally shown by the young people (FG2) and the adults with higher education (FG1), especially in Finland ("It is up to the immigrants themselves, whether they wish to maintain their own culture") and Sweden ("it is an individual choice whereas one should keep one's culture or adopt a new cultural way of life"). In this latter country it was also said that there might be positive effects from minority cultures remaining unaltered by the majority culture. Identity also changes over time. The notion of culture was here treated as language and certain traditional celebrations. It was suggested that holding onto culture was very much a part of nostalgia of one's life and thus a perfectly understandable choice:

> "If I put myself in a situation that I would, for works sake, move to another country. Then I would still have a bit of it left, for example, I would still speak Swedish, I would still have a connection to Sweden. I would be very nostalgic during Christmas, like my relatives who moved to the USA and their remaining "swedishness", there is some left. Of course, with years it probably has diluted a bit, which is also natural" (FG1)

> "Even though you can also get new traditions, you still want to keep the old ones; they are a part of your identity" (FG2)

Reflective arguments emerged in Sweden, Spain and others countries. In Sweden, for instance, the discussants in FG2 primarily identified themselves with their own experience and reflections over how it would be to move elsewhere, and the extent they would want to keep their own culture. In Spain self-reflective arguments were present in the discussion about the use of Muslim veil and the change of Spanish customs over time.

In general, young people are less worried about the loss of their *cultural identity*. Religious pluralism is even considered positive for the society ("we have many more options", "that is a good thing brought by immigration": FG2, Spain). On the contrary, the adults refer more to legal limits, based on their training, experience or manner of speaking; the right to take a break and greater cultural permissiveness in private. Even the discourse of *assimilationist integration* was prevalent among lower-middle class adults (FG3):

> "When I am abroad, I just *adjust to* that culture so that people can tolerate me" (Sweden)

> "They must *adapt* to the country where they are" (Spain)

> "Yes, as long as they don't cause any trouble and they adapt a bit" (The Netherlands)

2.7. Convergences of discourses on immigration and ethnic minorities.

As a complementary summary, table 7 briefly illustrate the major positive and negative arguments around immigration and ethnic minorities found in the focus groups with general population. Whereas the former show various forms of *acceptance* or *xenophilia*, the latter express *rejection* at different levels of intensity. The first thing that stands out is the strong predominance of negative factors over positive ones, although this is probably not so surprising as we usually focus on and emphasise the negative more than the positive in a situation. A convergent reasoning is the circumstances of economic crisis affecting all societies involved in this project at the moment of the field work.

Table 7

MAJOR COMMON DISCOURSES ON IMMIGRATION AND ETHNIC MINORITIES FROM FOCUS GROUPS WITH GENERAL POPULATION
Living Together Project (May-July, 2009)

POSITIVE DISCOURSES	NEGATIVE DISCOURSES
A world without borders "Humans should be able to move freely around the world "	**Invasion-lack of control** "They have taken over neighbourhoods that were ours before" "It seems that we are the foreigners" **Criticism of immigration policy** "We have to set limits" "They should go back to their countries…"
Immigration necessary for the labour market "The problem is, we don't want to admit that there are certain jobs we don't want to do" "The harder work for the immigrant"	**Immigration damages labour expectations** "They leave us high and dry. They increase unemployment and decrease our salaries" "They are unskilled people" "We had our work and all our rights, but now we have less and less"
Cultural wealth-contribution "It's like a little of your culture brought to the country"	**Cultural imposition - adaptation failure** "They must adapt themselves to our customs, but they want to impose their norms and

"Different kinds of food and views on life" "Life more colourful, diverse and exciting"	customs" "They must adapt to the country where they are"
Discrimination -Exploitation "The employers take advantage of them" "Skin colour affects the individual's possibilities in life" "Immigrants find all doors close if they are a little darker…" ***Human Rights*** "All human beings have rights and obligations regardless of the country of the world where they are"	***Reverse Discrimination*** "They have more rights"; "They have priority over us" "If you want to have the same rights, you need to have the same duties" "They often come over here demanding rights as soon as they arrive" "Living on welfare" "Immigrants get more support from the State than the autochthonous" "State does not defend us properly" ***Autochthonous first* (Preference right)** "They should not be given the same preference" "You are entitled to have more rights because you were born here and have been contributing to Social Security all your life"
Positive conviviality "Never has happened anything as thefts… any kind of *problems*. Better the other way round" ***Unjustified bad image*** "Mass media are responsible for the spread of negative images of the immigrants and minority population"	***Negative conviviality – Problems* (insecurity, no civic manners, *disease already eradicated*)** "A lot of people talk about it without having experienced it, without actually living it" ***Insecurity - Delinquency*** "I have seen more and more insecurity" "Crimes that had almost disappeared are reappearing" ***Antisocial behaviour*** "They think they have all the rights in the world and we have to put up with it" "We have to educate them"; "What they have to do is adapt to our customs" ***Diseases*** "They bring diseases already eradicated" ***Racism*** "They are making us racist" "Most of us are racists when we live with them"

Both in Spain and Portugal a greater self admission of racism was collected. *Racism* either based on shared daily-life experiences (neighbourhoods, labour) or on the perception that immigrants monopolize public resources (receiving more Welfare State social benefits than autochthonous do). The increase in criminality, unemployment and competitiveness was behind their explanations. Moreover stories of real experiences of conviviality with immigrants (or ethnic minorities) were offered as a strategy for self-exonerating or legitimizing negative discourses on immigration in general, and on certain immigrants in particular.

But, at the same time, a self-reflective approach has been detected, mainly in Spain, Portugal, the Netherlands and Sweden, as a strategy both to neutralize the cultural criticism and to understand the ethnic concentration.

In order to complete the overall view of FGs, table 8 summarises arguments that are used to justify the rejection of immigration or ethnic minorities and counter-arguments that were used to reply them during the group debates.

Table 8

NEGATIVE ARGUMENTS	POSITIVE COUNTER-ARGUMENTS
Excessive immigration "There are too many of them; their number is excessive"	*Necessary immigration* "There are many jobs that autochthonous don't want to do"
Immigration to be controlled "We have to set limits"	*A world without frontiers* "We believe that a place is ours for the simple reasons of being born there"
Problematic immigration "There is awareness in society that this is a problem" "Why are we unemployed now? The reason: immigrants"	*Stereotyped immigration* "The foreigner is seen as a threat" "People usually blame the first thing they come across. In this case, it is immigration"
Overprotected immigration "They give them jobs, house, assistance… and there is no aid for you" "They come here and they immediately have support, help with everything…)	*Looked after immigration* "Perhaps it is because they have a greater need"

Overprotected immigration "They don't know their duties, but they know all their rights"	*Equal rights immigration* "All human beings have rights and obligations regardless of the country of the world where they are"
Abusive immigration "They abuse of the welfare state; living on welfare" "[Immigrants are] parasites on society"	*Citizen's immigration* "It is not a case of judging a population because it uses its rights"
Wasters-opportunists immigration "They haven't paid for all this progress, but they enjoy the benefits since the first day"	*Profitable-beneficial immigration* "They will receive the same as they are contributing"
Individual -labour immigration "They bring all their family and they have all those rights and receive a load of benefits straight away"	*Family immigration* "If someone lives alone and has to send money abroad, that person is not consuming, so all the money leaves the country"
No- qualified immigration "They are unskilled"	*Over-qualified immigration* "This happens to people from here too. They get a degree and end up cleaning"
Unilateral adaptation "They must *adapt* to the country where they are" "They stick together, they don't mix with others"	*Bilateral adaptation* "Keep your identity but respect other people's identity too" "In our culture until very recently, a woman was not allowed to enter a church if she wasn't wearing stockings and veil" "When we're abroad we also tend to stick together"
Lazy – marginal - visible immigration "People out on the street all day, drinking"	*Productive – invisible immigration* "We should differentiate between immigrants a bit more"; "When we talk of immigration we do not do so in the positive sense"
Delinquent immigration "They have come here to commit crimes"	*Stigmatised immigration* "Crimes have always happened" "We shouldn't highlight nationality but behaviour"

REPORT 3: NATIONAL EXPERTS FORUMS COMPREHENSIVE REPORT (FINLAND, IRELAND, PORTUGAL, SPAIN, SWEDEN)

3.1. The National Experts Forums in the context of the Living Together Project.

The *Living Together Project* (LT) has, as its general aim, the promotion of a European discourse of tolerance, based on the generation of arguments of conviviality and respect, recognition of the difference and construction of a European citizenship far away from any manifestation of racism and xenophobia. Four specific objectives have oriented the field work put in practice: 1) the study (via *focus groups*) of social discourses about immigration and ethnic minorities present in the general population of the European countries involved in the LT project; 2) a catalogue of *"best practices"* for archiving and disseminating initiatives to fight against racism, xenophobia and discrimination based on ethnic or national origin; 3) the elaboration (via *national experts forums*) of a *Decalogue* of *citizenship, tolerance and dialogue* that neutralize racist and xenophobic discourses and be of help to diverse social agents; 4) the creation of a transnational mechanism for monitoring and reaction against *new racist discourses.*

For the elaboration of the mentioned *Decalogue* we have presented, in the experts forums, the results obtained in the focus groups with general population. The arguments and counterarguments emerging in the focus groups were contrasted with the points of view of various experts, representatives of different sectors from the social and political life. A national expert's forum has been celebrated in each of the following partners' locations: Finland, Ireland, Portugal, Spain and Sweden[13].

---

13 With the exception of Ireland, whose national forum (more focused on stereotyping) followed some special guidelines; the rest of the countries had common criteria for the composition of national expert forums. In sum, one expert from each capital city of the partner countries; two experts from university or research centres; two experts from NGOs; one expert from national/ regional public administration; one from the business sector; one expert on mass media broadcasting or publicity campaigns; one on trade unions activities; and one on political parties in the opposition. Other recommended common references for the composition of those forums were indicated in the methodological documents shared by all partners.

3.2. *National Expert Forums´* preliminary reactions to the LT Project and to the general population discourses

Finland

According to the *Report of the Expert Forum in Finland*, from the *Ministry of the Interior* of this country, participants received beforehand a double background material: a) the analysis of the three focus groups designed within the *LT project*; b) an additional discourse analysis on racist discourse on the Internet, produced by the (project partner), *Finnish League for Human Rights*. It is remarked a (negative, especially on Internet platforms) change in the public debate on immigration during the last year; a new context emerged after: the success of the populist *True Finns' party* in the October 2008 elections, international financial crisis and increase of the number of asylum seekers in Finland.

It was suggested a debater tool providing counter-arguments on the Internet platforms[14] (for channels and styles of communication have changed: "different social-economic groups can only be reached through different messages and different channels"). It is discussed, who is the target of the Decalogue, its nature and approach (see full report).

A methodological controversy is also reported: suspicion that both the focus group technique and the analysis of Internet platforms have weaknesses. The former "would probably not be as productive as in countries with a more direct and open argumentation culture"[15]; the latter because "those with negative attitudes are active and others do not seem to bother participate in the discussion"[16], relating immigration issues. In terms of substantive results:

> Discourses that were dominant in Focus Groups, i.e. employment, integration, tolerance did not come up on the Internet at all. Instead, central arguments that came up on the platforms can be divided under following discourses: *"Immigrant identity vs. Finnish identity", "Immigrants' behaviour does not fit to Finland", "Immigrants' culture does not fit to Finland", "Somali people have better rights", "Politicians are guilty", "Immigrants are racist", and "Criticism towards immigration is not racism".*

---

[14] In relation to the increase of the *internet racism*, it is cited the "stigmatization of the Somali community", towards whom "large part of negative attitudes against immigration is canalized".

[15] "The Finns tend to stick to politically correct discourse when it comes to controversial topics".

[16] And, among other methodological problems, "their socio-economic status the basis of their attitudes remains unknown".

Ireland

In the case of the Irish partner no qualitative field with focus groups was done and, then, the national expert forum did not follow the common methodology to which Finland, Portugal, Spain and Sweden adhered. The Irish forum was organized by the Equality Authority with the support of European Network against Racism (ENAR) Ireland; and was oriented towards "tackling racism and the impact of racist stereotypes". A keynote speaker, Chair of the Fundamental Rights Agency and Head of Department of Applied Social Studies, National University of Ireland, provided an overview of racism in the Irish context. Three themes, followed by discussion, were presented: 1) by a Belfast City Council representative, on creating an evidence base to document and monitor racism; 2) by an academic sociologist, on journalism as a tool for countering racism; 3) by the Coordinator of ENAR Ireland, on generating best practice tools for policy and practice.

The expert forum report contains a summary of points for the Decalogue ("those on which there was strong consensus") that will be considered below.

Portugal

According to the report from the High Commission for Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue (ACIDI, I.P), in general terms the focus groups results correspond to the knowledge held by the experts based on racism and discrimination in Portuguese society. One of the most surprising results for the forum participants was the choice, "in all but the medium high status focus group", of the Chinese as the best integrated minority in Portugal. The result most expected by experts being the identification of the Roma as the most discriminated group.

Some experts from the university remarked the adequacy of the focus group methodology to reveal something that normally is silenced in surveys (the prejudice being expressed vs. the denied but existing racism in Portuguese society). And a representative of SOS Racism, referred to the ongoing economic crisis as a circumstance affecting the level of racism especially on the lower strata of society, where the "relative deprivation discourse" is now gaining force.

Spain

Once the main results from the three focus groups done in Spain (May 2009) were presented in brief by professors from the University Complutense of Madrid, the first invited speaker posed (among others) the question "To whom the Decalogue is addressed?" This matter was focused once and again along the *Forum*. The question, nevertheless, went together with the recognition of immigration rejection by some of the autochthonous population, as a kind of *"cultural humus"* (according to the recent study and to others made in Spain). At the same time, it was affirmed that those discourses (more unfavourable) are trying to be counterbalanced by others that speak of "cultural wealth", and "we were also emigrants"; but without knowing if these arguments are really shared. Both positive and negative arguments are present in the general population and became a starting point of controversy or further reflection among the experts reunited.

It was also remarked that the current economic crisis context makes political action more imperative. Initiatives such as the Decalogue (and other components of the *LT Project*) are justified by the "need to work on the field of awareness raising and mutual understanding" (*Madrid City Council*); and of "focusing which way to go" (*Barcelona Delegation*), meaning by that the specification of procedures to be developed from every area of political-administrative action. These and the rest of participants suggested and discussed a series of proposals of action, distinguishing areas, and linking them to the negative and positive discourses nowadays circulating in Spanish society on immigration and ethnic minorities. We list them below under the next heading.

Sweden

According to the Expert Forum Final Report from the *Centre against Racism* in Sweden, the invited speakers expressed various reactions to the focus groups results obtained with Swedish autochthonous population. Most stressed being the false discourse of "individual tolerance" by focus groups participants, as a consequence of a hegemonic political correctness spread all over Swedish society in relation to the racism and discrimination topic ("Even if individuals may hold prejudiced opinions, they will not say so, but will speak in a socially accepted manner"; "people deny the existence of

racism and discrimination in their attitudes and in their work")[17]. Experts gave numerous examples, reflections or interpretations of "discrimination and racism in Sweden, taking place in practice":

- Women's rights organizations treating immigrant women in a stereotypical fashion;

- Denial of racism and discrimination among social researchers;

- Denial that Swedish (and other European countries) historical heritage also includes the historical racist discourses and terminology, something that today is avoided or selectively remembered;

- Swedish denial of racism interpreted as an "extension of the Lutheran tradition of personal purity" (impurity, ugliness being projected to others);

- Plans and policies against racism seldom put in practice or followed up;

- "A tendency to treat immigrants as experts on immigrant questions, without seeing immigrants' other competencies and skills":

- Recent media tactic to write about the Swedish extreme right party as the only source of political racism, while xenophobic opinions expressed by other parties are left without consequences.

After this debate came a proposal of strategies and arguments to address racism and discrimination in Sweden, in order to contribute to the Decalogue (see below).

3.3. National Expert Forums contributions to the LT Project Decalogue.

Sweden

The experts reunited in the Swedish forum proposed both arguments and strategies to address and tackle racism and discrimination in Sweden. The authors of the forum report divided into 7 major areas such contributions, presenting them with the Decalogue aim in mind.

---

[17] "Sweden is a country where racism is exercised in a very subtle, elegant, soft manner, and that there is a need to speak about power, about how people are viewed and treated and about inequality".

Table 1

Swedish contributions to the *Decalogue on citizenship, tolerance and dialogue*

Swedish Expert Forum 7 major argument areas for the *Decalogue*	EXPERTS ARGUMENTS/DISCOURSES (-) COUNTERARGUMENTS (+)	EXPERTS STRATEGIES PROPOSALS
AREA **1** **Naming the problem** "The Swedish challenge: naming the problem"	- The *silence discourse*: denial of racism + *Discrimination* exists. It is done by ordinary people in Swedish everyday life + Race matters and leads to *discrimination* of visible minorities (Black people…)	➢ Challenging the **silence** in the Swedish society on all levels ➢ **Calling** *discrimination* and *racism* their right names ➢ Development of **methods** and **tools** (*situation testing* …) to identify and present excellent proof that racist incidents have taken place
AREA **2** **Labour market**	- *Structural* racial/ethnic discrimination + Many public authorities want to find a way to employ without discrimination	➢ Independent **labour market monitoring** by agencies with resources and power position to demand explanations when immigrants are not employed ➢ Development of **tools** that can be used to eradicate labour *discrimination* ➢ Offer employers **courses** in **antidiscrimination law** so that they know what rules apply
AREA **3** **Mass media**	- Media tactics of *silence discourse* or the only source of political racism + The problem of denial or visibility starts by the refusal to name the phenomenon	➢ Campaign for **refusing to watch** the mainstream TV-channels unless they address the question of *racism* and *stereotypes* ➢ Alternative minority and **immigrant Medias** should be given importance
AREA **4** **Legal Sphere**	- *Institutional racism* due to lacking or bad legislation/administration practice	➢ Reporting and persecution of racist incidents with **legal instruments** ➢ Recognize the **different groups** that are subjected to different forms of *racism* (including the role played by gender in its expression)
AREA **5**	- The political sphere in Sweden is characterized by a *rhetoric of antiracism* as a	➢ Stop looking at extreme right groups as the only source of *racism* and start investigating own

Political Sphere	core category in the *political discourse of correctness*	politics among the **established political parties**
AREA **6** **Public space/public discourse**	+ Adequate language in public places: the public needs information on what is ok and what is *racist* to say… + Importance of organizations, which receive complaints of *discrimination*	➤ "The power handbook": concrete tool for NGOs to address various **racist discourses** (includes common racist arguments and counter-arguments individuals can use to retort) ➤ Those who are subjected to *discrimination* and *racism* can get their **rights acknowledged**
AREA **7** **Research and education**	- Research and recognition of racism historical roots still pending + Swedish society *potential self-critical discourse* [*social reflexivity*, either induced or autonomous] *Education* is a useful tool as long as people are willing to open up for a dialogue and admit that there is a problem	➤ Youth education to address stereotypes and **change stereotypical views** of the world ➤ Educational efforts to provide information about the **antidiscrimination law** to different organizations, state, private and NGOs ➤ **Education** about the historical roots to *racism* and how it is differentiated depending on which **vulnerable group** the focus is on

Spain

In the report of the Spanish expert forum eight major areas are distinguished, where political action and arguments oriented to achieve intercultural conviviality are interlaced. As special forum contributions, various Decalogue core principles were proposed to set its foundations (equality of treatment and opportunities; human dignity, equality of rights, respect, tolerance, diversity appreciation, and civism; social cohesion, social participation, citizenship). Notice also that the areas of argumentation have a diverse anchorage in the sociological qualitative exploration through focus groups with Spanish people, or in the expert Forum.

Table 2
Spanish contributions to the *Decalogue on citizenship, tolerance and dialogue*

Spanish Expert Forum 8 major areas of argumentation	GENERAL POPULATION ARGUMENTS OR DISCOURSES (-/+)	EXPERT ARGUMENTS AND STRATEGIES OF POLITICAL

[cross-references added]		ACTION
AREA **1** **Legal** [See Swedish area 4; Irish areas 4 & 10]	- Immigrants are more aware of rights than obligations + Every human being has rights and obligations no matter the country of residence or belonging	o The *citizenship discourse*: citizens or persons *vs.* immigrants, legal equality of rights and obligations ➤ *Positive action*, preferable to *positive discrimination* ➤ An *antiracist* and for **victims protection law** is proposed. (There is a Spanish equality law, but it deals only with gender; we should have an extension of it or a new one dealing with racism)
AREA **2** **Labour area** [See Swedish area 2; Portuguese forum argument 10]	- The **discourse of *unfair labour competition*** and lack of control by the authorities ("They take *jobs* that the Spanish do not want *under those conditions*"; "they only benefit employers and put workers at a disadvantage") + *Humanist argument* (utopian) of the **borderless world** ("there should be no need for an immigration policy") or references to Spaniards working abroad + "Many of the jobs taken by foreigners are the ones the Spanish don't want"	➤ **A priority** field of action due to the **immigration-work-integration** relation ➤ Transmit the idea of "**control**" (immigration fluxes, labour conditions) ➤ Disseminate the idea that **immigrants contribute** to economic growth, as both workers and consumers ➤ They do not take away jobs or get wages down: for "they do the jobs we do not want to do" or "they get the wages employers pay"; we **all** are **part** of the **labour market** ➤ "Take advantage of **immigrant population potentialities**" (specially certain education levels): as opposed to the feeling of *competition* and combined to **everybody rights to compete** and improve living conditions
AREA **3** **Welfare State/ Public Services** [see Portuguese forum arguments 1 & 5]	- The constellation of arguments**:** *immigration as **burden**, **competition** for limited resources* and ***preference for** the native* ("they swallow public assistance and abuse of social services taking them away from Spaniards") - "They haven't paid for all this progress with their taxes, but they enjoy the benefits from day one"	➤ Our National Health System requires more funds, and it is collapsed by an **older population**, not by immigrants ➤ Strengthen the **Welfare State (investments)** and unmask the demagogy that blame immigrants for the deterioration of public services quality (investigations) ➤ **Public expenditure** hasn't been **increased** to cope with the

	+ "Over the years, as immigrants live and work in Spain and have kids (...) they will receive the same as they are contributing" + "Aiding to immigrants is an investment that stays in Spain and results in a benefit for Spanish society as a whole"	necessities of a growing population ➢ **Strengthen local government** intervention (**more funds** for social integration)
AREA **4** **Life together** (neighbourhoods, schools, work) [see Portuguese forum argument 3 & 4[18]]	- "They make you racist": laws and conviviality (bad behaviour and insecurity in neighbourhoods, appropriation of public places ...) + criticism of the *media* for the **negative image** they give of immigrants on these topics + There is good and bad behaviour also among Spaniards	➢ **Everyday life contexts** are the main axes of **action** for **immigrants' integration** ➢ **"Solidarity policies"** should avoid that the autochthonous population abandon the quarters where immigrants and ethnic minorities are concentrated
AREA **5** **Mass Media** [see Swedish area 3; Portuguese argument 9; Irish point 11]	- *Media* **reinforce** the immigration - delinquency association ("you hear it on TV") + Repeated criticism of the role of the *media* in **distorting the image** of immigration ("Sensationalism sells... and that's what the Spaniards like to hear". The plea: "keep a balance")	➢ **Biased treatment** of immigration by the mass media, contributing to the **stigma** of immigrants ➢ **Normalize diversity** and treat immigrants as **humans** (via TV series, media professionals training...) ➢ Their invisibility should finish and turn into **normalization** in the field of **publicity**, and others ➢ Promote a *positive action* in **castings**, without pretending to sell fiction
AREA **6** **Immigrants participation via associations**	No spontaneous arguments or discourses emerged in the *focus groups* with the general population	➢ It is suggested that **immigrants** get implied **(co-participate),** as any **member of society**, in the different areas of social life ➢ **Strengthen** the **cooperation** with institutions, associative movement inner leaders... ➢ Counterbalance the dependency from public benefits, increasing **immigrants' autonomy**

---

[18] The Portuguese *forum* argument on territorial normativity may be invoked here too

AREA **7** **Empathy:** **"place oneself in the other´s shoes"** Opposing images of our emigration past and our immigration present: the Spanish *reflective society* [see Sweden area 7; Portugal arguments 1, 2, 3, 4,10]	Historical memory: **Spanish emigration as discourse** (positive and negative, recurrent and reflective arguments emerging spontaneously in focus groups): - Spaniards abroad adapted to the customs of the countries they went - "We, Spaniards, emigrated with a contract, they come with no papers and in open boats or kayaks" + "We also were emigrants" + We´ve been victims of stigmatization in some countries ("I was called a black head in Sweden")	➢ The **Spanish emigration remembrance** may have "a value of generating solidarity" depending on the people, the format and elaboration of that historical memory ➢ **Abroad emigration** (to Germany, France, Switzerland and so on) and also the **inner migration collective memory** to the great urban centres ➢ Transmit the message that equals **immigration** to development and opportunity (included the construction of new identities); and see it as a **historical or universal phenomenon** (humans as one specie on earth)
AREA **8** **Knowledge – Education** [see Sweden area 7; Ireland 2, 3, 6 & 8]	The view (by some people) of immigration as a "problem" has a counter-argument (by others) that it is a *question of image*, of *stereotypes* and *prejudices*, which can be corrected through *education, conviviality* and knowledge…	➢ Youth and public employees training for the **preventive awareness raising** and understanding of the *other* ➢ Education for **counteracting immigrants´ racism** too ➢ Knowledge and reception of **best practices** from other countries

Portugal

The report from the *High Commission for Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue* (ACIDI) reflects the Portuguese expert forum comments to ten selected major racist arguments drawn from the focus groups done in Portugal. Experts were asked to contribute with counterarguments both of an intellectual and political nature. Here we extract a portion of that contribution. For a comprehensive list of examples of every racist argument, their respective refutations, tools already available in Portugal to combat them and counter-arguments proposed by the experts see the extraordinary *Minutes of the Portuguese expert forum.*

Table 3

Portuguese contributions to the *Decalogue on citizenship, tolerance and dialogue*

Portuguese Expert Forum 10 major racist arguments from general population focus groups	EXPERTS´ COUNTERARGUMENTS (o) AND AVAILABLE TOOLS (**AT**)
1 **The parasitism argument** "[Immigrants are] parasites on society" [see Spain area 3 & 7]	o The vast majority of social integration income **beneficiaries are not Roma**. Many of these ideas are false. We need to deconstruct them. There is abuse everywhere and members of every group abuse. o It would be useful to make very clear that there is no *affirmative action* in Portugal or positive discrimination towards certain groups. Social benefits such as **RSI are for everybody** who is in serious economic need. o Mainstream the Portuguese informal practices to contrast to the stereotype that only immigrant and Roma groups do so (e.g. **Portuguese**[19] working in cafés, for instance, also don't give a receipt to every client. And we don't ask for it). o Facts and numbers on the economic **contribution of immigrants** for society can be used to persuade the more educated public. o We should make the calculation and disseminate info on the **contribution / benefit ratio** of migrants' relation with Social Security. **AT:** Various *Immigration Observatory* publications related to the **economical contribution of immigrants** to Portuguese society are cited in the document *Minutes of the Portuguese experts forum.*

[19] Reflective argument. Notice that this kind of arguments is spread all over the other arguments.

2 **The indolence argument** (Some minorities shy away from work) [see Spain area 7]	o The same is said of **the emigrated Portuguese** in their host countries. Still, the productivity of Luxembourgish work force, a considerable share of which is composed of Portuguese emigrants, is one of the greatest in the planet. o The **working conditions** on the side of immigrants are probably more fragile and this may lead to **lower productivity**. o To **inform public opinion,** put up a campaign showing migrants working on non-stereotyped jobs, being careful to represent people and not categories (by diversifying their economic roles). o Someone who becomes a labour migrant is strongly oriented towards work and savings, as we know from the example of **Portuguese emigrants** everywhere. **AT:** Although not specifically targeted at the general public, several publications document the **industriousness of migrants** (see the *Minutes of the Portuguese experts forum*).
3 **The territorial normativity argument** "They should go back to their countries…" [see Spain[20] area 4 & 7]	o Show the emigration and **immigration numbers** (the former is much larger than the latter). o If people all went back to their birthplace the **Portuguese resident population** will rise by 50% and the country will collapse. o To remind people that almost all of us are displaced relatively to our place of birth (e.g. people coming from different cities and/or **Portuguese villages** that move to big cities). o Show that the **country needs immigrants**. o The clear historic trend towards globalization, porous boundaries and human fluxes denies the allegedly **'natural' character of being** in one's place of birth. o It is important not to **confuse ethnicity and birthplace**. Many **ethnic minority** youngsters were **born in Portugal**. **AT:** "Nós" (We), a TV show that results from a partnership between ACIDI and the 2: a public TV channel (…) committed to integration, it strongly emphasizes the **benefits of cultural diversity**.
4 **The criminality argument** (Minorities have a higher propensity to crime)	o To show to people **how unlikely** it is to **assume** that someone might leave their home and family to pursue **a criminal career** abroad. o To provide contextualized numbers (i.e., caeteris paribus on a series of social factors) to understand what is behind the apparent higher rates of criminality among foreigners when **compared to natives**. o To raise awareness of the **social factors** (not ethnic) that promote **crime** and vandalism. But we must be careful not to do away with personal responsibility. o The justice system is perhaps biased on condemnations and is

---

[20] The invasion argument was also present in Spain, and also myths and facts Portugal first one.

[see Spain area 4 & 7]	certainly so on remand in custody. **AT:** Immigration Observatory studies of the relation between nationality and the judiciary system, which provide contextualized comparisons that help dispelling the **myth of a greater incidence of criminality** in the foreign population and actually hint at some **discrimination** within the system itself.
5 **The *relative deprivation* argument** (Minorities are somehow being privileged: "They come here and they immediately have support, help with everything...") [see Spain area 3]	o The notion of **relative deprivation** as being concerned mostly with comparison one's own lot with that of others was criticized in favour of a definition structured on the notion of cost/benefit or **investment/return ratio**. And, given this other definition, the argument becomes similar enough to that of **parasitism** for an aggregation to make sense. o The use of **discrimination testing** in the housing market and the dissemination of its results was advocated. o Immigrants **contribute more** than they take from social security. o Migrants actually **work more** and **earn less**. **AT:** Some of the existing studies even suggest that Roma and immigrants **need** more equitable and **fairer conditions** in the access to **social services** (*Minutes of the Portuguese experts´ forum*).
6 **The *sexual competition* argument** (Migrant women, namely Brazilian women, are more aggressive sexual competitors than their autochthonous counterparts)	o Given that many of the women who are the main characters of the real life situations that originate this folklore are **victims of human trafficking**, "sexual competition" is actually a misnomer and this designation should be avoided in the dissemination of the project results. The designation 'sexual stigma' was proposed. o Their role as **victims** should be stressed. o To show that **mixed marriages** are **common** everywhere (the mere availability of a vast number of potential spouses from the majority makes the probability of a migrant marrying an autochthon go up). **AT:** There are some tools produced under ACIDI' Immigration Observatory that are already available to combat this argument (*Minutes of the Portuguese experts forum*).
7 **The *victims' culpability* argument** (Minorities are somehow responsible for their own	o It would be heuristically useful to analyze separately the **Roma** and the immigrants. o This is particularly difficult to counter because, regarding the **Roma**, everybody, including themselves, believes that they have **no desire to integrate**. **AT:** The studies aimed at detecting the ideas and images that the Portuguese and immigrant population have of each other in various aspects of their lives can be instrumental in combating this argument. Once again several useful studies can be identified in the Immigration Observatory publications (see references in *Minutes of the Portuguese*

discrimination)	*experts' forum*).
8 **Multiple discrimination: status effects** (Discrimination is not so much based on phenotypes or culture as on **social strata**)	o This time slot was originally reserved for the geoclimatic argument but, given that only one example of this kind of argument was found in the focus groups, we opted to replace its discussion by one of whether the allegations made by the upper-middle status group that discrimination is not so much based on phenotypes as on education and manners could be taken at face value or if such allegations might be just the **rationalization of a more unacceptable prejudice**. o As time was becoming scarce and forum participants were finding it hard to see the point, this section was skipped. **AT:** ACIDI brochure named "44 ideas to promote **tolerance** and celebrate **diversity**"
9 **The *fanaticism* argument** (All members of a religious category are fundamentalists) [see Swedish area 3; Spanish area 5; Irish point 11[21]]	o The **religious literacy** on the **mass media** must be improved. The import of international concerns related to **Islamic groups** throughout the media should be contextualized by its inexistence in **Portuguese public opinion** concerns. o Not all Islam is fundamentalist. Islam is **a religion of peace**. o The sheikh at the Lisbon mosque is actually a strong proponent of **interreligious dialogue**. **AT:** ACIDI brochure named "44 ideas to promote **tolerance** and celebrate **diversity**"
10 **The economic competition argument** (Migrants are taking away jobs and lowering wages: *labour area*) [see Swedish area 2; Spanish area 2 & 7]	o He/she who is **exploited** is a victim. o Who actually profits from underpaid labour are **unscrupulous employers**. o The **labour inspection** should do more. o Everyone, migrant or Portuguese, is covered by the laws that **regulate labour**. o The ethnic Portuguese population **benefits** from the **low price** of products and services. o The argument that the **Portuguese emigrants** suffer with this abroad is always crucial (remember the *'British jobs for British workers'* affair). o Migrants come to occupy **jobs** for which the **Portuguese have no use**. o Perhaps **a campaign** with employers stating how they **need migrant workers**. AT: ACIDI brochure *"Myths and Facts about Immigration"*.

---

[21] Although in these countries the argument was more focused on mass media role.

Ireland

The Irish expert forum report contains, as already said, a summary of points for the *Decalogue* ("those on which there was strong consensus" among the experts reunited). No *ad hoc* and updated arguments drawn from the general population via focus groups were used as prompts in the expert forum. Nevertheless, the *forum* shares the objectives of the *Living Together Project* and makes the following contribution to the *Decalogue*.

Table 4
Irish contributions to the *Decalogue on citizenship, tolerance and dialogue*

Irish Expert Forum 12 major points on racism [cross-references added]	EXPERTS´ DIAGNOSIS AND PROPOSALS OF POLITICAL ACTION FOR "TACKLING RACISM AND THE IMPACT OF RACIST STEREOTYPES"
1 **New challenges in a new context**	➢ Changes to the Irish **equality and inclusion infrastructure** present us with new challenges in a context of **increasing demand for support** and **solidarity** driven by recessionary conditions within which racism thrives. The future is in the present - within these new parameters, the measure of our effectiveness is our approach to fixing the problem.
2 **Victim centred definition of racism**	➢ The importance of a **victim** centred **definition of racism** needs to be recognised.
3 **Naming all forms of racism** [see Swedish area 1]	➢ We need to name racism in **all** its guises at individual and institutional level. ➢ We need to recognise and confront personal, individual and institutional **racism**.
4 **Legal proposal (I)** [see Spanish area 1, Sweden area 4]	➢ We need a **legislative framework** that distinguishes between racist incidents and crimes.
5 **Racism archives** [see Swedish 1 & 2 areas; Spanish area 1]	➢ It is imperative that we develop a comprehensive, reliable **monitoring system** that incorporates trust building with victims and a systematic approach to reporting disaggregated data. ➢ We need to act on statistics while remaining sensitive to data protection considerations.

6 **Keep racism on the agenda and more…**	➢ There is a need for partnership and solidarity between those on the ground, NGOs and mainstream bodies to **keep racism on the agenda**, deepen the analysis and build on the good work of the NCCRI, Equality Authority, academics, community groups and NGOs which have led the efforts in this area.
7 **Approach proposal to good practice**	➢ We need to recognise that **good practice** exists and can be found both in NGOs and mainstream and/or statutory organisations. We also need to recognise there is not a fixed approach to good practice; what is needed is **a holistic**, integrationist, blended **approach** that balances mainstream approaches with targeted approaches as necessary.
8 **Qualitative research and archive of racism experience and ethnic diversity**	➢ We need to listen to and elevate the authentic voices of those experiencing racism. We also need to create a **non-judgmental research space** that listens to the voices of those who struggle with or are challenged by cultural and ethnic diversity.
9 **From *integration discourse* to *respect culture* and *diversity recognition***	➢ We need to acknowledge the tension between the state and civil society, which implies explicitly linking redistribution and inclusion and moving from a discourse of integration to a **culture of respect** and **recognition of diversity** and conditions that promote equitable outcomes.
10 **Legal proposal (II) and better archival probing** [see Spanish area 1, Sweden area 4]	➢ We need leadership on a number of levels. Leadership from government should incorporate clear legal lines about what is unacceptable and a framework for reporting and responding to racist incidents. We need leadership from the *"Gardai"* (Irish police) in terms of developing a culture of fairness and impartiality, building trust and confidence in the system so that the conditions to encourage the **reporting of racist incidents** are in place.
11 **Mass media role** [see Swedish area 3; Spanish area 5]	➢ We need leadership from the **media** and we need to exploit the powerful role the media can play in **promoting positive images** of diversity and **challenging stereotypes**. ➢ We need to recognise the difficulties around free and hate speech.

Finland

The experts reunited in the Finnish forum proposed raw material in relation to the elaboration of the LT Project Decalogue. The authors of the forum report divided into 3 major areas of xenophobic and racist argumentation the contributions collected. Below

there is an attempt to link this material with the rest of the countries´ proposals. We first reproduce some fragments from the conclusion note in the expert forum report:

> "…the Forum concentrated more on discussing where the debate takes place and who is determining the discourses, and how to respond to this, than actually producing concrete counter-arguments (…) Finally, it was seen as difficult to produce valid counter-arguments that would adequately and effectively answer to all types of negative arguments of immigration. That is why the Forum recommended the project to concentrate on finding a way to produce constructive and positive pieces of reality, based on which the reader can build his/her own counter-arguments".

Table 5
Finnish contributions to the *Decalogue on citizenship, tolerance and dialogue*

Finnish Expert Forum 3 major areas of xenophobic and racist argumentation	EXPERTS´ CONTRIBUTIONS
AREA 1 *Employment and integration* [see Spanish area 1: citizenship and equal treatment discourse; Minutes of the Portuguese expert forum; Ireland point 1]	➢ The City of Helsinki has mainstreamed the immigrants' services into normal service structure (...) based on the idea that **immigrants are citizens** of the city, **equal to** any other customer, with individual needs. ➢ **Terminology** (immigrant, multi-culturalism, tolerance etc.) was discussed and noted that it is a **problematic** issue, since it often creates boundaries, and may even produce false information if it does not correspond to the phenomenon which it is describing, or is outdated. All participants seemed to agree that basically it is a good thing that in services structure the **human beings** are lifted to the **centre of attention**, without underlining their ethnic background.

AREA 2 **Criminality and Public safety** [see Sweden area 7; Spain areas 4 & 8; Portugal argument 4]	➢ Despite the common presumption, the immigrants do not actively seek housing in areas with high presence of ethnic minorities, but in most cases they do not have a choice (…) It was seen that a valid counter argument for fear of ghettos with high immigrant populations would be that people living there actually like to live there and **enjoy the multicultural atmosphere**. In Sweden there seem to be housing areas with high proportions of ethnic minorities, but against general assumption the young generations manage to acquire education and find their places in the society. A key to this development is the resources that are given to the schools. In Finland this discussion is only starting, but it is a topical issue.
AREA **3** **Multi-culturalism i.e. everyday encounters**	➢ Discussion on e-Government and on how **Finnish public officers at local, regional and national level should participate in public discussions** (e.g. officers at all ministries should use a certain amount of their working time **on the Internet**, participating in public debates, correcting false information etc.) All actual **information** should be easily available on the **Internet**, in an easy-to-read format.

REPORT 4: A TRANSNATIONAL PROPOSAL OF A DECALOGUE ON CITIZENSHIP, TOLERANCE AND DIALOGUE

As a final step in the elaboration process of the *LT Project Decalogue*, all project partners have been asked to contribute with a selection of what they consider the three most important principles, arguments and counterarguments, strategies of action. This has been a complementary way to identify and validate the top ten elements of the Decalogue. In the following draft proposal we summarize the various contributions collected in this from-bottom-to-up and participatory or collaborative approach put in practice along the execution of the *LT Project*.

Nature and *scope* of the Decalogue.

These issues (nature and scope) were especially debated during the interim meeting celebrated in Stockholm (2009, November 12-13th), where all project partners could share the results from the focus groups, experts forums and best practices of each country. A need to blend *social discourses* and *political action* was recognized ("*words are not enough but they are necessary*"). The *Decalogue* is conceived that should be composed of: 1) *principles* or ideals; 2) *social beliefs* expressed by the general population in relation to immigration and ethnic minorities (arguments denoting xenophobia or xenophilia); 3) *counterarguments* or refutations to racist or xenophobic discourses that experts from different areas could offer; 4) strategies of possible actions, *best practices* or tools available to fight and prevent all forms of xenophobia and racism. The importance of *prevention* is also stressed and related to the core principles of *citizenship, tolerance* and *dialogue.*

To who is the Decalogue addressed has become a most debated issue. A predominant view is that the *Decalogue* should be addressed to a wide range of users: from policymakers, NGOs, teachers, journalists to the general population (either autochthonous or foreigners). And it was also clarified that *"it is directed to all areas, not only that of employment or Islamophobia"*. Even though the Decalogue is directed to all areas, it should be mentioned the importance to dedicate specific efforts to identify, describe and propose concrete measures against very concrete forms of discrimination such as racism towards the Roma or discrimination towards Muslims and Jews.

[22]. Although it is finally reminded the need of a strategic document, as a first idea of the LT Project; and also that the document is in the context of the European Union. For this context we need materials like this document: a useful network tool[23] for politicians and also for administrations in the EU context. There are other tools for the day-to-day awareness of racism and fighting xenophobia.

A strategic and transnational *Decalogue* for a plurality of users with one aim: preventing all forms of xenophobia and racism.

After all this (very briefly narrated) process of gathering contributions from different countries and partners within these countries, an operation of synthesis has been accomplished with the presentation format of a *Decalogue*. Its final composition has adopted a two hands structure. One based on a more elaborated discourse emerged from the experts forums; that is, five points around which the experts reunited in several EU countries showed strong and recurrent consensus. The other handful of issues have emerged mainly from the focus groups with general population and sum up a redundant set of primary discourses on immigration and ethnic minorities. Nevertheless, and especially for these latter set of arguments, we follow the structure of presenting a racist or xenophobic argument. Afterwards, the counterarguments found, both in the general population or the experts discourse, are listed. And finally the measures or strategies of political action proposed by experts are annotated.

Decalogue summary
1. Identifying principles on which good or best practices should be based.
2. Naming and recognizing all forms of racism and xenophobia as problems.
3. Documenting and monitoring racism and xenophobia.
4. Identifying effective legal remedies, policy actions, educational programs and best practice approaches.
5. Fostering Mass Media role in promoting the respect of culture and the recognition of diversity.
6. Recognising the economic, social and cultural contribution of immigrants.

---

[23] "Ours should be a network similar to a think-tank, only thinking about new racist discourses and new arguments. So may be a network completely compatible with the existing networks. It should be a think-tank network: watching about new arguments and new racist discourses. A network adding institutions, experts, academics, etc"

7. Designing public services taking into consideration the needs of society.
8. Promoting principles of respect and dialogue, seeing cultural diversity as enrichment.
9. Moving from stereotypes to "living together".
10. Seeing migration as a universal phenomenon. Europeans were immigrants. The reflective argument: emigration memory of current immigrant societies.

1/10. Identifying principles on which good or best practices should be based.

The current circumstances of economic crisis have changed the previous context lived in the past years all around the world, in both sending and receiving migrants' societies. The new situation has been registered in the discourses produced within the *Living Together Project*; not only during the national experts' forums but also when conducting the focus groups with general population pertaining to diverse social positions. As it was recorded by one the *Project* partners, "equality and inclusion infrastructure" faces "new challenges in a context of increasing demand for support and solidarity driven by recessionary conditions within which racism thrives" (Irish forum organized by the Equality Authority with the support of European Network against Racism (ENAR) Ireland)[24].

In the case of Spain, as it has been already noticed, various *Decalogue* core principles were proposed by the experts reunited at the national forum. The principle of *equality* (with specifications such as "legal equality of rights and obligations", "equality of treatment and opportunities") gathered strong consensus. Special mentions to the classical principle of *human dignity*[25] or the more recent of *social cohesion* and *social participation* were also made. And references to other related principles with a double anchorage (in the experts discourse and the general population discourses) were recorded as well: *respect*, *tolerance*, *diversity appreciation*, and *civism*. Finally, although more common in the discourse of experts, politicians or mass media

---

[24] Although mainly referred to the case of Ireland, the national forum report of this country makes a remark on the need to keep racism on the agenda and more: "There is a need for partnership and solidarity between those on the ground, NGOs and mainstream bodies to keep racism on the agenda, deepen the analysis and build on the good work of the NCCRI, Equality Authority, academics, community groups and NGOs which have led the efforts in this area".

[25] A combination of the principles of human dignity and equality emerged in the Spanish qualitative research with focus groups when the xenophobic perception expressed by some Spaniards of immigrants as being "more aware of rights than obligations" was counterbalanced by other Spaniards with the statement: "Every *human being* has rights and obligations no matter the country of residence or belonging".

communicators, the principle of *citizenship*[26] stands out as a holistic or comprehensive one. Moreover, a proposal of alternative denomination that should embrace newcomers or ethnic minorities is derived from it. Words such as c*itizens* or *persons* (instead of *immigrants*) form part of a new terminology that tries to take principles from its ideals or technical realms down into the practice of everyday life. In other words, making nationals out of immigrants (or citizens out of non-citizens) is the new horizon foreseen. Such transformation of the immigrant category implies rethinking the process of nation-building as historical and reversible; and acceptance by the majority population (Wimmer, 2007: 20) [27].

The principles of equality, citizenship, tolerance and the like have already being invoked and put into practice by some Finnish institutions, according to the information gathered in the national forum. The City of Helsinki has mainstreamed the immigrants' services into normal service structure. An initiative "based on the idea that **immigrants are citizens** of the city, **equal to** any other customer, with individual needs". All forum participants seemed to agree that in social services structures the "**human beings are lifted to the centre of attention**, without underlining their ethnic background".

The contribution by the (project partner) *Finnish League for Human Rights*, in relation to racist discourses on the Internet, may be linked to the current approaches to *citizenship* in the *digital culture* context or era[28].

The experts reunited in the Swedish forum made a self-critical remark that should be remind it by other European countries: the risk, in the political sphere, of the *rhetoric of antiracism* or the *political discourse of correctness* and failing to put into practice the ideals or principles.

---

[26] See the *Strategic Plan for Citizenship and Integration 2007-2010,* promoted by the Spanish Government, where the principle of citizenship is defined as *"entailing the recognition of full civic, social, economic, cultural and political participation of immigrant men and women"*. English executive summary link: http://www.mtin.es/es/migraciones/Integracion/PlanEstrategico/Docs/PECIingles.pdf

[27] See "How (not) to Think about Ethnicity in Immigrant Societies. Toward a Boundary-Making Perspective" by *Andreas Wimmer, in* Karin Schittenhelm (ed.) (2007), Concepts and Methods in Migration Research, Conference Reader. Available at: www.cultural-capital.net

[28] An example in that direction is the Project *Euro-Med: Social Technology and Digital Citizenship*; set by the Euro-Mediterranean University Institute of Malta, in cooperation with the Complutense University of Madrid & EU Consortium and under the patronage of the Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation. A digital monitoring observatory available for public and private institutions interested in the area.

Finally, an extract from the experts' forum in Portugal is reproduced to illustrate the interrelation among *principles*, *policy measures* and general population *arguments* in everyday life.

Recommendation 1:

It is recommended by the authors of this report to facilitate the links to a series of international declarations or reports focusing on racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance. For example, to learn more on *citizenship*, *tolerance* and *dialogue* see:

- World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and related Intolerance, Durban, South Africa 2001   http://www.un.org/WCAR/

- Durban Review Conference, Geneva 2009 http://www.un.org/durbanreview2009/

- European Network Against Racism (ENAR) [see the series of reports for each country] http://www.enar-eu.org/Page_Generale.asp?DocID=15276&langue=EN

- European Year of Intercultural Dialogue. Together in Diversity. Resources http://www.interculturaldialogue2008.eu/

- Charter of fundamental rights of the European Union (2007/C 303/01) http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/unit/charte/index_en.html

- Declaration of Principles on Tolerance (UNESCO, 1995) http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13175&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

Recommendation 2:

It is recommended by the authors of this report to facilitate the links to a series of *best practices* where real applications of the mentioned principles can be seen.

2/10. Naming and recognizing all forms of racism and xenophobia as problems.

Although this second issue in this *Decalogue* proposal was reported as the first area of argumentation according to the Expert Forum Final Report from the *Centre against Racism* in Sweden[29], the topic has also emerged in other countries´ explorations within the *Living Together Project*. In the Stockholm forum it was stressed the existence of a false discourse of *"individual tolerance"* (as the illustrated in the focus groups

---

[29] The authors of the mentioned report used as area heading: "The Swedish challenge: naming the problem".

meetings), as a consequence of a hegemonic political correctness spread all over Swedish society in relation to the racism and discrimination topic.

- "Even if individuals may hold prejudiced opinions, they will not say so, but will speak in a socially accepted manner"

- "People deny the existence of racism and discrimination in their attitudes and in their work"

- "Sweden is a country where racism is exercised in a very subtle, elegant, soft manner, and that there is a need to speak about power, about how people are viewed and treated and about inequality"

In the last sentence it could be substituted the referred country with the name of many other European countries. There is also an intellectual and political recommendation: to deal with the racism question in terms of power relations among nations, races and so on.

Experts' diagnosis or argumentation:

- Immigrant societies suffer the syndrome of *the silence discourse* or the denial of racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance. This denial, which has relation to the historical heritage of European countries, also includes the historical racist discourses and terminology. Something that today tends to be avoided or selectively remembered.

- Discrimination exists; it is perpetrated and suffered by people and organizations, in many social levels and everyday life contexts.

- Race and ethnicity matters and leads to discrimination especially of visible minorities (Black people, the Roma and other ethnic or religious minorities).

Experts' strategies proposals for action:

- Challenging the *silence* in the European societies on all levels (Sweden)

- Calling all forms of *discrimination* and *racism* their right names (Swedish forum). Or, as verbalize in the Irish forum: "We need to name racism in all its guises at individual and institutional level", "we need to recognise and confront personal, individual and institutional racism".

- A victim centred definition of racism is also proposed ("The importance of a victim centred definition of racism needs to be recognised": Irish expert forum).

- Renaming terms by the people involved and in consonance with the purpose of the living together ideal. For instance: The word "immigrant" sounds negative (according to the reports from Finland and Spain); while *"new Finn"* [*uussuomalainen*] seems to be correct or *citizens* and *persons* preferred[30].

3/10. Documenting and monitoring racism and xenophobia.

The third point of this *Decalogue* derives from the *Living Together Project* objectives themselves (mainly the planned base of *best practices* collection) and has a special anchorage to the Irish forum organized by the Equality Authority with the support of the European Network against Racism (ENAR) in Ireland.

The first of three themes selected for discussion during this expert forum, oriented towards "tackling racism and the impact of racist stereotypes", was presented by a Belfast City Council representative, on creating an evidence base to document and monitor racism. At the same time, the need of research and archives has been pointed out by experts and partners reunited in the forums celebrated in other countries (Sweden, Spain, Portugal and Finland).

Experts' diagnosis or argumentation:

- Research and recognition of racism historical roots still pending (Sweden).

- In all European societies it seems to be a *potential self-critical discourse* (what social scientists called *social reflexivity*, which may be induced or autonomous).

Experts' strategies proposals for action:

- **Reliable and ethical archives of racism**. It is imperative that we develop a comprehensive and reliable **monitoring system** that incorporates **trust building** with victims; and a systematic approach to reporting **disaggregated data**. We

---

[30] In Spain expressions such as "the new Spaniards" or "the other Spaniards" have been used in the sociological literature. And from these and other sources (including the mass media) mixed terms denoting two nationalities or belongings can be found; e.g. "ecuatoespañoles" (Equato-Spaniards).

need to act on **statistics** while remaining **sensitive to data protection** considerations (Ireland);

- **Qualitative research and archive of racism experience and ethnic diversity**[31]. We need to listen to and elevate the authentic voices of those experiencing racism. We also need to create a non-judgmental research space that listens to the voices of those who struggle with or are challenged by cultural and ethnic diversity (Ireland);

- Development of **concepts, methods and tools** (*situation testing…*) to identify and present excellent proof that **racist incidents** have taken place (Sweden).

4/10. Identifying effective legal remedies, policy actions, educational programs and *best practice* approaches.

Parallel to the previous point and in convergence with the attention towards *best practices*, there is a research and archive proposal of anti-racism and xenophilia initiatives. Learning how to cope with racism and xenophobia may come also from the study of the opposite phenomenon. Examples of this line of research are in the *hispanophilia* showed by Latin-Americans towards Spaniards or the Argentinophilia felt by Spaniards towards Argentineans[32]. But there is as well a need to promote *legal tools* and *policy networks*, that had a special echo in the experts´ discourse of all countries.

Experts' diagnosis or argumentation:

- The absence of legal tools is behind some forms of racism, xenophobia and intolerance. A part of the so-called *institutional racism* is considered to be related to a bad legislation, a bad administration practice or lack of them all (Sweden, Spain).

- There is an extended discourse among the general population in the immigrants' societies holding the belief that *immigrants are more aware of rights than*

---

[31] It is recommended a kind of social research of a qualitative nature or methodology and with archival sensitivity. This means that the results of research on racism experience are reunited and made accessible in a document base or archive.

[32] The case of the so-called "invisible immigrants", referring to Europeans of Anglo-Saxon origin emigrating to North America may also be cited.

obligations. This argument, together with other more direct criticism of the legal systems, puts under suspicion the existing legal tools or its application.

- **Approach to good practice** (Irish forum).We need to recognize that good practice exists and can be found both in NGOs and mainstream and/or statutory organizations. We also need to recognize there is not a fixed approach to good practice. What is needed is a holistic, integrationist, blended approach that balances mainstream approaches with targeted approaches as necessary.

- The Finish Forum recommended the *LT Project* "to concentrate on finding a way to **produce constructive and positive pieces of reality**, based on which the reader can build his/her own counter-arguments".

- The view (by some people) of immigration as a "problem" has a counter-argument (by others) that it is a *question of image*, of *stereotypes* and *prejudices*, which can be corrected through *education, conviviality* and knowledge (Spain).

- Education is a useful tool as long as people are willing to open up for a dialogue and admit that there is a problem (Sweden).

Experts' strategies proposals for action:

- Recognize the different groups that are subjected to different **forms of racism** (including the role played by gender in its expression). Reporting and persecution of racist incidents with legal instruments (Sweden[33]).
- An antiracist and for **victims protection law** is proposed ("There is a Spanish equality law, but it deals only with gender; we should have an extension of it or a new one dealing with racism").
- We need a **legislative framework** that distinguishes between racist incidents and crimes (Ireland).

---

[33] Another action proposal and criticism from the forum of this country is: "Stop looking at extreme right groups as the only source of racism and start investigating own politics among the established political parties". The Swedish team have contributed with other formulations of polity measures such as: 1) To identify good practice in anti-racist and anti-discrimination practice at the grass root level in order to influence EU and national policies; 2) Increasing the participation of immigrants and vulnerable groups in the policy formulation of antidiscrimination and antiracist measures.

- **Legal and archival improvements**. We need **leadership** on a number of levels. Leadership from government should incorporate **clear legal lines** about what is unacceptable and a framework for reporting and responding to racist incidents. We need leadership from the Gardai (Irish police) in terms of developing a culture of fairness and impartiality, building trust and confidence in the system so that the conditions to encourage the reporting of racist incidents are in place.

- Three fronts of action proposed by the Swedish experts: 1) Youth education to address stereotypes and change stereotypical views of the world; 2) Educational efforts to provide information to different organizations (public, private and NGOs) about antidiscrimination laws; 3) Education about the historical roots to racism and how it is differentiated depending on which vulnerable group the focus is on.

- Youth and public employees training for the preventive sensitization and understanding of the *other* (Spain).

- Education for counteracting immigrants´ racism too (especially reported in Spain, Portugal and Finland).

- Knowledge and reception of best practices from other countries (Spain).

5/10. Fostering Mass Media role in promoting the respect of culture and the recognition of diversity.

The importance of paying attention to both edges of nowadays mass media technologies was already pointed out in the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance that took place in Durban, South Africa, from 31 August to 8 September 2001. The resulting Declaration contains some articles with recommendations referred both to *mass media* in general and the Internet in particular. Notice also references to the principles of tolerance, respect for human dignity, equality and non-discrimination among others.

> 88. We recognize that **the media should** represent the diversity of a multicultural society and play a role in fighting racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. In this regard we draw attention to the power of advertising;

> 89. We note with **regret that certain media**, by promoting false images and negative stereotypes of vulnerable individuals or groups of individuals, particularly of migrants and refugees, **have contributed to the spread of xenophobic and racist sentiments**

among the public and in some cases have encouraged violence by racist individuals and groups;

90. We recognize the **positive contribution** that the exercise of the right to freedom of expression, particularly **by the media and new technologies, including the Internet**, and full respect for the freedom to seek, receive and impart information can make to the fight against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance; we reiterate the need to respect the editorial independence and autonomy of the media in this regard;

91. We express **deep concern about the use of new information technologies**, such as the **Internet**, for purposes contrary to respect for human values, equality, non-discrimination, respect for others and tolerance, including to propagate racism, racial hatred, xenophobia, racial discrimination and related intolerance, and that, in particular, children and youth having access to this material could be negatively influenced by it;

92. We also recognize the **need to promote the use of new information and communication technologies, including the Internet**, to contribute to the fight against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance; new technologies can assist the promotion of tolerance and respect for human dignity, and the principles of equality and non-discrimination;

Experts' diagnosis or argumentation in the *Living Together Project*:

- There are mass media tactics of *silence discourse* or of focusing attention only to the extreme forms of political racism. And the problem of denial or visibility starts by the refusal to name the phenomenon properly (Sweden).

- The media reinforces the immigration-delinquency association ("you hear it on TV"). Repeated criticism of the role of the media in distorting the image of immigration ("Sensationalism sells... and that's what the Spanish like to hear"). The plea: "keep a balance"). Both extracts from focus groups celebrated in Madrid (Spain, May 2009).

- **Mass media and Islamophobia** (Lisbon forum[34]). The religious literacy on the mass media must be improved. The import of international concerns related to Islamic groups throughout the media should be contextualized by its inexistence

---

[34] In the more elaborated and detailed *Portuguese experts' forum report* this contribution is presented under the heading of *the fanaticism argument*. In the Decalogue proposed by Portugal, it is annotated for every racist argument one o more available tools (mainly social research publications as source of facts where expert counterarguments may be based). Another type of tools, conceived for a more ample audience and sensitization purposes, is the ACIDI brochure named "44 ideas to promote tolerance and celebrate diversity".

in Portuguese public opinion concerns. Islam is a religion of peace. The sheikh at the Lisbon mosque is actually a strong proponent of interreligious dialogue.

- **Mass media leadership and difficulties** (Dublin forum, October 2009). We need leadership from the media and we need to exploit the powerful role the media can play in promoting positive images of diversity and challenging stereotypes. We need to recognise the difficulties around free and hate speech.

Experts' strategies proposals for action:

- Campaign for refusing to watch the mainstream TV-channels unless they address the question of racism and stereotypes (Sweden).

- Alternative minority and immigrant mass media should be given importance (Sweden, Spain).

- Biased treatment of immigration by the mass media contributes to the stigmatization of immigrants. It is proposed to **normalize diversity and treat immigrants as humans** (via TV series, media professionals training...). Their invisibility should finish and turn into normalization in the field of publicity, and others, promoting a positive action in castings, without pretending to sell fiction. (Madrid forum).

6/10. Recognising the economic, social and cultural contribution of immigrants.

Except for case of the Irish partner, where no *ad hoc* qualitative field with focus groups was done within the *Living Together Project*, the attribution of unemployment or wages decrease to the arrival of immigrants is a constant feature in the general population discourses pulsed in Finland, Portugal, Spain and Sweden. In all these countries "the economic competition argument" (category heading suggested by the Portuguese team) or the "labour area" argumentation (Spain, Sweden) has occupied a prominent position either at the focus group and expert forum phases or along the *Decalogue* elaboration process. More specifically, the three arguments singled out by the **Portuguese team**, "elected on the basis of universality, relevance and clarity of focus" were: 1º) "the criminality argument", 2º) "the parasitism / relative deprivation argument"; and 3º) "the

economic competition argument". Whereas **the Finish team** selection, in terms of myths, was: 1º) "Immigrants receive better services"; 2º) "People coming from different cultures cannot live together"; 3º) "Immigration threatens stability of society and causes unemployment, criminality and disorder".

The **competition argument** is not only expressed referring to the labour area, as we have seen. Some natives perceived that immigrants as competitors in other areas too: public benefits, marriage or couple market and the national space or territory itself. Thus, the **invasion argument** or discourse (see point 9) may be said to be juxtaposed as an umbrella category covering those areas.

Below, first of all, we give a synthesis and examples of statements collected in the focus groups that took place in the Project partner countries where there was also a national expert forum. Then we list the experts´ counterarguments and proposals of measures for action.

General population argumentation from focus groups of the *Living Together Project*:

- *They take away our jobs* and *they do not work* summarizes the social discourse on this issue according to the Finish team.

- Although "the indolence argument" (*some minorities shy away from work*) is also identified by the Portuguese team, the "economic competition argument" stands out in this country with many verbal examples. These are only some of them:
    - It's a bit like slavery, for them to work 24 hours without a break, it's normal.
    - We work 5 days a week and they work 7, and they aren't obliged to do so.
    - The large contingents of foreign labour that come to Portugal have lowered the wages of the Portuguese.
    - They take away a lot of jobs, mainly from youngsters.

- The *mundane reasoning* of an unfair labour competition and lack of control by the authorities has also emerged in the Spanish fieldwork. The rich verbatim reported may be summed up here with this sentence: «They take *jobs* that Spaniards do not want *under those conditions*»; or the complementary comment: «they only benefit employers and put workers at a disadvantage».

- The xenophobic argument is sometimes counterbalanced by other participants in the same focus groups, using different logics. In Spain the ***humanist argument*** (utopian) of the borderless world ("there should be no need for an immigration policy") appeared together with references to Spaniards working abroad; or the comment: "Many of the jobs taken by foreigners are the ones the Spanish don't want".

Experts' diagnosis or (counter) argumentation in the *Living Together Project*:

- They do not take away jobs or get wages down: for "they do the jobs we do not want to do" or "they get the wages employers pay". **We all are part of the labour market** (Spanish forum).

- Host countries like Spain and other European host societies have not taken full "advantage of immigrant population potentialities" (specially certain education levels). This may be a counterargument to oppose to the feeling of *competition,* which may be combined with the message of: **everybody's right to compete and improve living conditions**.

- Counterargumentation from the Portuguese forum includes: We should talk of exploitation ("He/she who is exploited is a victim"); distinguish among employers ("Who actually profits from underpaid labour are unscrupulous employers"); and remember that "Everyone, migrant or Portuguese, is covered by the laws that regulate labour". Moreover: "The ethnic Portuguese population benefits from the low price of products and services", "The argument that the Portuguese emigrants suffer with this abroad is always crucial (remember the 'British jobs for British workers' affair)"; and "Migrants come to occupy jobs for which the Portuguese have no use".

- There is research in various European countries showing the existence of *structural* racial/ethnic discrimination at work.

- Lack of updated legislation is underlined by the Swedish forum ("Many public authorities want to find a way to employ without discrimination").

Experts' strategies proposals for action:

- Consider it as a **priority field of action,** due to the immigration-work-integration relation (Finland, Spain)

- Transmit the idea of **"control"**; disseminate the idea that immigrants contribute to economic growth, as both workers and consumers (Spanish forum)

- Apart from reporting about an available tool already put in practice via the ACIDI brochure "Myths and Facts about Immigration", the Portuguese team collected via the experts´ forum other suggestions of action: "The labour inspection should do more"; "Perhaps a campaign with employers stating how they need migrant workers".

- Swedish experts' forum measures include: "Independent labour market monitoring by agencies with resources and power position to demand explanations when immigrants are not employed"; "development of tools that can be used to eradicate labor discrimination"; and "offer employers courses in antidiscrimination law so that they know what rules apply".

7/10. Designing public services taking into consideration the needs of society.

As noticed previously, there are various arguments connected with the logic of *competition* (and *invasion*) as a determining factor of *xenophobia.* In fact, the category heading proposed by the Portuguese team is composed of two discursive ingredients (*parasitism* and *relative deprivation*) that were embedded in the design of the focus groups of Portugal, Spain, Finland, The Netherlands and Sweden. That is, one of the agreements taken in the common methodology of the Living Together Project was to use three sentences as conversational provocation in the second part of the group discussions. One of them was precisely the invitation to discuss the following assertion *"Both immigrants and ethnic minorities get more (from the country they live) than they give".* Its selection was based on both the academic literature on the forms of racism and the research material available, as has been informed above.

Once more here we give a synthesis and examples of statements collected in the focus groups that took place in the Project partner countries where there was also a national

expert forum. Then we list the experts´ counterarguments and proposals of measures for action.

General population argumentation from focus groups of the *Living Together Project*:

- *Immigrants receive better services* could be a first written and short translation of a kind of *myth* number one in Finland, according to the Finish team. Verbatim examples of this shared topic also formulated as *Finns are being discriminated against* are: why do we not deal with our own problems, instead of "pampering" the immigrants? They get better apartments and more social benefits. It is added that *Service structure is exploited consciously and systematically*: *They have a guidebook on our social security system.*

- Among the Spanish general population in the capital of Madrid a similar constellation of arguments abridged would include: *immigration as burden, competition for limited resources* and *a demand of preference for the native.* In other words, based on the fieldwork: *They swallow public assistance and abuse of social services taking them away from Spaniards*. A reiterated verbatim example of a xenophobic nature is: "They haven't paid for all this progress with their taxes, but they enjoy the benefits from day one". Something that was responded during the focus groups meetings from more sympathetic positions: "Over the years, as immigrants live and work in Spain and have kids (…) they will receive the same as they are contributing"; "Aid to immigrants is an investment that stays in Spain and results in a benefit for Spanish society as a whole".

- Drawing from the Portuguese reports, the *parasitism argument* as a social belief or myth according to which *minorities live at the expense of the majority* is very close thematically to the *relative deprivation argument* (*minorities are somehow being privileged*). Typical statements are respectively: "[Immigrants are] parasites on society" and "They come here and they immediately have support, help with everything…"

Experts' diagnosis or (counter) argumentation in the Living Together Project:

- Finish experts (based on the principles of equality and citizenship of the city) suggested as counterargument (or countermyth) that *"All users of the public services are treated as **citizens of the city**, and the basis for providing services is the need of the citizens, not ethnicity/ immigration background"*.

- From the Spanish experts reunited in the forum: *"Our National Health System requires more funds, and the problems it faces are caused, more by the older population, not by immigrants"*. *"Public expenditure hasn't been increased to cope with the necessities of a growing population"*.

- Counterarguments from the Portuguese experts' forum were: *"Immigrants contribute more than they take from social security. Migrants actually work more and earn less"*; *"The vast majority of social integration income beneficiaries are not Roma. Many of these ideas are false. We need to deconstruct them. There is abuse everywhere and members of every group abuse"*. Various *Immigration Observatory* publications related to the economical contribution of immigrants to Portuguese society are cited in the document *Minutes of the Portuguese experts forum.* Some of the existing studies even suggest that Roma and immigrants need more equitable and fairer conditions in the access to social services (*Minutes of the Portuguese experts' forum*).

- The Swedish team has selected this argument as the second myth (of three) in the final process of the Decalogue elaboration. The assertion *Immigrants receive more than what they contribute with to the society* was responded with the counterargument: *Many studies show that immigration is vital for the development and growth of countries, historically and today. The instances where immigrants are retrained from full participation the underlying reason is discrimination and racism*[35].

---

[35] Among the policies and measures proposed: *Increasing the participation of immigrants and vulnerable groups in the policy formulation of antidiscrimination and antiracist measures*; and *Empowerment and increased capacity to NGOs working with antidiscrimination and antiracist work.*

Experts' strategies proposals for action:

- Finish experts suggested two measures to be taken: 1) *Mainstreaming of services for immigrants into normal services structure* (based on the premise that immigration affairs do not concern only "experts" on immigration, but also social services, employment services and housing services); 2) *Trust for immigration policy and planning of services needs to be enhanced: transparency, client-oriented services and open PR work.*

- Spanish experts put emphasis in a couple of measures: 1) *Strengthen the Welfare State* (investments) *and unmask the demagogy that blames immigrants for the deterioration of public services quality* (investigations); 2) *Strengthen local government intervention* (more funds for social integration). Other measures that may be added here face the issue of immigrants' participation via associations. Although no spontaneous arguments or discourses emerged in the focus groups with general population, experts proposed: 3) *Immigrants get implied (co-participate), as any member of society, in the different areas of social life*; 4) *Strengthen cooperation with institutions, associative movement inner leaders...*; 5) *Counterbalance the dependency from public benefits, increasing immigrants' autonomy.*

- Measures from the Portuguese experts' forum were: 1) *It would be useful to make very clear that there is no affirmative action in Portugal or positive discrimination towards certain groups. Social benefits such as RSI are for everybody who is in serious economic need*; 2) *Mainstream the Portuguese informal practices to contrast to the stereotype that only immigrant and Roma groups do so (e.g. Portuguese working in cafés, for instance, also don't give a receipt to every client. And we don't ask for it)*; 3) *Facts and numbers on the economic contribution of immigrants for society can be used to persuade the more educated public*; 4) *We should make the calculation and disseminate information on the contribution / benefit ratio of migrants' relation with Social Security;* 5) *The use of discrimination testing in the housing market and the dissemination of its results* was advocated.

8/10. Promoting principles of respect and dialogue, seeing cultural diversity as enrichment.

Both arguments are particularly close to each other, thematically and in the *system of discourses* (or *semantic field*) that may be identified when analyzing focus group conversations or other research material about immigration and ethnic minorities. The former is specially related to integration policy models, either assimilation-oriented or multicultural-oriented integration. It is connected to the third sentence used at the end of the focus groups of the LT Project: "Both immigrants and ethnic minorities should keep their identity and culture of origin".

Once again here we present a synthesis and examples of statements collected in the focus groups that took place in the Project partner countries where there was also a national expert forum. Then we list the experts´ counterarguments and proposals of measures for action.

General population argumentation from focus groups of the *Living Together Project*:

- *People coming from different cultures cannot live together would* summarize a sort of *myth* number two in Finland, according to the Finish team[36]. The whereabouts and basis of this xenophobic argument is: *Every-day life in residential areas: differences in upbringing of children, disputes in apartment buildings (laundry rooms, smell of cooking in corridors etc.); disregard or no information of common rules. Differences in communication cultures: e.g. loud conversation in public transportation/public places.* And *gender equality (perception of oppressed Muslim women).*

- The Swedish team contributed with a complementary argumentation found in the focus groups with natives, which was finally selected as a third myth: *If you socialize with immigrants, you cannot be a racist.*

---

[36] The criminality argument is presented by this team within a third myth ("*Immigration threatens stability of society and causes unemployment, criminality and disorder*"). Typical statement: "*Immigrants commit more crimes than Finns*".

- Reports from Spain[37] highlight arguments such as "They make you racist" (referring to experiences of bad behaviour, insecurity in neighbourhoods, appropriation of public places; among others). And counterarguments or refutations by focus groups participants, where criticism of the *media* (for the negative image they give of immigrants on these topics) is combined with a self-critical comment ("there is good and bad behavior also among Spaniards").

- Portuguese reports singled out the criminality argument both in their Decalogue proposal and in the final selection of three major myths, where it is listed in the first place. A short wording is: *minorities have a higher propensity to crime.* Verbatim examples are: 1) "They kill as easily as they would drink a glass of water, and that is just their nature…"; 2) (…) "we make an effort to welcome them and they come here and steal"; 3) "They are people who come from societies where the levels of tolerance for criminality and ignorance have nothing to do with our standards [references to Eastern Europe and Brazil]"; 4) "[of Blacks] they cause problems with the kids at school, they cause problems on the street, they cause problems at night, a climate of insecurity has been created, which is not controllable"; 5) (…) "Portugal is a nation of gentle ways and that is why they come here already prepared to rob".

Experts' diagnosis or (counter) argumentation in the Living Together Project:

- Finish experts (based on the principle of tolerance and dialogue) suggested as counterargument this reflection: *Cultures transform constantly and there is no such thing as immigrant culture. Also the Finnish culture is subject to changes and influences. Cultures can learn co-existence as result of interaction and dialogue.*

- Swedish experts (based on the principle of dialogue with the groups subjected to discrimination and racism) suggested as counterargument: *Racism is a relation of power, which you have to be aware of in your interactions.*

---

[37] A special contribution from Casa Árabe on Islamophobia should be considered in the final version of the Decalogue.

- Experts from Portugal suggested as counterarguments: 1) *the second cause for Brazilians to abandon their country is flight from criminality and insecurity*; 2) *there are social factors (not ethnic) that promote violent crime and vandalism, although one should not do away with personal responsibility*; 3) *it is unlikely to assume that someone might leave their home and family to pursue a criminal career abroad*; 4) *The justice system is perhaps biased on condemnations and is certainly so on remand in custody.*

Experts' strategies proposals for action:

- Finish experts suggested this reflection on measures to be taken: "*Finding xenophobia, i.e. the wisdom in the encounter with the strange (vs. xenophobia or xenophilia); role and importance of schools; facing people as individuals, not as representatives of a culture; emphasising **reasonably good behaviour** as a way to live together*".

- The Swedish team suggested the political measure of *Empowerment and increased capacity of NGOs working with antidiscrimination and antiracist work.*

- Measures from the Portuguese experts' forum were: 1) *To provide contextualized numbers (i.e., caeteris paribus on a series of social factors) to understand what is behind the apparent higher rates of criminality among foreigners when compared to natives*; 2) *To raise awareness of the social factors (not ethnic) that promote crime and vandalism*; 3) And as available tools already put into practice[38], the Portuguese team informed of *Immigration Observatory studies of the relation between nationality and the judiciary system, which provide contextualized comparisons that help dispelling the myth of a greater incidence of criminality in the foreign population and actually hint at some discrimination within the system itself.*

- Spanish experts highlighted a couple of measures: 1) ***Everyday life contexts** (neighborhoods, schools, work) should be considered as the **main axes of action***

---

[38] This contribution made systematically by the Portuguese team is considered an example to be followed by other Project partners in order to enrich the Decalogue; or to conceive this as a reference of resources and never-ending updating tool.

for immigrants' integration; 2) ***"Solidarity policies"*** *should avoid that the autochthonous population abandon the quarters where immigrants and ethnic minorities are concentrated.*

9/10. Moving from stereotypes to "living together".

When natives suffer a bad interaction with immigrants at work, at the neighborhood, or other contexts a repeated answer according to the information from the focus groups is: *That they only create a mess here…that they should go back to their countries (Portugal).* It may be added that even at the institutional or State level some legal tools prescribe the measure of taking back to their countries the people that committed criminal acts.

The feelings of territorial invasion are rooted in the cultural mechanisms of national and supranational identities; and also (as a Spanish expert pointed out) in the "morality tacitly ascribed to the territorial frontiers". This is a handicap very difficult to overcome, which is also at the base of the *preference right* claimed by natives when in circumstances of competition.

As annotated in point 6 some natives perceive immigrants as competitors in the areas of labour, public benefits, sexual partnership and at national or neighborhood scale. Thus, the *invasion* or *territorial normativity* argument is a key discursive element to fulfill the conceptual map of racism and xenophobia. It may be said that acts as a sort of umbrella or core category covering and interconnecting those areas.

Below we maintain the structure used in the presentation of the previous points, although the more elaborated contributions by experts have been reported mainly from Portugal.

General population argumentation from focus groups of the *Living Together Project*:

- The Portuguese team expresses this argument in a moderate and polite tone: *The point of the territorial normativity argument is that everybody would be happier if no one left 'their own' geographical place.* Typical statements collected from focus groups at Lisbon: 1) *That they only create a mess here…that they should*

go back to their countries...at least that is what I hear the most ...; 2) *"Ah, yes, they have already beaten up who knows who...blablabla...they have robbed this place...they should go back to their own countries and do this crap there". You hear a lot of this...if you want to make trouble then go do it in your own country. Leave my country in peace. One hears this idea a lot*; 3) *Yes... normally, they say ... "ah... if they want to make a mess, why don't they go back to their country..."*

- The ***invasion*** discourse and the increase in ***insecurity,*** related to the greater number of immigrants are also reported by the Spanish team. Typical statements from the Madrid focus groups: 1) "and now it seems that they've invaded us a bit, and everybody's tense…"; 2) "They have taken over neighborhoods that were ours before"; 3) "Suddenly they invaded us"; 4) "Overbooking of immigration"; 5) "It seems that we, Spaniards, are the foreigners"

Experts' diagnosis or (counter) argumentation in the Living Together Project:

- Experts from Portugal suggested as counterarguments: 1) *If people all went back to their birthplace the Portuguese resident population would increase by 50% and the country will collapse*; 2) *The clear historic trend towards globalization, porous boundaries and human fluxes denies the allegedly 'natural' character of being in one's place of birth*; 3) *This kind of discourse is not a manifestation of differentialist racism, as it might seem, but a reminder of the subordinate place migrants occupy in the social structure*; 4) *It is important not to confuse ethnicity and birthplace. Many ethnic minority youngsters were born in Portugal*.

Experts' strategies proposals for action:

- Measures from the Portuguese experts' forum were: 1) *Show the emigration and immigration numbers (the former is much larger than the latter)*; 2) *To remind people that almost all of us are displaced relatively to our place of birth (e.g. people coming from different cities and/or Portuguese villages that move to big cities)*; 3) *Show that the country needs immigrants*; 4) And as available tools

already put into practice[39], the Portuguese team informed of[40]: *"Nós" (We), a TV show that results from a partnership between ACIDI and the 2:, a public TV channel (…) committed to integration, it strongly emphasizes the benefits of cultural diversity*.

10/10. Seeing migration as an universal phenomenon. Europeans were immigrants. The *reflective* argument: emigration memory of current host societies.

Most of the above arguments (points 6 to 9) have provoked among the experts counterarguments based on statistical figures, what some academics consider *hard data*. But not always the arguments based on this kind of data achieve their purpose of convincing general population or even elites of their racial prejudices and stereotypes. In sum, the efficacy of figures is relative[41]. A comment and example[42] of it was provided by an expert after one of the national forums.

Compared this last element of the *Decalogue* to the first one (the principles and ideals around the *human rights discourse*), the *reflective* argument closes the Decalogue trying to complete it with an existing argumentation base on the part of the general population and the experts consulted. This is a promising combination having in mind our intention of reaching the highest possible number of people, as a Madrid City Council representative suggested in the Spanish forum. This means that we have a legal heritage of principles resulting from the historical experience lived by the world human population. At the same time, there are also historical and biographical experiences at the grass root level of general population (mainly in the cases of countries with a special

---

[39] This contribution made systematically by the Portuguese team is considered an example to be followed by other Project partners in order to enrich the Decalogue; or to conceive this as a reference of resources and never-ending updating tool.

[40] The *invasion argument* is the first of a selection of *Myths and Facts* that Portugal counterargumented via the ACIDI brochure of the same name.

[41] Researchers and politicians face a multi-faced reality that is perceived and experienced from very different social positions, status or strata. Stereotypes, myths and facts compose such reality. To transmit the message that racist or xenophobic people is only because of ignorance would be an error. Every research material has methodological weaknesses, either statistics or testimonies. One way to overcome them is to have a combination of both, especially when there are diverse potential users of the *Decalogue.*

[42] The percentage of people perceiving the number of immigrants in their territory as "too many" or "many" did not oscillate a great deal when knowing the statistical figures (Head of the Immigration Observatory in the Basque Country, Spain).

emigration tradition as Portugal and Spain). In any case, this more reflective element of the *Decalogue* should be conceived as interwined to the challenge of naming all forms of racism and xenophobia, of educating and researching; but also with the objective of archiving best practices of anti-racism and experiences of xenophilia. This task it is stressed now and again should be faced and accomplished from an historical perspective.

General population argumentation from focus groups of the *Living Together Project*:

- Focus groups report by the Madrid team has pointed out the use (by common people) of individual and collective memory on the Spanish emigration past as a source of both xenophobic and xenophilic arguments in today's immigrant Spain. Typical statements with xenophobia connotation are: 1) *Spaniards abroad adapted to the customs of the countries they went*; 2) *We Spaniards emigrated with a contract, they come with no papers and in open boats or kayaks*. Typical statements connotating xenophilia are: 1) *We also were emigrants*; 2) *We've been victims of stigmatization in some countries* ("I was called a black head in Sweden" [because of the color of her hair]).

- Retrospective arguments either negative or positive in terms of racism, but with no relation to the migration theme, have also been reported by the Spanish team. One example of each: 1) *"shots weren't heard as much before"*; 2) *"robberies and stealing have always been around"*.

- Although not explicitly singled out as one the ten arguments proposed by the Portuguese team, a similar argumentation of contrasting self-images of one's own emigration past with the immigration present might be documented using the research material collected in Portugal by ACIDI. References to the emigrated Portuguese or the Portuguese emigrants; and examples of good and bad behavior among the natives at home.

Experts' diagnosis or (counter) argumentation in the Living Together Project:

- Although it is a controversial issue in the Spanish experts forum, advocates defend that this remembrance generates *empathy* ("means to place oneself in the other´s shoes"); and may help understanding the situation of current immigrants, and avoid any form of rejection. References are made to **collective memory** of both a**broad emigration** (to Germany, France, Switzerland and so on,) and to the so-called **inner migration** from villages to the great urban centers as potential sources of counter-argumentation.

- Portuguese experts used in the national forum this *reflective* argument while refuting various racist arguments. For example: *The argument that the Portuguese emigrants suffer with this abroad is always crucial (remember the 'British jobs for British workers' affair).*

Experts' strategies proposals for action:

- Spanish experts reunited in the national forum proposed as measures: 1) Elaborate *and disseminate that historical memory adapting the product to the target population with the aim of generating solidarity out of the **Spanish emigration remembrance***; 2) *Transmit the message that equals **immigration** to development and opportunity (included the construction of new identities); and see it as an **historical or universal phenomenon** (humans as one specie on earth)*; 3) As an example of available tools, an expert from the mass media informed of *a public TV program seen three days before the Forum, where the Dictatorship's archives vision of a Spanish "happy emigration" in the 60s was contrasted with a more real migration experience both international and inner.*

- Portuguese experts in the national forum suggested a measure for action grounded on this *reflective* argument. For example: 1) regarding the *parasitism* argument under the statement "They [Roma] don't make social security contributions", experts suggested as measure: *Mainstream the Portuguese informal practices to contrast to the stereotype that only immigrant and Roma groups do so (e.g. **Portuguese working** in cafés, for instance, also don't give a receipt to every client. **And we** don't ask for it)*

- The educational measure of focusing the historical roots of racism in each country, suggested by the Swedish team, may be reminded here to be considered also from the point of view of the *reflective* argument (*"Rendering visible the historical roots of racism"*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aja, E. y Arango, J., (2006) Veinte años de inmigración en España. Perspectivas jurídicas y sociológicas (1985-2004). Barcelona. Fundación CIDOB: 17-44.

Allport, F. H. (1954) The Nature of Prejudice.Cambridge, M.A. Addison-Wesley

- (1977) La naturaleza del prejuicio. Buenos Aires. Editorial Universitaria de Buenos Aires. 5ª edición.

Álvarez Silvar, G. (1997) La migración de retorno en Galicia (1970-1995). Xunta de Galicia.

Bergalli, V. (2001) "La reacción de la sociedad receptora a nivel local. Una aproximación al caso de "Ciutat Vella" de Barcelona", en Solé, C., El impacto de la inmigración en la economía y en la sociedad receptora. Barcelona. Anthropos: 213-248.

Blumer, H. (1958) "Race prejudice as a sense of group position". Pacific Sociological Review, 1: 3-7

Bobo, L. (1988) "Group conflict, prejudice and the paradox of contemporary racial attitudes", en Katz, P. A. y Taylor, D. A., Eliminating racism: profiles in controversy. New York. Plenum.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2006): Racism without racists: colour-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States. Rowman & Littlefield.

Bourhis, R.Y., Gagnon, A. y Möise, L.C. (1996) "Discriminación y relaciones intergrupales", en Bourhis, R.Y. y Leyens, J.P., Estereotipos, discriminación y relaciones entre grupos. Madrid. McGraw Hill.

Brücker, H., Epstein, G. S., McCormick, B., Saint-Paul, G., Venturi, A. y Zimmermanne, K. (2002) "Managing migration in the European Welfare State", en Boeri, T., Hanson, G. y McCormick, B., Immigration policy and the welfare system. A report for the Fondazione Rodolfo Debenedetti in association with The William Davidson Institute. New York. Oxford University Press: 1-167.

Cachón, L. y Valles, M. S. (2003) "Trade unionism and immigration: reinterpreting old and new dilemmas". Transfer, 9 (3): 469-482.

Calvo Buezas, T. (2000) Inmigración y racismo. Así sienten los jóvenes del siglo XXI. Madrid. Cauce Editorial.

Camarero y García (2004) "Los paisajes familiares de la inmigración", Revista Española de Sociología, 4, pp. 173-198.

Cea D´Ancona, Mª A. (2002) "La medición de las actitudes ante la inmigración: evaluación de los indicadores tradicionales de racismo". Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas, 99: 87-111.

- (2004) La activación de la xenofobia en España. ¿Qué miden las encuestas? Madrid. Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas/Siglo XXI. Colección Monografías nº 210.

- (2005) "La exteriorización de la xenofobia". Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas, 112: 197-230.

- (2007) Inmigración, racismo y xenofobia en la España del nuevo contexto europeo. Madrid. OBERAXE. Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales.

- (2009a) "La compleja detección del racismo y la xenofobia a través de encuesta. Un paso adelante en su medición". Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas, 125: 13-45.

- (2009b) "Filias y fobias ante la imagen poliédrica cambiante de la inmigración: claves en la comprensión del racismo y la xenofobia". Revista del Ministerio de Trabajo e Inmigración. Migraciones Internacionales, nº 80: 39-60.

Cea D´Ancona, Mª Á. y Valles Martínez, M. S. (2008a) "Nuevos – viejos discursos ante la inmigración y su reflejo vivencial de racismo, xenofobia y xenofilia en la España inmigrante". Migraciones, 23: 237-277.

- (2008b) Evolución del racismo y la xenofobia en España. Madrid. OBERAXE. Ministerio de Trabajo e Inmigración.

- (2009a) Racismo y xenofobia en España [Informe 2009] Madrid. OBERAXE. Ministerio de Trabajo e Inmigración.

- (2010) Experiencia migratoria en clave biográfica: relatos entrelazados de autóctonos y foráneos. Madrid. Siglo XXI (in press).

Coenders, M., Lubbers, M. y Scheepers, P. (2003) Majorities´attitudes towards minorities in European Union Member States. Results from standard eurobarometers 1997-2000-2003. Report 2 for the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia.

Colectivo IOÉ (Pereda, C., Actis, W. y De Prada, M. A.) (1995) Discurso de los españoles sobre los extranjeros. Paradojas de la alteridad. Madrid. C.I.S. Colección Opiniones y Actitudes nº 8.

- (1998) Inmigración y trabajo. Trabajadores inmigrantes en el sector de la construcción. Madrid. IMSERSO. Colección Observatorio Permanente de la Inmigración, nº 1.

- (1999) Trabajadores inmigrantes en el sector de la hostelería. Madrid. IMSERSO. Colección Observatorio Permanente de la Inmigración.

Colectivo IOE y Ortí, A. (2007) La convivencia en Madrid. Discursos ante el modelo de desarrollo de la ciudad y la instalación de población inmigrante. Madrid: Observatorio de las Migraciones y de la Convivencia Intercultural de la ciudad de Madrid.

Conde, F. y Herranz, D. (2004) Los procesos de integración de los inmigrantes. Pautas de consumo de alcohol y modelos culturales de referencia. Madrid: Fundación CREFAT.

Contreras, A. de (2005) El discurso de mi vida. Madrid: Armas Tomar Ediciones.

Delibes, M. (2004/1958) Diario de un emigrante. Barcelona: Destino.

De Miguel, A. (2007) "Estructura y movilidad de la población sobre el territorio", en Rocci, S. (Ed.) Las infraestructuras del transporte y la calidad de vida. Madrid: Fundación ACS.

Díez Nicolás, J. (2005) Las dos caras de la inmigración. Madrid. Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales. Documentos del Observatorio Permanente de la Inmigración, nº 3.

Doty, R. (2003) Anti-immigrantism in western democracies. Statecraft, desire, and the politics of exclusion. London. Routledge

Flecha, R (2001) "Racismo moderno y postmoderno en Europa: enfoque Dialógico y pedagogías antirracistas", REIS, 94: 79-103. (Traducción de su artículo original: «Modern and Postmodern Racism in Europe: Dialogic Approach and Anti-Racist Pedagogies», Harvard Educational Review, 69: 2: 150-171).

Giles, M. W. y Evans, A. (1986) "The power approach to intergroup hostility". Journal of Conflict Resolution, 30: 469-485.

González Enríquez, C. y Álvarez-Miranda, B. (2005) Inmigrantes en el barrio. Un estudio cualitativo de la opinión pública. Madrid. Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales. Documentos del Observatorio Permanente de la Inmigración, nº 6.

González Enríquez, C.; Brey, E.; Rivilla Baselga, P. y Herranz Andújar, D. (2008) Los sindicatos ante la inmigración. Documento del Observatorio Permanente de la inmigración nº 18. Madrid. Ministerio de Trabajo e Inmigración.

Houts Picca, L. y Feagin, J. R. (2007) Two-faced racism. Whites in the backstage and frontstage. New York. Routledge.

Izquierdo Escribano, A. (1996) La inmigración inesperada. Madrid. Trotta.

Jackson, J. S., Brown, K. T. y Kirby, D. T. (1998) "International perpectives on prejudice and racism", en Eberhardt, J. L. y Fiske, S. T. (comps.) The problem and the response. Thousand Oaks. Sage: 101-135.

Jiménez Pérez, F. (2000) La fábula del indiano. Madrid: Eypasa.

Kinder, D. R. y Sears, D. O. (1981) "Prejudice and politics: symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life". Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 40: 414-431.

Krysan, M. (1998) "Privacy and the expression of white racial attitudes. A comparison across three contexts". Public Opinion Quarterly, 62: 506-544.

Lamo de Espinosa (1990) La sociedad reflexiva. Madrid: CIS-Siglo XXI.

López Urbano, Á. (2008) "Inmigración y sanidad: una relación de doble sentido". Panorama Socia 8 - Inmigrantes en España: participación y convivencia. Madrid. FUNCAS: 112-118.

Lyman, S. M. (1974) Chinese Americans. New York: Random House.

Marsal, J. F. (1969). Hacer la América. Autobiografía de un inmigrante español en la Argentina. Buenos Aires: Editorial del Instituto Torcuato Di Tella.

Marsal J. F. (1972) Hacer la América. Autobiografía de un emigrante español en la Argentina. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel.

Moya, J. C (1998) Cousins and Strangers. Spanish Immigrants in Buenos Aires, 1850-1930. Berkeley y Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Moya, J.C. (2004) Primos y extranjeros. La inmigración española en Buenos Aires,1850-1930. Buenos Aires. Emecé. [Edición original en inglés, de 1998].

Muñoz Pérez, F.; Izquierdo, A. (1989) "L'Espagne, pays d'immigration", Population, 2: 257-289.

Oso, L. (2004) Españolas en París. Bellaterra.

O´Sullivan, S. K. y Wilson, W. J. (1988) "Race and ethnicity", en Smelser, N. J., Handbook of sociology. Newbury Park. Sage.

Pajares, M. (2005) La integración ciudadana. Una perspectiva para la inmigración. Barcelona. Icaria &Antrazyt.

- (2007) Inmigrantes del Este: procesos migratorios de los rumanos. Barcelona: Icaria.

- (2009) Inmigración y mercado de trabajo. Informe 2009. Madrid. Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales. Documento del Observatorio Permanente de la Inmigración nº 21.

Pérez Díaz, V., Álvarez Miranda, B. y González Enríquez, C. (2001) España ante la inmigración. Madrid. Fundación "La Caixa". Colección Estudios Sociales nº 8.

Pérez Yruela, M. y Desrues, T. (2006) Opinión de los españoles en materia de racismo y xenofobia. Madrid. Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales. OBERAXE (Observatorio Español del Racismo y la Xenofobia).

- (2007) Opinión de los españoles en materia de racismo y xenofobia. Madrid. Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales. OBERAXE (Observatorio Español del Racismo y la Xenofobia).

Quillian, L. (1995) "Prejudice as a response to perceived group threat: population composition and anti-immigrant and racial prejudice in Europe". American Sociological Review, 60: 586-611.

Rinken, S. y Pérez Yruela, M. (2007) Opiniones y actitudes de la población andaluza ante la inmigración. Junta de Andalucía.

Ross, C. E. y Mirowski, J. (1998) "The worst place and the best face". Social Forces, 62: 529-536.

Rydgren, J. (2004) "The logic of xenophobia", Rationality and Society, 16 (2): 123-148.

Sartori, G. (2001) La sociedad multiétnica. Pluralismo, multiculturalismo y extranjeros. Madrid. Taurus.

Sears, D.O. (1988) "Symbolic racism", en Katz, P.A. y Taylor, D.A, Eliminating racism. Nueva York. Plenum Press.

- (1998) "Racism and politics in the United States", en Eberhardt, J. L. y Fiske, S. T., The problem and the response. Thousand Oaks. Sage: 76-100.

- (2005) "Inner conflict in the political psychology of racism", en Dovidio, J. F., Glick, P. y Budman, L. A., On the nature of prejudice. Fifty years after Allport. Oxford, U.K.Blackwell Publishing: 343-358.

SORA (Thalhammer, E., Enzenhofer, E., Salfinger, B. y Ogris, G.) (2001) Attitudes towards minority groups in the European Union. A special analysis of the Eurobarometer 2000 survey. Viena. European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia.

Valles Martínez, M. S. (2007) "Metodología y técnicas de investigación", en Pérez-Yruela, M. y (comp.), *Sociología en España*. Madrid. CIS y FES: 49-71.

- (2009) "Metodología biográfica y experiencia migratoria: actualidad del enfoque de los testimonios anónimos y de autor en el legado de Juan F. Marsal", Papers, 91: 103-125.

Valles, M. S., Cea D´Ancona, Mª A. e Izquierdo, A. (1999) Las encuestas sobre inmigración en España y Europa. Madrid: IMSERSO. Colección Observatorio Permanente de la Inmigración, nº 3.

Walker, I. y Pettigrew, T. F. (1984) "Relative privation theory: an overview and conceptual critique". British Journal of Social Psychology, 23: 301-310.