



Monitoring (anti-) discrimination in European cities: which tools, which strategies?

Hassan Bousetta ULg-FNRS-CEDEM
ECCAR General Conference, 18-20 September 2008,
Bologna



Plan

1. Monitoring strategies of racism and discrimination
2. Examples of monitoring strategies of racism and discrimination
3. Moving forward



Why indicators?

- Measuring and diagnosing the extent of discrimination, disadvantage, diversity in a given local context at different points of time?
- Measuring the effectiveness of policies at different points of time?
- Comparing different context/cities ?



Why indicators?

So, ideally, what ECCAR is aiming to is:

The construction of valid, reliable and comparative quantitative indicators measuring the extent of racism and discrimination

But....



Indicators for monitoring what?

- Discrimination or anti-discrimination policy?

Difference between:

- Indicators of implementation
- Indicators of results



Indicators for monitoring whom?

- Indicators may be monitoring
 - Majority group (attitudes of tolerance, ethnocentrism, etc)
 - Minority groups (subjective feeling of potential victims of discrimination)
 - Both



Indicators to measure how?

- Surveys
- Aggregate behavioural testing
- Secondary Statistical analysis of existing quantitative datasets
- Qualitative assessment



Limits to anti-discrimination indicators

- Aggregated behavioural testing: without any effect on indirect discrimination, possible biases in testers' attitudes and sampling (e.g. informal recruitment procedures)
- Opinion surveys: not a measure of actual discrimination
- Surveys: large number of measures needed in order to capture discriminatory effects (Difficult to address cumulative discrimination)
- Existing administrative data: generally not aimed at measuring discrimination
- Complaints databases: register only processed cases
- Qualitative interviews: small number of observations



II. Examples of monitoring strategies of racism and discrimination

ECCAR Cities

- Municipal survey: Rotterdam, Madrid, Bologna
- Secondary data: Botkyrka, Liège
- Qualitative data



II. Examples of monitoring strategies of racism and discrimination

MIPEX

- Migrant Integration Policy Index
- Biannual measurement by a consortium of 25 organisations under leadership of MPG and British Council
- Analysis of third country nationals in 140 areas of policy (access to labour market, rights to settlement, political participation, etc)



II. Examples of monitoring strategies of racism and discrimination

MIPEX

- Indicators are established in relation to the normative framework. They do evaluate in accordance to the best EU and national normative standard
- Points are allocated from 1 to 3 on each indicator
- Peer reviewed assessment



III. Proposal for moving forward

- Gradualism: step by step methodology, phasing the construction of the indicators
- Pragmatism: necessity to draw on available resources (political will and financial resources)
- Bottom-up approach: devise a flexible common framework based on already existing indicators at municipal level



Proposal for moving forward

Liège seminar showed:

1. Indicators derived from primary data (Rotterdam, Madrid, Bologna)
2. Indicators derived from existing administrative data (Botkyrka, Liège)
3. Qualitative indicators



Proposal for moving forward

- Liège seminar showed that there are:
 - Limits to data availability (e.g. ethnic data)
 - Limits to data comparability (e.g. categorisation)
 - Limits to reliability and validity of data



Proposal for moving forward

- Liège seminar showed that cities are using primary and secondary data for measuring different issues:
 - Lawful and unlawful/direct and indirect/subjective and objective discrimination
 - Ethnic disadvantage
 - Diversity/Interaction/Tolerance/Interculturalism



Proposal for moving forward

- Seminar showed that cities are monitoring different groups:
 - Majority groups
 - Minority groups
 - Or Both



Proposal for moving forward

1. Allow for a diversity of data sources
2. Invite different methods for constructing indicators locally
3. Publish a common report on municipal indicators that would bring together the multiplicity of practice
4. Pilot experiment with a set of common indicators



1. Allow for a diversity of data sources

1. Indicators derived from primary data (Municipal surveys, aggregated behavioural testing, opinion surveys, etc)
2. Indicators derived from secondary data (census, national registers, complaints databases, etc)
3. Qualitative indicators (Case-studies based on interview material)



2. Invite different methods for constructing indicators locally

- Analysis of primary data from municipal data archives, surveys and aggregated behavioural discrimination testing
- Analysis of secondary data from existing administrative datasets (census, national registers,
- Regression analysis of existing quantitative data (census, national registers, surveys, etc.)
- Qualitative analysis of interview material



3. Publish a common report

- Collect city-reports on indicators (partly achieved)
- Draw common report bringing side by side the multiplicity of municipal experience and the diversity of local indicators (next step).



4. Pilot experiment

- Bring together a common research team from both member cities and their partner universities
- Devise a common methodology and framework of analysis specifically focused on discrimination (CIRIEC proposal can be used here)
- Look for additional resources (EC FP 7, American and European Foundations)
- Select pilot cities on the basis of previous report
- Collect primary data in a harmonised way
- Multivariate analysis of discrimination