



Arts & Humanities  
Research Council



## **Franco-British Collaborative Workshop**



# **Two Models - one integration crisis? Immigrant/Minority conditions and policy options in France and Britain**

## **Contents:**

### **Workshop 1**

- Programme
- Participants List
- Workshop Report

### **Workshop 2**

- Programme
- Participants List
- Workshop Report

# WORKSHOP ONE - Programme

Church House Conference Centre, Westminster – 27 April 2007

- 9.00-9.30 **Registration**
- 9.30-9.45 **Opening**  
**ADRIAN ALSOP**, Economic and Social Research Council
- 9.45-10.00 **Presentation of the workshop**  
**STEVEN VERTOVEC**, ESRC Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS)  
**PATRICK SIMON**, Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques (INED)
- 10.00-11.30 **Session 1: Philosophies and policies of integration**  
*Chair:* **PATRICK SIMON**, Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques (INED)  
*Speaker:* **CHRISTOPHE BERTOSSI**, Institut Français des relations internationales (IFRI)  
*Policy Respondents:* **BHARTI PATEL**, Advisory Board on Naturalisation and Immigration;  
**ZAIR KEDADOUCHE**, Inspection générale de l'éducation nationale (IGEN) & conseiller à la présidence de la république  
*Discussant:* **THOMAS KIRSZBAUM**, l'Université d'Evry & GPECS, Paris 5
- 11.30-11.50 *Coffee/Tea break*
- 11.50-13.20 **Session 2: Migrants, minorities and the anti-discrimination model**  
*Chair:* **OMAR KHAN**, Runnymede Trust  
*Speaker:* **SARAH SPENCER**, COMPAS  
*Policy Respondents:* **CLAUDE-VALENTIN MARIE**, Haute Autorité de Lutte Contre Les Discriminations et Pour L'Egalité (HALDE), INED; **LIZ BARNARD**, Cohesion and Faiths Unit, Department for Communities and Local Government  
*Discussant:* **JOHN SOLOMOS**, City University
- 13.20-14.00 *Lunch*
- 14.00-15.30 **Session 3: Local institutional arrangements**  
*Chair:* **DIDIER LAPEYRONNIE**, l'Université de Bordeaux 2, CADIS  
*Speakers:* **PHILIP DUFFY**, Strategy Division, Department for Communities and Local Government  
*Policy Respondents:* **CLAUDE LANVERS**, Délégation à la politique de la ville et à l'intégration (DPVI), Ville de Paris; **ROGER LAWRENCE**, Wolverhampton City Council  
*Discussant:* **RICHARD STANTON (P.C.)**, Greater London Authority
- 15.30-17.00 **Session 4: Challenge of diversity: religion and cultural controversies**  
*Chair:* **STEVE VERTOVEC**, COMPAS  
*Speaker:* **TUFYAL CHOUDHURY**, Durham University  
*Policy Respondents:* **HARRIET CRABTREE**, Interfaith Network, **FOUAD IMARRAINE**, Collectif des Musulmans de France (CMF)  
*Discussant:* **MOHAMMED AZIZ**, FaithWise
- 17.00-17.30 *Closing Reception*

## WORKSHOP ONE - Participants List

<p>ALSOP, ADRIAN Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC),</p> <p>AZIZ, MOHAMMED FaithWise,</p> <p>BARNARD, LIZ Cohesion and Faiths Unit, Department for Communities and Local Government, k</p> <p>BASSEL, LEAH Department of International Development, University of Oxford,</p> <p>BERTOSSI, CHRISTOPHE Institut Français des relations internationales</p> <p>CHOUDHURY, TUFYAL Department of Law, Durham University,</p> <p>CRABTREE, HARRIET Interfaith Network,</p> <p>DUFFY, PHILIP Strategy Division, Department for Communities and Local Government,</p> <p>HAMAZ, SOFIA University of Oxford,</p> <p>IMARRAINE, FOUAD Collectif des Musulmans de France (CMF),</p> <p>ISAL, SARAH Runnymede Trust,</p> <p>KAO, TERESA University of Oxford,</p> <p>KEDADOUCHE, ZAIR Inspection générale de l'éducation nationale (IGEN) &amp; conseiller à la présidence de la</p> <p>KIRSZBAUM, THOMAS l'Université d'Evry &amp; GPECS, Paris 5,</p>	<p>KHAN, OMAR Runnymede Trust,</p> <p>LANVERS, CLAUDE Délégation à la politique de la ville et à l'intégration (DPVI),</p> <p>LAPEYRONNIE, DIDIER l'Université de Bordeaux 2, CADIS,</p> <p>LASKY, REBECCA Department of Social Anthropology, University of Oxford,</p> <p>LAWRENCE, ROGER Wolverhampton City Council, l</p> <p>MARIE, CLAUDE-VALENTIN Haute Autorité de Lutte Contre Les Discriminations et Pour L'Egalité (HALDE), INED,</p> <p>NWAJIAKU-DAHOU, KATHRYN Department of Politics and International Relations, University of Oxford,</p> <p>PATEL, BHARTI Advisory Board on Naturalisation and Immigration (ABNI),</p> <p>SIMON, PATRICK Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques (INED),</p> <p>SOLOMOS, JOHN Department of Sociology, City University,</p> <p>SPENCER, SARAH COMPAS, University of Oxford,</p> <p>STANTON, RICHARD (P.C.) Greater London Authority,</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

# **WORKSHOP ONE - Report**

## **Two Models - one integration crisis? Immigrant/Minority conditions and policy options in France and Britain** *Church House Conference Centre, Westminster – 27 April 2007*

This workshop brought together academics, policy makers and practitioners to discuss the commonalities, differences and challenges of integration in the British, French and European contexts. Co-chair Steven Vertovec noted that the conference topic was particularly timely in light of heightened public awareness of and concern about immigrant and ethnic minority integration following race riots in both countries (France 2005 and Britain 2001 and 2005). Co-chair Patrick Simon dedicated the workshop to unpacking the dual national models of integration through the examination of concrete examples of policy in practice.

A second session of this workshop will be held in Paris in October 2007 at which time the issues of labour markets, education and public relations will be discussed.

In his introduction to the workshop Adrian Alsop emphasized the need for a comparative and collaborative approach to research in this area, which is increasingly international in its examination of issues surrounding environment, security, religion and population change. He encouraged funding institutions to enable such collaboration by fostering development of methods for improved data comparison and simplified cooperation among social scientists.

The workshop was divided into four sessions and covered the themes of 'philosophies and policies of integration'; 'migrants, minorities and the anti-discrimination model'; 'local institutional arrangements' and 'the challenge of diversity: religion and cultural controversies.' Each session began with a preliminary speaker and policy respondents who presented French and British perspectives, followed by a discussant who drew out key themes for debate by all participants. This report will summarize the overall themes that emerged from the presentations and discussions in each session.

### ***Philosophies and policies of integration***

Preliminary speaker Christophe Bertossi drew attention to the crisis of confidence that both British and French models of integration were experiencing and noted the tendency in both countries to adopt new approaches to their existing philosophies rather than to question the philosophies themselves. In order to make sense of the policies of integration, he suggests an inspection of the contradictions that emerge from them and a recognition of their role in entrenching the under-representation and stigmatization of ethnicity and religion in public institutions.

Policy respondent, Bharti Patel, defended the British approach to integration, which she defined as an emphasis on the practical aspects of citizenship such as familiarity with the English language, law, and health and educational systems. She contended that this approach aims to be inclusive and compatible with diversity and the mutual tolerance of values. Policy respondent Zair Kedadouche focused on the importance of a system of political representation that reflects the diversity of the nation and emphasized the role of class divisions and their resulting inequalities of opportunity in the impediment of integration.

Discussant Patrick Simon encouraged comparison of the role of the state, national identity and treatment of Islam with reference to the frameworks of diversity tolerance in the UK and equality through non-difference in France. Discussion revealed that although French and British approaches to national identity

differed greatly, the impact on the integration of ethnic minorities was similar. In both cases, exclusion was presented as part and parcel of national identity.

The political discourse surrounding Islam was a revealing point of comparison for the French and British philosophies of integration. While it was generally agreed that the immediate political response to the 2005 London bombings was a measured one in terms of the absence of any overt blame on Islam, it was noted that criticisms of Islam did eventually emerge in more subtle debates surrounding immigration and the wearing of the niqab. It was generally agreed among the delegates that a stigmatization of Islam exists in the public spheres of both France and Britain with similar consequences for integration.

Other points of discussion and debate included an investigation of the nature and meaning of integration itself. There were several challenges to the notion that integration was a 'feeling' or 'a state of being', arguing that it was instead a much more practical process towards full socio-economic and political participation. There was general agreement that employment and equality were crucial aspects of integration, as well as agreement about the responsibility of the state in promoting these. Citizenship was identified as a key state institution through which to direct policies of integration.

### ***Migrants, minorities and the anti-discrimination model***

Preliminary speaker Sarah Spencer traced the history of anti-discrimination law and policy in the UK with a focus on race and individual redress. Spencer challenged the adequacy of individual redress alone to affect collective or systemic failures of public institutions, arguing that shifting the responsibility away from victims and onto state institutions was the key to 'positive duty' model of anti-discrimination. She identified this 'positive duty model' as one of the five principles of the UK's approach to anti-discrimination, the other four being ethnic/racial monitoring, recognition of diversity, a cohesion strategy that emphasizes citizenship, and equal access to social rights.

Policy respondent Claude-Valentin Marie questioned the choice to locate all anti-discrimination efforts in one institution in order to better coordinate strategies and reported that French experience was that resistance toward anti-discrimination measures among public institutions continued despite the availability of legal instruments. He also reminded delegates that anti-discrimination laws and principles should not displace efforts at equal employment.

Policy respondent Liz Barnard emphasized the importance of the local area in efforts to build community cohesion, an emphasis taken in the forthcoming 'Report of the Commission on Integration and Cohesion'.

There was a general consensus among delegates that promoting equality through public institutions was central to the anti-discrimination project, although the meaning and emphasis of 'equality' was contested.

Community and social cohesion, understood to mean efforts to foster shared values and a greater mixing and bridging of different communities, were discussed in relationship to feelings of belonging, anti-discrimination efforts, and diversity. There was disagreement about whether or not social cohesion and anti-discrimination efforts could co-exist, or whether their goals were contrary. Social cohesion was understood to discourage difference and create uniformity, efforts which are contrary to the maintenance of diversity. It was concluded that social cohesion is a concept that must be understood in context and can be interpreted as either progressive or conservative.

Examples of lived experiences of the failure of cohesion and anti-discrimination highlighted the range and complexity of the issues at hand, and ranged from misunderstandings about how and when to do things to the complex conflation of racial attitudes and personal or situational discontent. Racial segregation was identified as an important issue at the local level that contributed to both discrimination and failures of social cohesion.

The practice of ethnic and racial monitoring was specifically examined as it exists in the UK but not in France. Some maintained that effective anti-discrimination policy was not possible without ethnic and racial monitoring, while others rejected ethnicity as the basis of monitoring. It was noted that categories of ethnicity or race alone were inadequate as explanations of social outcomes such as educational performance, which could also be affected by locality or class.

### ***Local institutional arrangements***

The examination of local institutional arrangements highlighted the disjunction between governance, identity, and local and national experience. Preliminary speaker Phillip Duffy advocated the concept of 'participatory citizenship' with a local focus, since attitudes of belonging begin locally and because resource allocation is best understood at a local level. He cited the process of devolution in the UK as a progressive shift of governance to local authorities.

Speaker Thomas Kirschbaum contextualized the French policy of 'territorialisation' or 'politique de la ville' as an attempt to tackle the ghettoisation and social exclusion of immigrants and ethnic minorities. He explained that the practice involved administering to the needs of the quartiers through community agencies, and that an ethno-racial element was implicit in the selection of neighborhoods. By addressing social exclusion and inequality in this localized way, conflict with national political discourses of 'colour blindness' was avoided, at least until national political discourse began attributing social inequality to global processes and central control of policy in the quartiers was sought.

The experiences recounted by British and French policy respondents detailed some lessons learnt from and impacts of local integration efforts. Roger Lawrence emphasized that recognizing the attitudes and social problems of host populations was important in promoting the inclusion of ethnic and minority communities. Claude Lanvers focused on the divergence of national and local political agendas in France where, in the country's highly centralized political system, cities are subject to directives from the 'top' and are not given control of employment, education or policing on a local level. However, within these constraints Lanvers acknowledged the room for building local solidarity and political will to promote equal access to rights for all.

Discussion centered upon a comparison of national and local governance, the nature of ethnic and minority associative life, and the operation and role of the third sector.

Comparing national and local governance illustrated different perspectives on and experiences of immigration. On one hand, the conclusion in some cities that there is no alternative to increased immigration has led to a pragmatic approach towards infrastructure planning. But this often happens in the shadow of efforts at the national level to limit migration flows. Several French participants observed that efforts to resolve a crisis of national governance in France were directed at establishing a cohesion agenda and asserting control over the management of immigration in cities.

Associative life was described as a common response to integration needs in both France and Britain. Several participants criticized associative life for focusing on social needs and creating dependencies that reinforced differences of power. Others countered with experiences of the empowering nature of associative life as a means for the development of social capital, voice and the transformation towards wider participation. A question was posed about whether associative life was disrupting gender relations in ethnic and minority communities, and a concern was also noted about a possible separatist effect of ethnic and minority associations. Specific control of ethnic and minority groups through funding priorities was criticized as problematic and unfair.

The experiences of the third sector, a main component of local institutional arrangements, were discussed. These were described as ones of exhaustion, burnout, and perpetual funding challenges, despite increasing reliance on the sector for social services.

Once again, the theme of segregation was raised. It was apparent from experience at the local level that cultural interventions were not successful in dealing with unemployment and growing social and financial exclusion.

### ***Challenge of diversity: religion and cultural controversies***

Speaker Tufyal Choudhury approached the subject of religious and cultural diversity within the context of the law. Choudhury described the tool of law as a social consensus arrived at through a democratic debate concerning the balance between an individual's rights and society's interest. He urged an analysis of indirect discrimination via 'neutral' laws that may disproportionately affect certain groups. He also cautioned against condemning identity-based politics due to a fear of their possible separatist effects, arguing instead for the tendency of the democratic process to engage people in wider political engagement.

British policy respondent Harriet Crabtree spoke of the social contributions that faith organizations can make as well as of the platform they provide for a dialogue on difference. But she also pointed out that democratic representation within communities of faith can be difficult to achieve and that the deepening divide between secularism and religion poses a major challenge. It was noted that Muslim organizations in France are beginning to build bridges with secular political organizations, notably the radical left.

Debate covered the role of law in mediating religious and cultural diversity, the place of religion in the public sphere, and identity politics. Central to the debate was the interpretation of article nine of the EU Convention on Human Rights, which protects the freedom of religion. It was revealed that European courts defer a great deal of discretion to individual states in the handling of religion, which allows for a wide interpretation of the concept of religious freedom. Participants highlighted the need to clarify the meaning of religious freedom, and listed the following possible elements; the equal treatment of all religions in public institutions, the banning of religious expressions, the punishment of religious intolerance, and the role of education in teaching religious tolerance.

The importance of identity politics and increased organisation around religion were examined and possible reasons for their growing prevalence were debated. It was suggested that religious participation is a reaction against ethnic identity, because religion can be a space free of state and parental control. Religious participation was also described as a refuge for those excluded from other forms of political or economic participation.

### ***Conclusion***

Three key themes underpinned discussion throughout the workshop: the tensions between integration issues at national and local levels; the pivotal role of locality in moving actions forward; and the common difficulties in defining responses to integration. It was concluded that further clarification about national identity crises, clashes of values, and socioeconomic contexts are necessary in order to develop better strategies for integration.

# WORKSHOP TWO - Programme

*Cité Universitaire Internationale, Salon David Weill, Paris - November 5, 2007*

9.00-9.30	<i>Registration and coffee</i>
9.30-9.45	<b>Opening</b> <b>FRANÇOIS HERAN, DIRECTOR OF INED; DAWN LONG, BRITISH COUNCIL IN PARIS</b>
9.45-10.00	<b>Presentation of the workshop</b> <b>STEVEN VERTOVEC, ESRC CENTRE ON MIGRATION, POLICY AND SOCIETY (COMPAS)</b> <b>PATRICK SIMON, INSTITUT NATIONAL D'ETUDES DÉMOGRAPHIQUES (INED)</b>
10.00-11.20	<b>Session 1: Integration, community cohesion and multicultural policies</b> <hr/> <i>Chair: CATHERINE WITHOL DE WENDEN, CERI</i> <i>Key speakers:</i> <b>OMAR KHAN, RUNNYMEDE TRUST</b> <b>PATRICK WEIL, CENTRE MALHER, PARIS I</b> <i>Discussant: MICHEL WIEVIORKA, CADIS</i>
11.20-11.40	<i>Coffee/Tea break</i>
11.40-13.00	<b>Session 2: Labour Market outcomes for minorities</b> <hr/> <i>Chair: DENIS FOUGÈRE, CREST</i> <i>Key Speakers:</i> <b>ARNAUD LEFRANC, UNIVERSITY OF CERGY-PONTOISE</b> <b>KEN CLARKE, UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER</b> <i>Discussant: JANE WILLS, QUEEN MARY, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON</i>
13.00-14.00	<i>Lunch</i>
14.15-15.35	<b>Session 3: Minorities and immigrants: the urban context</b> <hr/> <i>Chair: VERONIQUE DE RUDDER, URMIS, CNRS</i> <i>Key Speakers:</i> <b>MICHAEL KEITH, GOLDSMITH'S COLLEGE, LONDON</b> <b>EDMOND PRETECEILLE, OSC, SCIENCES PO-CNRS</b> <i>Discussant: ERIC MAURIN, EHESS</i>
15.35-15.50	<i>Coffee/Tea break</i>
15.50-17.10	<b>Session 4: Education system and minorities</b> <hr/> <i>Chair: FRANÇOISE OEUVRARD, MINISTERE DE L'EDUCATION NATIONALE</i> <i>Key Speakers:</i> <b>AGNES VAN ZANTEN, OSC, SCIENCES PO-CNRS</b> <b>NICOLA ROLLOCK, LONDON METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY</b> <i>Discussant: FRANÇOISE LORCERIE, IREMAM</i>
17.30	<i>Closing Reception</i>

## WORKSHOP TWO – Participants List

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Ana Gonzalez Medina	SCIENCES PO
Ana Raquel Matias	INED
Arnaud Simetière	Doctorant Paris X
Benoit Filippi	OLAP/DREIF
Bernard Dinh	MIGRINTER/UMR 6588-CNRS
Charlotte Cavaille	SCIENCES PO
Christelle Hamel	INED
Christian Poiret	Maitre de conf. Paris 7
Daniel Sabbagh	Ceri - Science Po
Elisabeth Feur	Service Etude et évaluation
Eric Macé	EHESS-CNRS
Hélène Y. Meynaud	Ingenieure senior EDF R&D
Hugues Lagrange	SCIENCES PO
Laetitia Van Eeckhout	Le Monde
Leonie McCarthy	Peterborough Council
Mahrez Okba	DARES
Martin Clément	HALDE
Martine Lurol	HALDE
Mireille Eberhard	INED
Nathalie Kakpo	CSU-CNRS
Nadine Eckert	COMPAS
Olivier Joseph	CEREQ
Patrick Legales	SCIENCES PO
Patrick Roger	HALDE
Renaud Epstein	Doctorant
Sarah Mazouz	ENS
Séverine Chauvel	ENS
Soline Laplanche-Servigne	Doctorante Sciences-po
Sophie Body-Gendrot	Paris IV-CESDIP-CNRS
Terrence Powell	
Valentine Henrard	DGTPE Minefe
Violaine Jolivet	Doctorante Paris 1
Yael Brinbaum	ENS
Aubin Hellot	ARTE
Catherine Coroller	Libération

# WORKSHOP TWO - Report

## Two Models - one integration crisis? Immigrant/Minority conditions and policy options in France and Britain

*Cité Universitaire Internationale, Salon David Weill, Paris – 5<sup>th</sup> November 2007*

Workshop Two in Paris brought together academics, policy makers and practitioners to discuss the commonalities, differences and challenges of integration in the British, French and European contexts. Co-chair, Patrick Simon, welcomed participants and reinforced the value of exploring:

- differences between French and English models of diversity,
- similarities in terms of historical background, and
- the current political responses that France and Britain are implementing.

Dawn Long, Deputy Director of the British Council, supported this view by highlighting the importance of migration and integration issues in Britain, France and Europe. She stressed the need for factual objective debate and drew attention to the 'Migrant Integration Policy Index' (MIPEX), a comparative assessment of integration and migration policies in the EU 27.

Co-Chair Steven Vertovec, introduced the workshops topics explaining that discussion should not focus on which country 'does things better'. Instead it should explore how differences between countries can be compared. He also stressed that in the past public debates have often accused migrants of choosing to live apart and of deliberately keeping their own culture. This type of debate is placing responsibility on 'victims' rather than on society as a whole.

### **Overview of Workshop Structure**

The workshop was divided into four thematic sessions:

- Integration, Community Cohesion and Multicultural Policies
- Labour Market Outcomes for Minorities
- Minorities and Immigrants: the Urban Context
- Education Systems and Minorities

Each session had two key speakers, each of whom was followed by a discussant who was asked to draw out key themes for debate. This report will summarize the overall themes that emerged from the presentations and discussions in each session.

### **SESSION I : Integration, Community Cohesion and Multicultural Policies**

**Chair Catherine Withol De Wenden (CERI)** introduced the session and welcomed:

**Omar Khan (Runnymede Trust)**, responded to a recent report published by the UK Commission on Integration and Cohesion. He explained the discussion around integration and cohesion should not be limited to the social phenomenon of immigration and diversity, but should be linked to social justice and democratic participation.

Khan argued that cohesion is not only about diversity and multiculturalism. He cited examples whereby people can live parallel lives without it causing any problems and residential clustering does not necessarily prevent groups from making a contribution to the broader community. He highlighted that discussion about 'parallel lives' of other communities does not seem to create the same fears as

discussion about 'parallel lives' in the context of Muslims. Khan suggested that many citizens in modern societies are increasingly disconnected from one another and from their leaders. Some observers suggest this breakdown began with widespread immigration. However, social isolation can occur independently from immigration. For example, in Britain, the number of Black Caribbeans in public governance is decreasing, while the number of Pakistani & Bangladeshi councilors increasing. Why is it that one immigrant group is integrated into British institutions while others are not?

This proves that neither integration nor cohesion is valuable in itself. Societies may be cohesive, but at the same time violent and unjust, and therefore individuals may integrate into a value system or indeed a community whose practices are immoral or otherwise undesirable. By promoting the value of social justice and human rights, Khan argued we can develop a more accurate notion of cohesion and explain why the participation of all members of the polity is a problem of a just government. He concluded - if a multicultural society model is inadequate without a commitment to equal rights & social justice, a Republican model is inadequate if all the various categories of people are not represented in important institutions of that Republic.

**Patrick Weil (Centre Mahler Paris I)** cited a new research survey on Muslim in Europe that shows there is a strong sense of belonging to the French national identity among Muslims living in France. The survey respondents considered themselves primarily as French and secondly as Muslim. Weil argued, this level of national identity can be interpreted as an indicator of the success of the French model of integration. He suggested that this identification with nationality provides a strong sense of cohesion that helps to create a higher participation in society, and reduces the impacts of discrimination.

He said that discrimination continues to be prevalent in labour and housing markets, and that this needs significant improvement as discrimination has forced migrants into ghettos. Without effective anti-discrimination policies, the French model of integration remains artificial and fails to build a more cohesive society. For example, an appropriate social housing policy should allow a migrant to choose to live inside or outside of their ethnic community.

**Discussant: Michel Wieviorka** raised four questions for open debate:

- Perhaps cohesion/integration is the solution and enforced cohesion will not lead to more cohesion?
- Are we associating other issues surrounding Islam with Muslim migrants and should these issues be treated separately?
- When defining a model of integration are we oversimplifying, and thereby failing to recognize changing historical and sociological realities?

## **SESSION 2: Labour Market Outcomes for Minorities**

**Chair Denis Fougère (CREST)** introduced the session and welcomed:

**Arnaud Lefranc (Université de Cergy-Pontoise)** who discussed "The Labor Market Outcomes of Second Generation Immigrants in France". This focused on using 'equality of opportunity' to define and measure the disadvantage suffered by ethnic minorities. He stated that most empirical assessments of ethnic disadvantage measure equality of opportunity in relation to ethnicity. However, the term 'equality of opportunity' has a wide variety of social justice conceptions and these differences imply different definitions of ethnic disadvantage. Therefore different measures are being used to capture ethnic disadvantage.

He recommends using second-generation immigrants as a measure, using information about their parental geographic and national origin in combination with measured earnings differentials to obtain a better reflection of ethnic discrimination and/or social inequalities. The reason for focusing on second

generation immigrants is they are born and socialized in the host country. Hence it can be expected their socio-economic outcomes could reveal potential ethnic disadvantage.

**Ken Clarke (University of Manchester)** presented economic data on ethnic minorities in the British Labour market. This data suggests a level of discrimination, as job opportunities for whites and non-whites vary considerably. However, Clarke also stressed that in the UK, statisticians are limited by the availability of administrative data on the labour market. For example employment rates may not be a true reflection of who is actually working, as students are excluded from the denominator but may still be employed. Additionally high self employment rates among Asian males refers to their employment in small scale poorly paid jobs such a cab driving, not in successful small businesses.

Clarke gave three explanations for ethnic labour market disadvantage in the UK:

- Human Capital - differences in skills and education
- Discrimination - by employers and customers (in some attitudinal surveys a quarter will admit to discriminating against other races)
- Self Segregation - people living in 'ghetto's of intense disadvantage.

In concluding he highlighted the 'Ethnic Minority Employment Taskforce' recommendations to address these inequalities. These include improving employability through education and providing assistance to people that better connects them with work.

**Discussant: Jane Wills (Queen Mary, University of London)** stated the British immigration policy is class oriented. A study of the ethnicity of contact cleaners working in Canary Wharf, London that was conducted by Queen Mary, University of London, highlights how white working class school leavers and different ethnic minorities are in competition for the same jobs. This creates a fear of migrants and discord between migrant groups themselves. She also raised the importance of having a minimum wage as with such competition for work, wages would perhaps be even lower. To enable self mobilisation a living wage is required rather than a minimum wage.

### **SESSION 3: Minorities and Immigrants: the Urban Context**

**Chair Véronique de Rudder (URMIS CNRS)** introduced the session and welcomed:

**Michael Keith (Goldsmiths Center for Culture and Community Research)** who discussed different methods of approaching solutions for city problems. He identified four key points in the debate on convergence between the two models:

- The urban imaginaries of policy intervention
- Thinking about urbanism and the history of urban thinking
- The metropolitan cartographies of citizenship and belonging
- The incommensurabilities of philosophy and the pragmatics of policy

Keith argued these ideas challenge the way we imagine the city and inform how we conceptualise modern cities, and that tensions defining the opposition between liberal individualism and community is replicated in writing about the city. Do we view a city as a ghetto or as a space of freedom? Keith suggested that these traditional views predate our concerns with making migrants minorities into community members.

Additionally, to illustrate the concerns about integration and its consequences at a national and local level, Keith used the example of migrants arriving in the East of London and how they obtain what they require as new citizens. Concluding that these tensions replicate the tensions between the republican and the multicultural model and the language of right translate into a debate about the right of visibility and invisibility.

He highlighted The Commission on Integration and Cohesion Report and suggested that we should go back to these basic principles by:

- Considering how diverse we are, we must think about a particular space where each one can identify oneself
- Thinking about the impact of new migration and adapting rights and responsibilities
- Encouraging hospitality by increasingly valuing the presence of migrants: organizing the city with participation of migrants in administrative local responsibilities.
- Settling a framework that allows visible social justice.

Keith then used his experiences as a member of the local Council in West London to provide concrete examples the conflicts between social needs and local council needs. He highlighted the tensions of taxation on construction of new homes. Questioning how much of the overall value is taxed for social impacts and how money is spent on social infrastructure for these houses (education, green space etc). This also raises tensions of how and to whom new homes are allocated to different communities (UK citizen or migrants?). Keith concluded there is an incompatibility between economic and social purposes, as economic benefits of migration are experienced nationally whereas the social costs are focused locally.

**Edmond Préteceille (OSC- Sciences Po-CNRS)** reminded us that French studies on migrants in urban areas date back to the 70s and draws a distinction between multi-ethnic inner districts (Belleville, Goutte d'Or) and the suburbs. He noted the housing issue should be addressed in a more homogeneous way across each territory involving larger number of municipalities in decision making.

He stressed that in France the political and media debate focuses mostly on migrants from Maghreb and sub-Saharan Africa (41 % of the total of immigrants in France). He pointed out that approximately 90 % of immigrants live in districts where they represent no more than 30 % of the local population. Concerning the segregation rate, he noted that migrants from the French Overseas Territories have a lower segregation rate than migrants from North Africa and regrets that these "sensitive" variables are not easily available in France, making it impossible to obtain exhaustive migration data.

**Discussant: Patrick Simon (INED)** highlighted points of similarity between the various speakers regarding the perception that we have about living spaces, which is less a question of their reality than a question of their visibility. Simon suggested we may wonder, in statistical terms, if the level of actual segregation is high (a point raised by E Préteceille). He questioned the dynamics explaining this segregation? Are minorities withdrawing from community life to live in 'self separatism' or does this concentration result from imposed segregative dynamics? If grouping is voluntary, it is less appropriate for the State authorities to intervene in order to break up such groupings. Although, if concentration results from discriminatory dynamics that prevent people from accessing specific urban amenities (such as housing); the authorities must intervene to restore the mobility of the segregated populations.

Simon stated that from the point of view of images, chosen or imposed, we have the feeling that society is splitting apart. Spatial concentration is one of the decisive elements in the perception of ethnic and social divisions. He pointed out that several speakers (Session 2) on the labour market showed that further debate is needed on the consequences of residential segregation on access to employment. He wondered if the "sharing" of the city is reduced by the concentration of populations from the same origins in the same districts and referring to his thesis "La Société Partagée ". Simon also suggested that the city may also be appropriated by certain groups. He recalled that at the time of the French 2005 riot, the British media were horrified to note the degree of segregation in the suburbs. But, is France more segregated than the UK? He questioned if concentration in the traditional London environment be less problematic than that observed in the French suburbs, with their tower blocks of social housing?

Simon concluded that distribution is not the only problem involved. It is also important to evaluate the urban environment in which this concentration is taking place and the local resources which could be deployed to develop sociability and thus reduce the negative effects of this concentration.

## **SESSION 4 : Education System and Minorities**

**Chair Françoise Oeuvarard (Ministry of education)** introduced the session and welcomed:

**Agnes Van Zanten (OSC- Sciences Po-CNRS)** retraced the history of migrants in the school system. Mentioning the creation of the ZEP (Priority Education Areas), today called Networks of Ambition-Success, that dates back to 1981. She argued this territorial tool has induced an effect of stigmatization rather than any real progress. She stated that new approaches towards integration of migrants in education are made "in a haphazard way" (i.e. debates on the wearing of the headscarf).

She further discussed the policy of mobility for graduates of elite educational establishments and stated it did not reduce discrimination; on the contrary it aggravated segregation. At the establishment level, there is little synergy between school and district. According to various studies there is a disparity between the model of integration advocated by society and its practical applications and a lack of regulation of these practices. This also stigmatizes the sporadic intervention of the State and testifies to the feeling of powerlessness among professionals on how to apply this model of integration.

**Nicola Rollock (London Metropolitan University)** began quoting the rhetoric of Gordon Brown's vision of the future of education in Britain and outlined how she disagreed. She argued that Britain lacks an equal education system as not all people are perceived to be equally capable of academic success. She stated that educational inequalities in the UK persist due to discrimination by gender, ethnicity and social class. She referred to recent academic studies carried out by Manchester and Sussex University which reviewed the way attainment groups are allocated in schools. The research revealed that pupils from lower socio-economic backgrounds were more likely to be placed in a lowest attainment group, whereas middle class students were more likely to be placed in a higher group. Therefore, attainment groups and their subsequent opportunities in terms of education and success are not the same for every category of the population.

This highlights Government's methods of addressing these issues are ineffective and more initiatives need to be undertaken to counterbalance the outcomes of young people not achieving at school. She highlighted the importance of targeting resources at people living in deprived areas. She acknowledged that the Government has increased spending on education by 55% within the last decade, but despite these measures, gaps in educational outcomes still persist. Rollock argued that a major focus should be to ensure the teaching of English to minority ethnic groups. There needs to be more support to motivate students (especially boys) and encourage parental participation in children's education. Resources should also be used to encourage students from these groups to attend university.

She recommended addressing these issues by:

- Improving Teacher training by carrying out an audit of the needs of those NQTs and making any necessary amendments to the current Runnymede Trust teacher training programme 'Achieving Race Equality in Schools' this type of training should be a statutory part of training and CPD for all teachers and that they should engage in such training every 3-5 years.
- Using the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000. This act could have instigated far reaching change now it is used only for the haphazard recording of racist incidents and there has been no genuine engagement and understanding of racism and race equality.

- Encouraging the Government's willingness have a genuine open debate on social class and inequalities in the UK; not as an issue which is the fault of those lowest social economic groups but as an issue focusing on how groups who are in a position of privilege seem to maintain their power.

**Discussant: Françoise Lorcerie (IREMAM)** noted from a legislative viewpoint, the subject of integration of minorities in education has dropped off the agenda. A number of reports were issued speaking about an ideal of a pluralistic society, such as the Swan Report in 1985 in the UK, but without any follow-up. She stated that the French system works in a bureaucratic way without external regulation, apart from vocational training which is based on a framework of agreements.

Lorcerie underlined that internal regulation amplifies the distance between teachers and students. In France unlike the UK there is no co-ordinated structure for the discipline of teaching or for the levels of classes. She also stated that since 1985, there is no longer an official policy of integration for minorities in the French system. There is also strong censorship of the subject, with the exception of 2002-2003, when under the pressure from the CFJO (Council of French Jewish organizations), the Minister set up a think tank to address racism, communitarianism and anti-semitism.

In the UK, academic research produces studies in political science and the social science of education. While, in France the question of school integration is very rarely tackled and there are very few studies. In 2000, a quantitative study that compared academic success of the pupils by ethnic origin and another study on "school apartheid" showed that immigrants' children are concentrated in certain schools. Further in 1996, Eric de Barbieu made a study of violence in schools which highlighted local variation between schools and the degree to which violent behaviour was attributed to migrants' children.

Lorcerie concluded by noting the difficulty of bridging qualitative and quantitative surveys. In France, it is impossible to answer the question of ethno-racial discrimination in the educational system. Expert assessment is approached differently in France than the UK, as assessment is monopolized by a body of inspectors. Also minorities appear to have no place in education programs (with the exception of the Aubin Report in 2004). However despite these gaps, adaptations are being made and some teachers are making efforts to address the question of the immigration in their lessons. But these adaptations are arbitrary and not properly assessed. It remains to be seen how these initiatives will influence the feeling among individuals of being in their place in society.