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FINAL OVERALL SCIENTIFIC SUMMARY

Recent world events have emphasised the importance of the successful integration of minority groups into their host societies. This project, conducted throughout the year 2001, brought together a multi-disciplinary team of seven core researchers from five Western, Central and Eastern European countries to explore the integration of five very different ethnic minority groups. This team was supplemented by meetings held with leading Hungarian and Spanish academics working in psychology, education, anthropology and linguistics as well as representatives of four ethnic minority groups in Spain and Hungary and the Hungarian Parliamentary Commissioner for Ethnic Minorities.

The work conducted under this award was conducted during two major workshops and five exchange visits, and involved the design and implementation of a pilot study collecting both quantitative and qualitative data from sixty participants recruited evenly across the five nations. Workshops were held at Eötvos Lorand University (Budapest, April) and Universidad Autonoma de Madrid (September). The first workshop had the prime objective of designing our pilot study aimed at assessing the support networks available for migrant communities across Europe. This was achieved through the development of a theoretical framework, a series of questionnaire and interview items for our pilot sample and the elaboration of a national policy inventory to be completed by each country leader. In the five months between the time of the first and second workshops, project leaders in each country collected questionnaire data in each country and completed the policy inventory for their nation. In our second workshop, project participants presented preliminary analyses of the data collected and developed an extensive coding scheme for the subsequent analysis of this data. Journal and conference papers are currently being prepared with detailed analysis of this pilot data, and an SPSS file with data from the 60 pilot participants is available from the project co-ordinator.

Our second workshop also gave us the opportunity to discuss and plan the submission of future funding applications to enable us to develop our research in this field. A framework and provisional timetable for these applications was prepared. As a direct consequence of the pilot work conducted in the present study one further network grant has already been approved (British Academy International Networks Grant, 2001-2005, 30,000 Euros) and further EU FP5 and EUROCORE applications are currently being developed.

1 Appendices for each workshop report are compiled within a separate pdf file on the ESF web page
1. **Executive summary - Workshop 1**

This workshop had the prime objective of planning in more detail our agreed programme of collaboration. This collaboration centres around an agreed pilot study to be conducted in each of the five countries in this project which aims primarily to assess the support networks available for migrant communities across Europe. In this meeting we brought together our key participants from each country (listed under 6 below) plus representatives from the Hungarian parliament, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Vietnamese community in Hungary to plan this pilot research in more detail.

Prior to the workshop, each key participant was asked to prepare relevant statistics about the immigration situation in their country and to provide the group with any relevant questionnaires or additional questions or frameworks from their previous work that they could contribute to the project. Dr Goodwin also visited Ms Goebel in Frankfurt and Dr Schmitz in Bonn prior to this meeting to prepare papers (Dr Schmitz was unfortunately seriously ill and unlikely to attend our meeting). We began the workshop discussing these materials and providing each other with brief presentations on previous research we had conducted in this area (see Appendices). Following this, we began work identifying the framework for our pilot research project. Dr Burau presented ideas for a political framework for our discussions which identified many of the main regimes of immigration policy. This was integrated into the final theoretical outline (see Appendix 2). We discussed the groups we would wish to interview in our pilot research and the procedure for the conducting of interviews in each country. Finally, we worked on the development of the interview and questionnaire items, discussed in more detail in the scientific report (below). This took the bulk of our time during the remainder of the meeting, as each interview item demanded lengthy and detailed consideration.

These discussions were very much complemented by the contributions of our outside experts, Dr Kaltenbach, Professor Fülöp and Mr Binh Nguyen. Dr Kaltenberg gave us a morning session on immigration policy and its implications in Hungary, giving us a detailed analysis of the law regulating the recognition of minority groups in this country. Mr Binh Nguyen was able to elaborate on this in an evening session when he discussed the plight of the Vietnamese community in Hungary, a minority group with great commercial significance but one which is not ‘officially’ recognised as an ethnic minority in this country. Professor Fülöp, an expert on the Hungarian migration situation, was able to contribute her considerable experience of cross-cultural research to the design of our project. On the evening of Monday 9th April we were also joined in our discussions by Janos Gyori, an educationalist and colleague of Professor Fülöp working in the Eotvos Lorand University and at Radnoti Miklos Training School, a private school where there are a large number of Vietnamese students. Mr Gyori was thus able to supply us with a valuable developmental perspective on the establishment of social networks amongst second generation Vietnamese in this society.
At the end of the meeting we had produced a detailed theoretical and practical framework for our pilot research which is now being conducted simultaneously in all five countries (discussed in the scientific report below). This workshop therefore achieved all of its aims in providing us with the tools to conduct the pilot research stipulated in our research proposal.

2. Scientific Content - Workshop 1

This meeting had two primary objectives, both of which we feel were fully attained. The first objective of this meeting was to design a small pilot research project which assesses support networks for migrants across Europe. This study was to be conducted by a core group of largely young researchers from 5 nations (Britain, Germany, Spain, Estonia and Hungary) drawn from a range of interdisciplinary perspectives in the social sciences. The second aim was to bring together an additional group of primarily older and distinguished experts - from both the scientific community and the wider political and social environment - who were to help provide additional guidance in designing this pilot work as well as further information about the research topic being investigated.

Our first stage in this research work was to gather together a large package of relevant materials which were to be considered at our first workshop. This package, which was primarily brought together via extension email contacts prior to our meeting, is attached in Appendix 1. In addition, Drs Burau and Goodwin held a meeting in February 2001 with Dr Eva Ostergaard-Nielsen, Research Fellow in International Relations, at the London School of Economics where we discussed a related UK Economic and Social Research Council project on Diaspora politics and social integration and generated further ideas for our pilot research. Workshop attendees also prepared various additional papers relevant to the proposed research topic prior to the meeting, which are attached as Appendix 2. These include pertinent statistics on migration and academic articles relevant to our research venture.

Having gathered this material, we then begun the meeting with a detailed consideration of the overall plan of the research, and the theoretical perspectives we were to adopt in this work. Each team member presented evidence concerning their own previous pertinent research in this field, and Dr. Burau provided a valuable political science framework into which our project could be placed. In particular we begun work on a theoretical rationale for this research which could incorporate the various themes to be explored in our pilot research. This framework is appended as Appendix 3.

Having established a theoretical framework for our research we then discussed the practical limitations of the work plan. In particular, we were concerned about the limited time we had available until our subsequent workshop (5 months) and discussed at length the degree to which data could be collected ready for analysis by that time. Eventually we decided on the criteria listed in the workplan presented in Appendix 4: as stipulated in the ESF proposal for this grant a minimum of 12 participants were to be interviewed in each country, six younger and six older participants but with age of participant dependent on generation studied (see Appendix for details). Researchers were, where possible, to be members of the ethnic minority group studied, with interviews to be conducted in the appropriate language for most of the interview. All interviews were to be conducted in a natural setting and recorded.
Our attention then turned to the framing of appropriate questions for our pilot respondents. There was considerable (and sometimes quite heated!) discussion over each question included, with materials prepared partly from the materials brought with team members (Appendix 1) and partly as a result of discussions at the session. Additionally, in the case of two final scales, items were drafted during the meeting but finalised following consultations held after the workshop (in particular with Professor Shalom Schwartz, Hebrew University, Israel, who advised us on the use of his values items in our pilot research). We particularly welcomed the contributions of Professor Fülop (Hungarian Academy of Sciences) during these discussions, with Professor Fülop adding her considerable knowledge of cross-cultural research methodology.

In addition to our research planning, Professor Dr. Jeno Kaltenberg and Mr Binh Nguyen gave us further information about the situation of ethnic minority groups in Hungary. We particularly welcomed their insights into how the legal and political frameworks that exist within this country influence the support networks available for migrants, an insight which helped us considerably in the formulation of our interview questions and procedures. We also greatly welcomed Mr. Binh Nguyen’s advice on the manner in which participants might best be recruited, an important additional consideration for any such research project.

3. Final Programme - Workshop 1

Day 1: Friday 6th April 2001
10.00-13.00: Welcome meeting. Overview and history of the project and outline and discussion of research frame for project.
13.00-14.00: Lunch
14.00-18.00: Presentation of relevant prepared materials (presentations by each core member of the team of their work in this area and related theoretical and empirical materials). Discussion of prepared package of materials prepared by Dr Goodwin and initial discussions of sampling procedures.

Day 2: Saturday 7th April 2001
10.00-13.00: Development of research framework for current research. Identification of key research participants and communities for pilot comparisons across cultures.

Day 3: Sunday 8th April 2001
9.00-13.00: Development of interview items for analysis of values and support networks: I
13.00-14.00: Lunch
14.00-17.00: Development of interview items for analysis of values and support networks: II

Day 4: Monday 9th April 2001
9.00-13.00: Discussions with Parliamentary Commissioner for National and Ethnic Rights Prof. Kaltenbach on implementing policy approaches.
13.00-14.00: Lunch
14.00-20.00 (Discussions continued over Dinner). Discussions with Professor Fülop on cross-cultural research methodology and Mr. Thanh Binh Nguyen from the Vietnamese Community on support networks for migrants in Hungary. We were joined for Dinner by Janos Gyori, a Mentor teacher at Eotvos Lorand University and Radnoti Miklos Training School.
Day 5: Tuesday 10th April 2001
9.00-13.00: Development of structured interviews for pilot research work: I
13.00-14.00: Lunch
14.00-18.00: Development of structured interviews for pilot research work: II

Day 6: 11th April 2001
10.00-13.00: Clarification of remaining issues, ensuring all participants were certain of work to be completed by workshop II in September 2001.
13.00-14.00: Lunch and close.

4. Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field - Workshop 1

We believe that this first planning workshop was a great success. As a result of this meeting we were able to produce a complex and detailed research agenda for the participants to be pursued over the five months prior to our second workshop in Madrid. Informed by the valuable contributions made by all the team members plus our ‘external’ experts we were able to prepare a theoretically rich research framework which forms the basis not only for our pilot investigations but should also provide us with an ideal structure for more elaborate and ambitious research.

To this end we also discussed the new EUROCORE programme currently about to be launched by the ESF, and considered as a group preliminary papers available on the Foundation’s website. We are optimistic that the pilot work currently being conducted for this project should provide us with an ideal launch-pad for a more detailed grant application on immigration and social support. We intend to prepare this application in the months that follow our second workshop and to submit it for consideration for the June 2002 round of applications.

Throughout the planning and implementation of these workshops we have striven to link this work with our on-going projects in our respective countries. As mentioned above, Drs Burau and Goodwin held a discussion meeting with Dr Ostergaard-Nielsen (London School of Economics, February 2001) and Ms Goebel has been working on integrating our research with a large (7m DM) German Government project exploring language learning and intercultural competency, with a particular interest in the acculturation process (Conference of the Federal Cultural Ministries). Dr Realo is a participant in a related Estonian project "Monitoring the Integration Process in Estonia" (Estonian Integration Foundation), and Dr Nguyen Luu in a Hungarian Bolyai Research project on acculturation of the Chinese and Vietnamese population in Hungary. Dr Grad is a researcher on the project “Orientations of young men and women to citizenship and European identity”, recently funded by the “UE Program Improving the socio-economic knowledge base” programme, and deputy representative for Spain on the RAREN network (Rapid Response and Evaluation Network) of the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia. We hope to extend our linkages with other such large international programmes as our pilot work and collaboration continues.
5. Statistical information - Workshop 1

**Age structure:** Of our key core team members at the meeting, four were 35 or under and two older than 35. Our expert advisors were all over 35.

**Gender breakdown:** Of the six core members attending the meeting four were female; three of the four expert advisors were males.

**Country of origin** (including our expert advisors)

- Hungarian: 3
- Vietnamese-Hungarian: 2
- British: 1
- German: 2
- Spanish: 1
- Estonian: 1

6. Final list of participants - Workshops 1

**Core research-team members:**

Dr Robin Goodwin  
Department of Human Sciences  
Brunel University  
Uxbridge UB8 3PH, UK  
Tel: +44 1895 816200  
Fax: +44 1895 203018  
Email: robin.goodwin@brunel.ac.uk

Dr Viola Burau  
Department of Government  
Brunel University  
Uxbridge UB8 3PH, UK  
Tel: +44 1895 274000 ext 3651  
Fax: +44 1895 812595  
Email: Viola.Burau@brunel.ac.uk

Dr Anu Realo  
Department of Psychology  
University of Tartu  
Tiigi 78, Tartu 50410, Estonia  
Tel: +372 7 375915  
Fax: +372 7 375900  
Email: realo@psych.ut.ee

**Temporary mailing address for Dr Realo (valid until the November 2001):**

Department of Psychology  
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven  
Tiensestraat 102  
B-3000 Leuven  
Belgium  
Phone: +32 16 325909.  
Fax: +32 16 325993  
E-mail: anu.realo@psy.kuleuven.ac.be
Kerstin Goebel
Deutsches Institut fuer Internationale Paedagogische Forschung
Schloss-Strasse 29
D-60486 Frankfurt am Main
Fon +49-(0)69-24708111
Sekr +49-(0)69-24708106
Fax +49-(0)69-24708444
e-mail: goebel@dipf.de

Dr Hector Grad
Gabinete de Estudios, Rectorado
Universidad Autonoma de Madrid
Ciudad Universitaria de Cantoblanco
28049 Madrid, Spain
tel.: +34 91 397 5294
fax: +34 91 397 4654
e-mail: hector.grad@uam.es

Dr Lan Anh Nguyen Luu
Social and Educational Psychology Department
Eotvos Lorand University,
H-1064 Budapest, Izabella u. 46
Tel: 361 3423 130
Fax: 361 3423 109
Email: lananh@izabell.elte.hu

Additional experts:

Professor Marta Fülöp,
Senior Research Fellow and Szecheni Professor of Social Psychology
Institute for Psychology
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
Budapest 1132
Victor Hugo utca 18-22
Hungary.

Thanh Binh Nguyen (Representative of Vietnamese Association)
Budapest XIII district,
Tatai ut 112/A
Budapest
Hungary

Professor Dr. Jeno Kaltenbach (Parliamentary Commissioner for National and Ethnic Rights)
H-1054 BUDAPEST,
Tüköry u.3.
Tel.: (36-1) 269-3500
Fax: (36-1) 269-3529
www.obh.hu.

Janos Gyori
Mentor teacher
Eotvos Lorand University and Radnoti Miklos Training School
Budapest
Hungary
1) Executive summary - Workshop 2

This, the second of our two meetings, had three main objectives, all of which we feel were fully met by this meeting. First, we developed an extensive coding scheme for our data collected in the months since our first planning meeting in Budapest. Second, we held a number of meetings and roundtable discussions with local experts and academics working in the field of migration in Spain. Finally, we discussed and planned the submission of further applications, and in particular an application for further EUROCORE funding.

The meeting begun with each member of the research team presenting a detailed report on the data collected so far. Any particular problems in the data collection were identified and discussed: these will be addressed in the remaining data collection and will of course be taken into account in future research projects conducted by the team. The team then devised a detailed qualitative data coding strategy, with the categories for analysis listed in Appendix 1. This was complemented by the formation of an SPSS file for entering the quantitative findings from our pilot research (see Appendix 4 for coding categories). Finally, prior to the workshop all team members had been asked to summarise the data they have collected in their country and to give a preliminary analysis of the broader background of the immigration situation and policy of the country within the theoretical framework given by Dr Burau, a political science expert (see Appendices 2 and 3). Each member of the project produced a brief report summarised in the Scientific Summary below and contributed to a policy discussion session led by Dr Burau. A full report from Dr Burau is in Appendix 3.

Consultations with expert colleagues and policy makers took a number of forms during our meeting. The project team was expanded to include local expert Dr. Luisa Martín Rojo from the Department of Linguistics at the Autonoma University of Madrid and an expert on language and migration. Two ‘roundtable’ discussions were held, involving social workers, psychologists, linguists, lawyers and anthropologists in a discussion on the situation of migration across Europe (see below for details). This was complemented by a field study of a Madrid neighbourhood with a large immigrant community (Lavapies) and meetings with two local community leaders at the Madrid Open Door Centre.

In the final part of our meeting we devised a detailed strategy for further research applications for the team. This involved the identification of the key aims of future research applications and the major methods of research. We also selected participant groups for future studies and the partners in this research process. Finally, we identified 14 potential sources of future funding for group projects and further network meetings (tabulated in section 2 below). One application for such funding, to the British Academy, has now been made, and further applications are currently in preparation.
2. Scientific content - Workshop 2

The meeting began with a detailed description of the progress of our work so far. Participants were asked to give details of the work completed (whom they had interviewed, the manner of recruitment and observations from the sample interviewed so far). We summarise these discussions below.

**Hungary**

Our Hungarian partner had so far interviewed 6 respondents, 4 from the older group studied (3 males, 1 female) and two from the younger group (1 male and 1 female). All were from the Vietnamese ethnic group and were interviewed in Vietnamese and Hungarian by Lan Anh Nguyen Luu. Respondents were recruited through a large sporting event for the Vietnamese community.

Dr Nguyen Luu noted that all her respondents spoke very good Hungarian and all were University educated, a typical feature of this group. The older generation generally consisted of business people who enjoyed a very good economic situation. None of those interviewed had Hungarian citizenship. Respondents were keen to fit into the Hungarian society but they reported that this was not easy. Respondents liked the living standard and cultural life in Hungary and the climate. Two respondents liked the political system too and generally found life to be more predictable. What was less appreciated was the perceived interpersonal selfishness of the Hungarians or the ways they raised children and some respondents complained of racism in Hungarian society. Four of the six thought it quite likely that they will stay in Hungary.

**Support networks**

All respondents said they had friends from both ethnic groups, and all had support from Hungarian friends. None however had “best friends” who were Hungarian, although some had more Hungarian friends than Vietnamese friends. Even those who said they had more Hungarian friends than Vietnamese did not have a strong Hungarian identity.

The most important support for these Hungarian colleagues came from family and Hungarian and Vietnamese friends, but the family was less important for providing informational support. Two respondents received support from those living in neither Vietnam or Hungary. In general there were few incidences given discussing emotional support and participants were less willing to give details of such emotional aid.

**Germany**

Our German colleague had also interviewed six respondents so far, 4 from the older group (2 male) and 2 from the younger (1 male). All were from the Turkish ethnic group, and were interviewed in Turkish (older respondents) or German (younger respondents). They were all interviewed by a Turkish student and recruited through associates of the student through snowball sampling.

Although elder participants had resided in Germany a long time, language competency was less than expected, and with this group it was not possible to do the interviews in German. All the elder participants reported that they had at least good German competence but the interviewer felt their language competence to be weak. The elder participants reported less education (from 0 to 5 years schooling) whereas younger participants reported a minimum of 13 years education (including professional education). In general the Turkish sample liked the discipline and the social welfare system in Germany. They disliked the hostility of
Germans towards foreigners, unemployment, alcohol and the German way of family life. One younger interviewee and one elder interviewee (both males) reported that it is unlikely that they will stay in Germany.

Support networks

Some of the interviewees reported having German friends but when it comes to the critical incidences they report greater aid from the Turkish community. Some of them reported that their best friends are from all the different groups assessed but the Turkish community seems to be more important. One elder Turkish respondent reported that their best friends were all Turks but that she received emotional help from a German colleague. One elder male Turkish participant reported that he did not receive any emotional support but that he did not need this. Notably, those who reported they had German friends did not feel that assimilating into German society was so important.

In general, Ms Goebel noted that the support ranking task proved problematic. She suggested that we may have to reanalyse this data when it comes to our final analysis.

Dr Schmitz has been severely ill during much of this project. However, he has agreed to complement this data set by collecting additional interviews using the same questionnaire with Spanish immigrants in Northrhine-Westfalia. The target is a minimum of 12 respondents although hopefully more will be completed, with a balance of younger and older respondents and males and females. Contact is being established through a Spanish cultural association and full data should be available to complement our present analysis towards the end of this year.

Estonia

Our Estonian partner had now arranged for our full sample (in this case 13 participants) to be interviewed. 7 were from the older group (mean age 56 years, 3 males and 4 females) and 6 from the younger group (mean age 23.5 years, 1 male and 5 females). The sample was contacted in Tartu through snowball sampling through acquaintances.

All of the sample were Russian-speaking and interviewed in Russian by an Estonian interviewer (graduate student). Notably all but one of the respondents said they used only Russian as their everyday language at home. Knowledge of Estonian in this group was relatively good except for some older participants who spoke little Estonian. The knowledge of Estonian by non-Estonians is a crucial issue in the integration process. Surveys in Estonia on interethnic relations have revealed that for the majority of Estonians the concept of integration is related, in the first place, to proficiency in the Estonian language.

All of the younger group were Estonian citizens, whereas in the older group 3 participants were Estonian citizens, 1 participant had Russian citizenship and a temporary residence permit in Estonia and 3 respondents were the holders of so-called “Alien’s passports” (citizenship undefined) with permanent residence permits in Estonia. In the older group, people had been in Estonia for at least 26 years (mean duration 40 years), so this represented a very well established group.

In general, respondents had a very positive opinion about Estonia. They liked Estonian nature, the people, and the general environment. On the negative side, they did not like their financial situation and discussed unemployment in general and other social problems as well “the coldness” of the Estonian people. However, they all intend to stay in Estonia because it is “my homeland,” as many of the respondents answered. Respondents felt it was important to belong to the Estonian majority group to fully participate in a
society but considered it moderately difficult to belong. Both identities were rated as not very important and shared the same mean in the values questionnaire.

Support networks

All respondents reported that they had many family members to support them. They had friendships both amongst Estonians and Russians. Practical support generally came from close family, relatives, and colleagues (both Estonians and Russians); emotional support included family and friends (mostly Russians). Sources of informational support were very diverse, including people from different ethnic groups as well as the media. In response to the question of whether it is possible to get practical and informational support from friends etc. back in Russia, the answers were mostly negative. For emotional support, the answers were a bit more positive.

Spain

Our Spanish partner has so far interviewed 6 respondents, 3 younger (2 male) and 3 older (2 male). All were Moroccans, one with Spanish citizenship and five with residence in Spain. Five were interviewed in Spanish, but one younger woman was interviewed in Arabic. One respondent was a student, the others contacted through contacts with the Moroccan community and snowball sampling. Overall the respondents demonstrated fairly good language competence with the exception of one younger respondent. Older respondents used Spanish and Arabic back at home, the younger used Arabic. Knowledge of the language was seen by the Moroccans as an essential factor for integration. One respondent mentioned that the Spanish people were however not open to other cultures and despite an effort to integrate by the Moroccans there was a general perception of difficulty in being accepted by the host society. In particular the Moroccans had a high economic expectation that was frustrated to some extent by the Spanish community. Despite this all but one of the older respondents wanted to stay in Spain.

Social support

Support came mainly from the family with other Moroccans particularly significant for emotional and informational support. The main problem reported here was the attitudes of Spanish people who were particularly distant in the workplace.

The social support question led to some problems of how to interpret emotional support and highlighted the need to simplify language where possible in our questions. There were also problems with the value questionnaire with high use of 7s. The value of pleasure was particularly problematic – respondents didn’t understand what “pleasure” meant and this question was seen as embarrassing. This is likely to need further clarification in later and larger studies.

England

In England our partner has so far interviewed 6 respondents (2 males) all from the older sample group. Five of the respondents reported themselves to be British residents, although one had an Indian passport. Two of the respondents reported that they were born in India before the partition. Respondents were contacted largely through health service contacts. Overall, spoken English language competency was rated as good or very good by the interviewer. However, reading and writing skills were far more variable, with one
respondent only able to write her name in English. All respondents were certain they would stay in the UK but felt that they would have to be from the host community to ‘fit in’ in Britain and they found it generally difficult to ‘fit in’.

**Social support**

Most of the respondents had friends and family in Britain already prior to moving to Britain. Respondents felt they had enough practical support and were moderately satisfied with this support and they could also get practical help from ‘back home’. They also felt that they had sufficient emotional support and they were generally happy with this aid. Four of the six felt they had a great deal of informational support too, but two felt that they lacked this help.

As specified above, the meeting then proceeded with the development of extensive coding schemes for both the quantitative and qualitative analysis of our research data. These are provided in detail in the attached appendices. In addition to this, we held roundtable discussions with local community experts and academics working in this field. Finally, we discussed in depth future research projects and identified potential sources of funding for such work (see end of section 3, below).
3. Detailed final programme - Workshop 2

Day 1 Thursday 6th September.

7pm – 10pm
Welcome meeting and initial discussion of amended programme.

Day 2 Friday 7th September

10am-1pm
Detailed report from each country on progress of work thus far (summarised in scientific report, above).

2pm – 6pm

Qualitative data analysis session 1:
Development of detailed programme for qualitative data analysis identifying the categories for each of the open ended questions to be used in subsequent analysis (see Appendix 1 for category lists developed)

Day 3 Saturday 8th September

2pm – 7pm

Qualitative data session 2:
Continuation of data analysis discussion for the identification of open ended categories.

Day 4 Sunday 9th September

10am – 5pm
Visit to Lavapies, a large migrant area. Touring of this area and meeting two local community leaders (Jesus Migallon and Tafsir Dia) at the Madrid Open Door Centre, which deals with the legal and social issues of migrants in this area.

7pm – 10pm

Theoretical analysis session.
Between the two workshops Dr Burau produced a question and answer sheet for each of the project participants designed to provide information about the characteristics of their society in terms of immigration policy and welfare provision (Appendix 2). Dr Burau then led a discussion of these country summaries which are also included here (Appendix 3). This allowed us to develop a more complete analysis of welfare and policy issues relevant to migrants in these societies. Her analysis focused on immigration policy and control, national identity, citizenship, welfare state provision and educational access. Her more complete report on these findings is provided in Appendix 3.

Day 5 Monday 10th September

10am – 1pm

Roundtable discussion I
A total of 11 participants participated in a roundtable discussion on the situation of migration across Europe. This was led by three experts in Spain: Inma Morales, Social worker and lawyer and Nadia Jamard, a psychologist (both at the Refugee Centre, Madrid) and Liliana Suarez Navaz, an anthropologist at the Departamento de Antropologia Social at the Universidad Autonoma de Madrid and Director of the Masters Programme in Intercultural Relations
Each expert gave a brief presentation of her work and the situation of immigration in Spain, with a particular focus on the situation of Moroccans, the biggest immigrant group in Spain. We discussed the significance of the personal histories of the individuals coming from the different countries and how these influence the support network patterns as well as the process of achieving refuge status and variations between different migrants groups. We also considered the role of personality in the process of integration of asylum seekers. Issues of mutual and historical conflicts and Islamophobia were considered, as well as the variations in hostility with other Muslim groups such as the Senegales. In particular we considered the manner in which different groups (such as Algerians) might be able to access non-familial support more successfully than others and we also explored the distinction between rural populations (largely berbers) and urban dwellers in Morocco and their representation by their community leaders. Also discussed was the situation of other similar sized ethnic groups from other nations such as Ecuador (there is less tension between Spaniards and other Spanish speaking Catholic groups) and broad gender and religious issues in migration.

2pm-3pm.

Roundtable Discussion II
Continuation of roundtable discussions with Ana Ruiz, Associate Professor in Linguistics at the Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, an expert on religion and migration and the literature produced by Spanish emigrants. Our discussions here focused on the way in which religious beliefs and commitment may influence the process of support gathering amongst Spanish migrants.

4pm – 7pm.

Quantitative analysis discussion
During this session we devised an appropriate coding scheme for the quantitative analysis of our data using the SPSS programme. A coding scheme was devised and amended by Dr Realo after the meeting – this is enclosed as Appendix 4.

Day 6: Tuesday 11th September

This day was dedicated to planning future project collaboration, both through the EUROCORES programme, extended network meetings and other potential projects, funded by both the EU and other relevant funders.

10am – 1pm

Discussion of core ingredients for future research applications

Central topics of future research programmes

The group sees as its basic topic for future research a research project provisionally entitled The Optimisation of support networks systems of migrants in a European context. A particular emphasis of this work will be on the social policy implications of these networks and their impact on individual adjustment and well-being.

This research work will have the benefit of:

• Providing basic information about use of different forms and levels of support in different European nations.
• Identifying patterns of needs of particular groups and the implications of these needs for policy practice, psychological wellbeing and the successful educational integration of migrants in these societies.
• Promoting the development and adaptation of culturally sensitive diagnostic instruments and methods for policy initiatives, community actions and individual and group representations.
• Identifying mutual benefits of mapping and fostering optimal roots of social support networks and the development of appropriate strategies for the enhancement of the economic and educational potential of migrants and their contribution to their host societies.
• Providing substantive policy recommendations, including
• Best location of physical migration within societies.
• Best means of providing support for the economic, educational and social development of these communities.
• Best practice for enhancing individual and group resources for coping with immigration process and migrant populations.
• Enhancement of the role of both local, regional and national governments and organisations and NGOs in the promotion of support and wellbeing for migrants.

Main methods of research

The group sees this work as best pursued through a combination of quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Probable future methodologies will include:

• Focus groups with migrants
• Socio-metric analysis of social integration and support
• Structured and semi-structured questionnaires
• Appropriately focused interviewing e.g. elite interviews with policy makers and practitioners, life story analyses of migrant populations.
• Discourse analysis of policy documents and the media.

Participant groups

We envisage two main participant groups in our future research topics:

1. A major migrant group relevant to the country under investigation (e.g. Moroccans in Spain). This will be a first generation group only: respondents will not be refugees but will be those applying for residential status. Respondents will not be those moving for either reasons of study or marriage, and respondents will not be those on short sojourns for companies etc.

2. A common group across all nations: at present, the most likely group will be the Chinese, as these represent a small community in each of these countries. Our focus will be on relatively isolated parts of this community (e.g. Chinese running a small restaurant in an area where there are few Chinese citizens)

Respondents will be an adult group aged 25 to 40 plus their accompanying children attending school. We will analyse support networks both amongst this adult group and school-aged children.

We will aim to achieve representative sampling of the migrant communities studied where possible, working with NGOs and governmental partners to recruit our participants.

Partners in the work.

At present we envisage working with a team drawn from those most active in the present workshops (i.e. the core team members in each country plus Marta Fulop and Luisa Martín Rojo). We are however aware that we need to expand our team to include a more diverse range of participants from across the social sciences, and we are looking in particular to include further social policy experts.

2pm-5pm

Preparation of materials for ESF report and plans for future research funding.

Responsibilities for both finding out about these funding sources, and potentially leading these applications, were discussed and appropriately devolved amongst the group. The team members were asked to provide brief descriptions of various funding sources and the contact details for these.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding foundation</th>
<th>Person responsible</th>
<th>One line description</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESF</td>
<td>Robin Goodwin</td>
<td>Offers networks: “small groups of scholars from different countries meeting over a period of three to five years to work on particular issues or questions of methodology”</td>
<td><strong>DR GOODWIN HAS NOW MADE A SUCCESSFUL APPLICATION UNDER THIS SCHEME ON BEHALF THE GROUP.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurocores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.britac.ac.uk/guide">www.britac.ac.uk/guide</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EU FP5
Anu Realo  
Third call for Key Action “Improving the Socio-economic knowledge base” (deadline 15<sup>th</sup> January 2002) includes two themes (2 and 3) highly relevant to our topic  
[www.cordis.lu/improving/calls/ser_200103.htm](http://www.cordis.lu/improving/calls/ser_200103.htm)

### Ford Foundation
Lan Anh Nguyen Luu  

### NATO
Kowi  
Paul Schmitz

### Nuffield
Viola Burau  
Funds research projects that advance education or social welfare. Open stream most relevant although our international orientation might be a constraint.  
[www.nuffield.org.uk](http://www.nuffield.org.uk)

### Bertelsmann Stiftung
  
The foundation seems to initiate a lot of research projects themselves. I have asked a friend who works for the foundation what the possibilities are for external funding.  
[www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de](http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de)

### Robert-Bosch-Stiftung
  
Offers funding for strictly health focused research projects and as such is not relevant for our research plans.  
[www.bosch-stiftung.de](http://www.bosch-stiftung.de)

### Volkswagen Stiftung
  
Funds international projects within its research streams. One is about processes of intercultural boundary settings and identities and sounds very relevant to us.  
[www.volkswagenstiftung.de](http://www.volkswagenstiftung.de)

### EU Accompanying measures
Hector Grad  
Although money is currently exhausted for this fund we are aiming to include this within FP6 if possible. The website provides useful materials on related projects for writing up papers from this work.  

### Jacobs Foundation
Kerstin Goebel  
This is likely to fund primarily an educational approach to this work.

### General German Funding site
  
[www.research-in-germany.de](http://www.research-in-germany.de)

In addition colleagues discussed the possibility to supplement these applications with funding from local and regional funding agencies.

*Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> September*

Departure.
4. Assessment of the results and contribution to the future direction of the field - Workshop 2

We believe that this second workshop was a great success. As a result of this meeting we were able to produce a detailed coding strategy for the analysis of the data collected between the two workshops. This strategy, which included guidelines for the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data, should allow us to produce a coherent and publishable analysis of our data, and plans are already being made for ‘writing up’ the results of this work for journal publication and conference presentations. Informed by the valuable contributions made by all the team members plus our ‘external’ experts we were also able to work on a theoretically rich and multidisciplinary research framework which will be crucial when interpreting our findings. This has formed the basis for interpreting our pilot investigation findings and should also provide us with an ideal structure for more elaborate and ambitious research.

We are optimistic that the pilot work currently being conducted for this project should provide us with an ideal launch-pad for a more detailed grant application on immigration and social support. One application, to the British Council for further network support, has already been made and is currently under consideration. We intend to prepare a new EUROCORES application in the next few months and aim to submit this for consideration for the June 2002 round of applications. Other possible funding sources are currently also being considered and are listed at the end of our Scientific Report.

Throughout the planning and implementation of these workshops we have striven to link this work with our on-going projects in our respective countries, a full list of which was included in our first workshop report. We hope to continue and extend our links with other such large international programmes as our collaboration continues.

5. Statistical information on participants

Country of origin:
Hungarian Vietnamese 1
British 1
German 3
Spanish 5
Moroccan 1
Senegalese 1
Estonian 1
Spanish Columbian 1
Spanish French 1

Age distribution. 50% of the participants (8) were 35 or under, the remaining were over 35.

Gender distribution. 6 males, 9 females.
6. Final List of Participants - Workshop 2

*Project co-ordinator.*
Dr Robin Goodwin  
Department of Human Sciences  
Brunel University  
Uxbridge UB8 3PH, UK  
Tel: +44 1895 816200  
Fax: +44 1895 203018  
Email: robin.goodwin@brunel.ac.uk

Dr Viola Burau  
Department of Government  
Brunel University  
Uxbridge UB8 3PH, UK  
Tel: +44 1895 274000 ext 3651  
Fax: +44 1895 812595  
Email: Viola.Burau@brunel.ac.uk

Dr Anu Realo  
Department of Psychology  
University of Tartu  
Tuigi 78, Tartu 50410, Estonia  
Tel: +372 7 375915  
Fax: +372 7 375900  
Email: realo@psych.ut.ee

Dr Paul Schmitz  
Department of Social and Personality Psychology  
University of Bonn  
Rommstr 164  
53117 Bonn, Germany  
Tel: +49 228 73 44 35  
Fax: +49 228 67 69 99  
Email: ups101@mailin.uni-bonn.de

Kerstin Goebel  
Deutsches Institut fuer Internationale Paedagogische Forschung  
Schloss-Strasse 29  
D-60486 Frankfurt am Main  
Fon +49-(0)69-24708111  
Sekr +49-(0)69-24708106  
Fax +49-(0)69-24708444  
e-mail: goebel@dipf.de

Dr Hector Grad  
Gabinete de Estudios, Rectorado  
Universidad Autonoma de Madrid  
Ciudad Universitaria de Cantoblanco  
28049 Madrid, Spain  
tel.: +34 91 397 5294  
fax: +34 91 397 4654  
e-mail: hector.grad@uam.es

Dr Lan Anh Nguyen Luu  
Social and Educational Psychology Department  
Eotvos Lorand University,  
H-1064 Budapest, Izabella u. 46  
Tel: 361 3423 130  
Fax: 361 3423 109  
Email: lananh@izabell.elte.hu
Local Cultural Informants

1. Masrar Mohammed (Moroccan informant in Madrid working on Spanish data)
   64 Derb Bouril
   Sidi Amar Lahcini
   Meknes-Marruecos
   Tel: 55 53 28 27

2. Jesus Migallon
   (Sociologist and Anthropologist and President of the Open –Door Centre (Madrid Puerta Abierta Asociacion))
   C/ Sombrerete, 26 bajo
   28012 Madrid
   Tel: 91 539 5028

3. Tafsir Dia
   Secretary of the Association of Senegalese Immigrants in Spain
   Cultural Mediator working for the Madrid Puerta Abierta Asociacion
   C/ Sombrerete, 26 bajo
   28012 Madrid
   Tel: 91 539 5028

Roundtable participants

Inma Morales, Social worker and lawyer at the refugee Centre in Madrid, Luis Buñel, 2, Madrid, 28038.

Nadia Jamard, Psychologist located at above address.

Liliana Suarez Navaz, anthropologist, Departamento de Antropologia Social. Universidad Autonoma de Madrid. Director of Masters Programme in Intercultural Relations.

Ana Ruiz, Associate Professor in Department of Linguistics, Universidad Autonoma de Madrid. Works on the literature produced by Spanish emigrants.

Appendices may be consulted as a separate pdf file