Chapter 1

Introduction: Turning Adult, Becoming Nationalized

Katrine Fangen and Ferdinand Andreas Mohn

This book is a product of the first research phase of EUMARGINS,[1] a research project endeavouring to enhance our understanding of inclusion and exclusion processes among young adults of immigrant background. The purpose of this phase has been to analyse secondary data in order to answer the following question: How is the inclusion and exclusion of young adults with immigrant backgrounds framed by different aspects of the host society context?

What young adults of immigrant background experience as inclusion and exclusion on the individual level is framed by different contextual factors such as the type and volume of immigration in each country, the actual degrees of poverty and inequality, the political tone, the climate of the media, cultural tensions and European politics. The empirical context of our research is seven European countries, namely Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom, Estonia, Spain, Italy and France. Although all seven countries in our study are European, there are great differences when it comes to their histories of immigration, immigration and integration policies, social benefits, education systems and labour market structures. What obstacles and opportunities are young adults of immigrant background facing in today's Europe? Finding out how juridical, political, economic and cultural contexts are framing their processes of inclusion and exclusion is of vital importance to the young adults themselves, to the host societies they have joined, and to the European Union.

The EU has developed a set of ten primary indicators to measure social exclusion, including persistent low income levels, long-term unemployment, living in jobless households and being an early school leaver not in further education or training (Social Protection Committee 2001).[2] Gaining access to education and employment is a critical stage in the lives of young people in general, but statistics show that young *immigrants* face greater barriers than young people from the majority population (for example, Feliciano and Rumbaut 2005, Olsen 2009).

---

1 The research conducted for the project 'EUMARGINS – On the Margins of the European Community' has received funding from the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement no. 217524.

2 The full list adds three other income measures (including low income after transfers), regional cohesion, life expectancy at birth and self-perceived health status.

Descendants of immigrants, on the other hand, occasionally perform on the same level or even better than the majority population in some countries (Olsen 2009). The same holds for certain ethnic minority groups such as the Indian and Chinese in the UK (Fry et al. 2008). Nevertheless, in most European countries, the picture of ethnic inequality in general prevails (Kalter and Kogan 2006). Occasionally, public discourses justify or excuse the prevalence of ethnic inequalities by claiming that immigrants have themselves to blame (Van Dijk 1992: 94). Such a perspective distracts attention from the responsibility of receiving governments, and fails to take into account the role of discrimination and prejudices, and the evident gap in material resources for the continuing ethnic inequality in society. The fact that Europe is ageing means that there will be a growing need for young people to fill jobs in sectors where there is a need for stability in the labour force (Esping-Andersen 2002: 3). This could imply a perception of young adult immigrants as a much-needed resource, and thus give them easier access to the education system and the labour market. However, in times of financial crisis, immigrants are often the first to be denied access to jobs (Rogstad 2000). It is therefore an open question whether the future trends go towards more inclusion or more exclusion of young adult immigrants in Europe.

The European Context – and Our Selection of Countries

The European Continent has seen a steep increase in foreign-born residents in recent decades (Penninx 2006: 7). The EU is seen as both the cause (through successive enlargements) and a possible alleviator of migratory pressures. The right to free movement of people is one of the fundamentals of the internal European market (Brady 2008). However, the external borders of Europe provoke allusions to walls – exemplified through the notion of 'Fortress Europe' (Lavenex 2001: 856).

While 'unity in diversity' is the motto of the EU (Baykal 2005) – which aims to defend common values such as freedom, peace and solidarity in a Union made up of many cultures and languages – there are other concerns implicit in the migration and integration policies. According to an official EU website, one of its main objectives is 'to better manage migration flows by a coordinated approach which takes into account the economic and demographic situation of the EU' (European Commission 2007). An important priority is to fight illegal migration, but on the other hand it is underlined that the EU needs migrants in certain sectors and regions in order to deal with its economic and demographic needs. As for integration policies, a top priority of the EU agenda is to promote full participation in the labour market and immigrants are seen as 'an important pool of potential entrepreneurs in Europe' (Commission of the European Communities 2007). European policy makers try to achieve economic and political integration, while they also try to protect and promote cultural and linguistic pluralism (Extra and Yagmur 2002). Carrera (2006) points out that the notion of integration as incorporated in national policies is often restrictive in nature, and does not facilitate immigrants' social inclusion or fair treatment, equality, nondiscrimination and respect for diversity,

which according to the Tampere European council should be at the heart of a common immigration policy in the EU.

Although immigration policies are Europeanized through treaties signed by most European countries, there remain national differences in immigration and integration policies, as well as welfare regimes, that cause both obstacles and opportunities for young adults of immigrant background in different countries. Our selection of countries is warranted by the variety of dimensions along which they can be compared and discussed.

First of all, we cover both the North-South axis and the East-West one, which enables us to study a variety of regimes and their welfare policies, border control, economic situations and much more. Participating institutions come from: Northern Europe – represented by Norway and Sweden, with the 'Scandinavian' welfare state model, according to Esping-Andersen's (2002: 14) typology, characterized by a broad and quite generous income safety net '[which] is demonstrably an effective bulwark against poverty' – and the United Kingdom, with a 'liberal welfare model' (Esping-Andersen 2002: 15). Southern Europe, in our case France, Italy and Spain, are run by a 'continental European welfare model' (Esping-Andersen 2002: 16–17), characterized by 'an overly transfer-biased social policy [which] is, arguably, an ineffective response to social exclusion' (Esping-Andersen 2002: 17). Furthermore, the Italian and Spanish system is based on decentralization, reliance on family solidarity, a large informal sector and a recent history of authoritarian politics (Millar and Middleton 2002). Eastern Europe, represented by Estonia, has a different historical, political and economic situation following the collapse of the Soviet Union. The country has a fairly well developed welfare system, but it is not as extensive as the Nordic model, and unemployment benefits are insufficient for basic subsistence (see Chapter 4).

Second, nation-states with both long-term and recent immigration experience are represented in the research. France has been a net immigrant country for over 100 years, whereas the reception of immigrants in Italy and Spain spans only about two decades (Penninx 2006: 8). Labour-driven migration with a *temporary* orientation dominates entry into Spain, and short-period residence and work permits are often found to be obstacles to long-term integration (Kalter and Kogan 2006: 262) – a situation that largely holds for Italy as well. Still, Southern Europe has erected a symbolic fence as protection against the global south. As the gateway to Europe from Africa and Asia, these areas are characterized by larger flows of migrants, and correspondingly tougher conditions compared to the situation in Northern Europe. While countries from Scandinavia have a similarly brief history of net immigration, their economic conditions are radically different – and their geographic location makes their inflows more easily regulated.

Third, there is the composition of the immigrant population in terms of legal, political and cultural status – which reflects different migration histories. Thus whether the immigrant has come as a refugee, an asylum seeker or as an economic migrant, whether she represents people with a history of domination recently transformed into minorities, or ethnic minorities which because of the colonial past

have a long representation in the country – are all factors that may contribute to their conditions of exclusion and inclusion. We seek to convey different inclusion and exclusion patterns of migrants belonging to the same category (for example, refugee or labour migrant), depending on country of reception and residence.

Fourth, there are substantial differences in access to citizenship, in particular between to what degree the countries emphasize most a citizenship conferral system based on *jus soli*, *jus sanguinis* or *jus domicili* (most of the countries have a combination of these, but with very different emphasis).

Analytical Framework

Research questions on several levels guide our study. What challenges and opportunities are young adult immigrants and descendants facing in different countries? What is their rate of participation in education, labour and leisure compared with young people without immigrant background? How is the complex interplay of ethnicity, class background, migration history, gender and urban context influencing their lives? Through an investigation of how juridical, political, economic and cultural patterns are framing processes of inclusion and exclusion, we seek to understand to what degree these factors are local – and to what extent similar mechanisms operate in several national contexts. A bottom line in conducting our research efforts is the desire to uncover the barriers that impede inclusion – and to shed light upon the factors that may create exclusion. Therefore, theories of social exclusion are central to our understanding. In addition, youth sociology, and in particular the branch that focuses on the transition to adulthood, is central, as are theories of immigrants' incorporation into a new society.

Social Exclusion[3]

As argued by Esping-Andersen (2002: 3), the post-war welfare state has succeeded in equalizing living conditions, but it has failed to deliver its promise of disconnecting opportunities from social origins and inherited handicaps. Despite the idea that everyone can choose their own identity and life-plan, social exclusion and systematic inequalities according to class, gender and ethnicity are all still facts.

Even with its prominent role in the European public and scientific discourse, social exclusion remains a contested term and it is framed in different ways by different authors (Middleton et al. 2003: 5). Nevertheless, late in 2001 the Social Protection Committee of the EU (part of the Directorate-General Employment and Social Affairs) adopted a set of commonly agreed indicators for social exclusion. The main impetus for this achievement arose through the agreement at the Lisbon European Council to promote social inclusion as a key strategy of the EU. However,

---

3   This section is based on Fangen (2008, 2009, 2010).

as argued by Feres et al. (2002), there is no reason to believe that the sensitivity of indicators is the same across countries or across indicators.

According to Room (1999: 167), it is important both for policy and explanatory purposes to disentangle different elements of hardship and also to identify the interrelationship for example between financial poverty and poor housing, between educational failure and lack of skills on the job market, between deprived childhoods and subsequent patterns of health and sickness. The way in which exclusion occurs is dependent on young people's belonging to a plurality of disadvantaged categories. On the one hand, young immigrants sometimes face greater barriers if they do not speak the dominant language fluently, or if they do not feel comfortable with the cultural codes or do not know how to cope with different sectors of society (Fekjær 2007). On the other hand, research shows that young people with immigrant backgrounds often have extra drive, because they expect to face challenges (Lauglo 2000). Descendants with certain national backgrounds occasionally also perform better than the majority population (Daugstad 2009; Chapter 3 in this volume). It is, however, important to clarify in what arenas the young adults are included and on whose terms, and also what field of possibilities they have.

During later years, it has been common to speak of a *new* social exclusion perspective, which is better suited to the analysis of the more heterogeneous, multicultural and complex societies (Body-Gendrot 2002). Social scientists highlight different aspects that they think should be included when analysing the societal changes that create new conditions for the social exclusion of young people. Sernhede (2002) underlines the growing inequalities in Europe, and the development of the two-thirds societies (societies in which two-thirds enjoy the benefits of affluence, while one-third are locked into poverty or near-poverty (Headey et al. 1993)), whereas Room (2005) emphasizes that the focus should be extended *beyond* poverty and should not solely be on the individuals, but also on their material and physical surroundings. Weil et al. (2005) highlight the need to focus on relationships and interactions among and between excluded and included groups and communities. Proponents for the interactionist perspective argue that the focus should not be only on differences between immigrants and non-immigrants, but rather on the intersection of variables (for example, Modood 2007). Social class is brought in to make the picture of ethnic inequality less one-dimensional (Fangen 2010). Finally, Weil et al. (2005) argue that an enhanced emphasis on time contributes to a more dynamic view than the one given by static structural explanations. Last but not least, exclusion does not only occur within the unit of the national state. A transnational perspective is better suited to including the whole range of inclusion and exclusion processes experienced by immigrants and their descendants (Wimmer and Schiller 2003).

It is impossible to go into depth on all these aspects in one book. However, we draw on some of these perspectives by focusing on the social exclusion found in different contexts, thus underlining the multi-dimensional aspect of social exclusion (Room 1995). The underlying question is: 'What is it that contributes to the social exclusion of young adult immigrants and descendants in different social

settings?'[4] In this book, we examine selected arenas in which social exclusion comes about: the education system, the labour market, civil society, crime and politics. We also investigate how social exclusion can be caused by immigration policies, public discourses, cultural practices and attitudes.[5]

According to a dominant social scientific view, a young person is socially excluded at some moment in time if the person is currently *outside the structured arenas of school and work,* and also has a high probability of remaining outside in the near future, given that the economy is in (or returns to) a 'normal' state (Raaum et al. 2009: 175). The extent to which different indicators serve as risk factors for the social exclusion of young people varies between different European countries. Tsakloglou (2003: 32, 35) found that in general there is a lower probability of young adults remaining in deprivation than the population at large. However, a movement from full-time work to unemployment was strongly correlated with poverty for young adults in all the countries compared (Austria, Germany, Greece, Portugal and the UK), and especially so in the UK. However, this study did not single out differences by immigrant or native background, which is the object of our concern.

A process of social exclusion is a process of 'losing ground' in a number of arenas simultaneously, such as the labour market, the social network, and political and cultural life (Cousins 1998). We argue that other arenas than the labour market are significant, at the same time we highlight the importance of the latter as there is ample evidence that labour market marginality tends to spill over into other areas of social life. In particular, labour market marginality has been shown to cause social isolation and poverty*,* almost regardless of the institutional structure and welfare system of the society (Raaum et al. 2009). Thus, special attention should be paid to labour market participation and structural conditions in each country that support or inhibit this participation. Social exclusion as such entails a failure to participate in the spheres of society for which there are strong social norms to participate (Raaum et al. 2009).

From a conventional viewpoint, we would expect a young person to prefer inclusion to exclusion. But many young persons temporarily choose to stay outside the more institutionalized settings of society (Raaum et al. 2009). For some, sub-cultural affiliations, gang membership or leisure activities take so much time and interest that school and work is not prioritized (Fangen 2009, 2010). This might also be related to a feeling of being tired of school or not mastering the way learning is done there.

---

4   An explicit aim of our project is to overcome the dichotomy between the most and least marginalized. We hypothesize that those often perceived as marginalised have experiences of inclusion, while those in high-status educational tracks or jobs have experiences of exclusion.

5   Most of these arenas are considered in our research project, and will be discussed in other publications. See, for example, Fangen (2009, 2010).

Young Adult Immigrants and Descendants

Youth and adolescence has been a much-researched issue in the social sciences since the middle decades of the twentieth century. Adolescence became culturally defined as a distinct life-stage when full-time education replaced full-time employment as the primary activity of young people (Furstenberg 2000). This transformation happened in societies with advanced economies, in which a greater premium is placed on education and training (Furstenberg 2000). However, as pointed out by Furstenberg (2000), the links between the adolescent years and the transition to adulthood is an area of scholarship that has come into its own during the past couple of decades. The increasing prominence of research on young adults is rooted in global structural forces that have extended the period of youth. However, the characteristics that are used to differentiate a young person from an adult vary between countries, and this is reflected in the provisions made for young people, and the rights and responsibilities given to them (Middleton et al. 2003: 8).

Being a young adult in Europe has become excruciatingly challenging for many: Since the 1970s, modernization theorists like Thomas Ziehe, Anthony Giddens and others have discussed the globalization of culture, ideas and people that have rendered traditional inputs on how to become an adult less unequivocal. However, qualitative and quantitative studies reveal that despite tendencies of individualization, there are still systematic inequalities along lines of class, ethnicity and gender (Fangen 1992, 1998). Recently the globalization of economic activity has effected a 'trickle down' from the collapse of financial markets to the crumbling of employment opportunities – which has affected immigrants in particular.

Culturally, young people in general are simultaneously indulged and castigated – allowed or even encouraged to seek their own company, yet reproached for being self-centred, irresponsible, and occupied with self-destructive or socially destructive behaviours (Furstenberg 2000). These issues are magnified in the case of young immigrants – as they carry the additional emblem of being 'aliens', 'strangers' (see, for example, how Italian and French media construct this group as socially latent explosives). Another variant of the stigma associated with young (female) Third World immigrants is the aspect of being a victim ('ignorant, poor, uneducated, tradition-bound, religious, domesticated, family-oriented, victimized': Mohanty 1988: 65).

This book reflects various national conceptual schemes, but centres on problematic aspects associated with the ways in which issues of immigration and ethnic relations are couched in language. A crucial concern for us is the question of whether young adult immigrants (and descendants) have radically different experiences from their peers in the ethnic majority/national population. According to the state-of-the-art knowledge, there are several arenas in which this seems to occur. An obvious example is citizenship. In youth sociology,[6] citizenship is often equated with adult status, and may be linked to leaving home, entering employment, establishing a family, and finally, acquiring legal obligations and rights (Hall et al.

---

6   The following paragraph is taken from Fangen (2007).

2000, Thomson et al. 2004). From this perspective, young people are *citizens in the making*, apprentices, not yet ready for adult citizenship status. The elements of citizenship include political participation and legal entitlement, commitment to shared values, community responsibilities and active civic participation (Hall et al. 2000). The question of which values are shared is relevant in relation to ethnic minority background. Are the values those of the majority society, or the values of the ethnic community? And towards which group are community responsibilities directed: towards the majority society, towards the neighbourhood in which one lives, or towards one's own ethnic group? Perhaps towards the international or global community? What is specifically interesting about the work of Hall and his colleagues is the connection they make between citizenship in the sense of becoming responsible and *the transition to adulthood*. The concept of *youth transition* is central in this regard. Chisholm and Hurrelman (1995: 131) conceptualize the adolescent phase of life as a series of interrelated transitions between childhood and adulthood. The social milestones of the transition process relate to the major spheres of social life: education, work, peer group, leisure activities, cultural and political participation, and family.

Incorporation of Young Immigrants into a National State

Our analytical perspective on incorporation is informed by Portes and Rumbaut's (2001) theory of segmented assimilation, which includes a holistic picture of relevant factors affecting the inclusion and exclusion of young immigrants. Their theory is based on the insight that both the immigrant population and the host societies are heterogeneous. A crucial statement relevant for our purposes is 'depending on their context of reception, immigrants can find themselves confronting diametrically different situations' (Portes and Rumbaut 2001: 45), and hence the course of their adaptation can lead to a number of different outcomes. We are reluctant to use the concept of assimilation as it has a normative connotation that immigrants should leave their own traditions and language behind, and substitute this with a concept of 'adaptation' which could include different strategies – ranging from assimilation to ethnic incorporation (see Fangen 2006). Furthermore, we would prefer to use a perspective of cultural syncretism, as proposed by Gilroy (1987: 155), rather than the perspective of acculturation, because young immigrants' self-definitions and cultural expressions draw on a plurality of sources.

The theory of segmented adaptation, as we will call it, says that outcomes vary across immigrant minorities and that rapid integration into the mainstream of the host society represents just one possible alternative (see Portes and Rumbaut 2001: 45). How the process of adaptation goes (again a slight modification of Portes and Rumbaut's theory), depends on (1) the migration history of the first generation; (2) the pace of adaptation among parents and children; (3) the cultural and economic barriers confronted by young adults of immigrant background in

their quest for successful adaptation, and (4) the family and community resources for confronting these barriers.

Today's immigrants differ along three fundamental dimensions (Portes and Rumbaut 2001: 46): (1) their individual features, including their age, education, occupational skills, wealth and knowledge of the language of the host society; (2) the social environment that receives them, including the politics of the host government, the attitudes of the majority population, and the presence and the size of a co-ethnic community, and (3) their family structure. In this book, we will focus on differences between young immigrants and young people without immigrant backgrounds according to the first dimension, and also between different immigrants of different origins along these lines. The chief aim of our study is to integrate the second dimension into the understanding of matters pertaining to the first dimension, while leaving out the third dimension because of spatial limitations. As pointed out by Portes and Rumbaut (2001: 46), the skills that immigrants bring in the form of education, job experience and language knowledge are referred to as their human capital and play a decisive role in their economic adaptation. However, their economic attainment does not entirely depend on human capital, because its utilization is contingent on the context into which they are incorporated. A number of different contextual factors shape the way in which they can put their skills to use. The policies of the receiving government represent the first such factor confronting newcomers. Although a continuum of possible governmental responses exists, the basic options are exclusion, passive acceptance or active encouragement (Portes and Rumbaut 2001: 46).

The usefulness of this perspective is that it focuses on the interrelationship between contextual factors of the host society and its politics, and the migration history of different ethnic groups, together with individual factors like education and work experience. This sets the frame for the different contextual factors as well as information on participation and achievement of different immigrant groups in different host countries.

Challenges of Comparison

International comparisons are complicated for both practical reasons (such as lack of comparable data) and methodological reasons. Countries which vary a lot with regard to social structure and culture do not easily allow focused comparisons (Allardt 1975). As pointed out by Gropas and Triandafyllidou (2007: 361): 'Available statistics do not offer a consistent and reliable numerical picture of immigrants within the EU. Each Member State uses different sets of statistical categories, different definitions, different ways of recording residents and citizens. Stocks and flows of immigrant populations … are rarely, if at all, directly comparable'.

To facilitate such comparative assessment of our national contexts, we employ the same disposition for each national context review, and as far as it has been possible, attempt to provide comparable data from each national setting.

According to Wimmer and Schiller (2003: 582), the conceptual tendency of methodological nationalism has influenced social science dealing with migration and ethnic relations. This involves several problematic assumptions. One dimension relevant for our outlook is the naturalization of the nation-state as a container for the social scientist's object of study: 'What the "People" is for nationalists, the "Society" is for post-war social scientists' (Wimmer and Schiller 2003: 583). An undesirable consequence of this is that the appearance of immigrants is conceived as an imposition on the alleged correspondence of people, citizenry and nation. Thus, in quantitative studies immigrants 'are rarely compared to sectors of a national population which they resemble in terms of income or education' (Wimmer and Schiller 2003: 584). This is important to bear in mind when considering the findings from quantitative studies in each of the seven countries. The cross-national discussion at the end of the book explicitly seeks to overcome the influence of methodological nationalism. Still, a significant part of our work is evidence that the actual ongoing influence of nation states on the inclusion and exclusion of young adult immigrants and descendants is undeniable.

The comparison of national discourses should help us take a reflexive perspective on the variety of academic conceptualizations within the field of immigration, integration and social exclusion research. In the concluding cross-national chapter, we will analyse what we have found to be the main similarities and differences between these countries when comparing sets of data, and we give additional references to a long range of earlier comparative studies from the European setting. While the last chapter discusses public discourses and political climates pertinent to the symbolic exclusion of young adult immigrants and descendants, in the following we present the official categories of identification used for national production of statistics in our selected countries.

A Variety of Official Categories

In each of the national research reviews, we make use of census data. As pointed out by Anderson (1991 [1983]: 184), the census allows governments to distinguish among peoples, regions, religions and languages. Furthermore, the use of identity categories in censuses creates a particular vision of social reality (Kertzer and Arel 2002: 5). Data from national censuses, population registers or border controls are often not comparable between countries, since they reflect national definitions that vary (Lahav 2004: 33). Differences between European countries in how they construct their official statistics also reflect different socio-political regimes and their different views of society. In the seven countries that are part of our project, there is a stark contrast between Estonia and the UK on the one hand, which include information about ethnicity in their censuses, and France on the other, which has legal directives not to include ethnicity or descendants' countries of origin in their censuses. In spite of no such legal directives in the other countries, the censuses are based on country of birth or country of origin, and not on ethnicity.

France is often presented as a special case when it comes to census making. According to Kertzer and Arel (2002: 8), the French republican state has an organic perception of the nation, a civic body regarded as indivisible. This standpoint, according to Blum (2002), called for a strict separation between those who were 'part of the nation' and 'others'. As a result, the citizen and the foreigner became the two principal categories of analysis. Despite the laws forbidding the production of racial or ethnic statistics, the national statistical agency INED[7] produces data on people granted resident permits, mapping nationalities with the kind of permit they receive. The National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE)[8] defines a 'foreigner' as a person who lives in France, but who does not possess French nationality. A foreigner can therefore even have been born in France. 'Immigrants' are persons who were born abroad, and who may or may not possess French nationality. Immigrant is a permanent category, whereas a foreigner can acquire French nationality and as such be omitted from the category (Triandafyllidou 2007: 117).

In the UK, by contrast, 'census-designers have long been interested in ascertaining the country of origin of their residents' (Kerzel and Arel 2002: 8). The population census asks for a 'country of birth', or as an alternative, 'immigrant status', and in the census of 2001 an ethnic and racial distinction was used (White, Mixed, all black, all Asian). Among the countries in our project, the UK is the only one to use racial categories like white, black and mixed in its census, and the 2001 census included questions on religion for the first time. In sum, it is the intention of the British system to deal with the fact that there are substantial numbers of individuals born in European countries, or naturalized within them, who still have some feeling of belonging to structurally and culturally distinct minorities (Rex 2000: 58).

In Norway and Sweden, censuses include country of origin, but not ethnic belonging. Thus, persons might be categorized as coming from Iraq, but it will not be clear from the census how many of these people are ethnic Kurds. Statistics Sweden uses the notion of 'foreign-born population' by region of origin and 'foreign citizens' by country of citizenship.[9] Statistics Norway divides the immigrant population into three different categories: 'foreign-born with one Norwegian-born parent', 'Norwegian-born with one foreign-born parent', 'foreign-born to Norwegian-born parents' (includes adopted), all of which are in turn separated by the country background (country of birth) (see Chapter 6).

In Italy, a classification of 'resident foreigners' or 'foreign resident population' (identified by citizenship) is used.[10] Spain adopts similar terms – 'foreign-born resident' or 'origin of residents' (EU, non-EU).[11] This aims to distinguish different continental origins. But in fact, the basic information is the country of origin, and from this information other groups of origins can be constructed, depending on the

---

7   Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques.
8   Institut National de la Statistique et des Études Économiques.
9   Statistics Sweden, <http://www.scb.se/>.
10 ISTAT, <http://www.istat.it/english/>.
11 INE, <http://www.ine.es/en/ine/eline_en.htm>.

objective: by continent (Asian, Latin American and so on) or by geo-political group (EU, non-EU). The Spanish census questionnaire (based on households) includes only 'place of birth' (city and municipality) and 'citizenship', to distinguish between citizenship acquired by birth and nationality acquired later on. As the last census was in 2001, when the migratory phenomenon was still incipient, a periodical register of information called 'Padrón' (based on individuals) is more frequently used as a statistical basis.

Estonian official statistics today are mostly based on the usage of 'ethnicity',[12] quite often making a distinction between Estonians and non-Estonians.[13] In the Soviet Union, ethnicity was included as a line of information on every citizen's passport. There were a certain number of ethnic categories that respondents could choose between. As a result of this legacy, many people in Estonia (and other former USSR republics) consider ethnicity to be a fixed category that is ascribed to a person from birth based on the ethnicity of his or her father (usually). However, it is not mandatory to answer the ethnicity question in Estonian censuses nowadays, and neither do the censuses prescribe ethnic groups to choose from. Nevertheless, it is very common in all surveys in Estonia to ask respondents about their mother tongue – due to the division of society into Estonian-speaking and Russian-speaking communities. In addition, censuses include place of birth and religion. However, since the majority of people from other ethnic groups use Russian as their mother tongue, in social science literature (and occasionally in this book) the term 'Russian-speaking population' is used (see Chapter 4).

Statistics should not be viewed as an ultimate source of impartiality, as the definitions in use are always socially constructed and may not be neutral in the comparative sense. Comparing 'immigrants' in one country with a group of 'ethnic minorities' in another may produce bias and misinterpretation, hence again, taking into account the context and background of the sources behind the data, sampling and data collection methods is important.

Contextualizing the Experiences of Young Adults with Immigrant Backgrounds

Analytically, this volume seeks to establish state-of-the-art knowledge of our topic – the inclusion and exclusion of young adult immigrants and descendants in Europe – and aims to identify well-known mechanisms and patterns of inclusion/exclusion, as well as issues that researchers have not yet cast light upon.[14]

---

12   'In statistics, "ethnicity/nationality" (rahvus) refers to self-reported ethnic belonging and is independent of both citizenship and mother tongue' (Triandafyllidou and Gropas 2007: 87).

13   Statistics Estonia, <http://www.stat.ee/?lang=en>.

14   EUMARGINS' next research phase is largely based on fieldwork and in-depth interviews. The project is inspired by methodological perspectives attempting to bridge the gap between data collected through interviews and participant observation, and data reflecting macro-sociological phenomena (often statistics). Thus, the extension of the

The cross-national chapter reflects an effort to systematically compare these national contexts. Focusing on public discourses, political and economic conditions, it also includes a section on challenges connected to comparing various data from these occasionally very different climates, ranging from contexts in which the registration of ethnic background is prohibited by law (France) to states where ethno-racial identification is official practice (the UK). The chapter compares representations of the 'other', legal regimes and patterns of inequality – uncovering the current state of affairs for young adult immigrants and descendants in a Europe plagued by financial crisis and surging right-wing nationalism.

There are several restrictions concerning the scope of this work. We had to set some limits on what information was to be included; there are endless amounts of information that to some extent are relevant for the understanding of social exclusion and inclusion of young adult immigrants and descendants in Europe. We have concentrated on the most recent research. There might be other sources that were equally relevant, but it is impossible to include them all. Each chapter treats multiple social arenas and spheres – in an attempt to challenge social science and policy thinking around the issues of integration and marginalization. As such, it represents a unique attempt to establish what we currently know about the social factors contributing to the exclusion and inclusion of young adult immigrants and descendants. One task of ours is to integrate former contributions into a cohesive perspective on the dynamics of each national setting as social context.

The chapters are written separately by researchers from each national context, and thus we might say that each chapter reflects their respective perspectives. Still, the co-ordinating group of the project (University of Oslo) has attempted to synchronize the work so that there is a structural/thematic homogeneity throughout the contributions of each national team. The pitfalls of varying national perspectives are further reflected upon in the cross-national chapter – which hopefully reflects the fact that this whole book has come about through mutual commenting and sharing of ideas, experience and insights from each of our countries' points of view.

References

Allardt, E. 1975. *Att ha, att. alska, att vara: Om välfärden i Norden*. Lund: Argos.

Anderson, B. 1991 [1983]. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Baykal, S. 2005. *Unity in Diversity? The Challenge of Diversity for the European Political Identity, Legitimacy and Democratic Governance: Turkey's EU*

---

local (Burawoy 2009) – collected principally through life-story interviews – is meant to be facilitated by the secondary analysis of both national and cross-national circumstances. Hence, our life-story interviews will be interpreted with conceptual and empirical resources from the phase resulting in this book.

Membership as the Ultimate Test Case, Jean Monnet Working Paper 09/05, New York: New York University. Available at: <http://centers.law.nyu.edu/jeanmonnet/papers/05/050901.pdf> (accessed 1 February 2010).

Blum, A. 2002. 'Resistance to identity categorization in France', in D. Kertzer and D. Arel (eds), *Census and Identity: The Politics of Race, Ethnicity, and Language in National Censuses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Body-Gendrot, S. 2002. 'Living apart or together with our differences? French cities at a crossroads', *Ethnicities* 2(3): 367–385.

Brady, H. 2008. *EU Migration Policy: An A–Z*. London: Centre for European Reform. Available at: <http://www.cer.org.uk/pdf/briefing_813.pdf> (accessed 1 February 2010).

Burawoy, M. 2009. *Extended Case Method, Four Countries, Four Decades, Four Great Transformations, and One Theoretical Tradition*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Chisholm, L. and Hurrelman, K. 1995. 'Adolescence in modern Europe: Pluralized transition patterns and their implications for personal and social risks', *Journal of Adolescence* 18(2): 129–158.

Commission of the European Communities. 2007. *Third Annual Report on Migration and Integration 2007*. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities. Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/fsj/immigration/docs/com_2007_512_en.pdf> (accessed 1 February 2010).

Cousins, C. 1998. 'Social exclusion in Europe: Paradigms of social disadvantage in Germany, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom', *Policy and Politics*, (26)2: 127–46(20).

Daugstad, G. (ed.). 2009. *Immigration and Immigrants 2008*, Statistical Analyses 104. Oslo: Statistics Norway. Available at: <http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/02/sa_innvand_en/sa104/sa104_en.pdf> (accessed 1 February 2010).

Esping-Andersen, G. 2002. *Why We Need a New Welfare State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

European Commission. 2007. 'Towards a common European Union immigration policy'. Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/fsj/immigration/fsj_immigration_intro_en.htm> (accessed 1 February 2010).

Extra, G. and Yagmur, K. 2002. *Language Diversity in Multicultural Europe: Comparative Perspectives on Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and at School*, Discussion Paper 63, UNESCO.

Fangen, K. 1992. Tysklands nye ungdom: DDR-ungdom i overgangen til det kapitalistiske samfunn, UNGforsk, report no. 5.

Fangen, K. 1998. 'Right-Wing skinheads: Nostalgia and binary oppositions', *Nordic Journal of Youth Research* 6(3): 33–49.

Fangen, K. 2006. ''Assimilert, hybrid eller inkorporert i det etniske? Tilpasning og identifikasjon blant somaliere i Norge', *Sosiologisk tidsskrift* 14(1): 4–33. Available at: <http://www.duo.uio.no/publ/iss/2006/70891/Assimilert_hybrid_eller_inkorporert_i_det_etniske.pdf> (accessed 1 February 2010).

Fangen, K. 2007. 'Citizenship among young adult Somalis in Norway', *YOUNG, Nordic Journal of Youth Research* 15(4): 413–34.

Fangen, K. 2008. 'An analytical framework for analysing the inclusion and exclusion of young immigrants: The case of young adult Somalis in Norway', keynote lecture, NYRIS10 Nordic Youth Research Conference, Lillehammer, 13–15 June.

Fangen, K. 2009. 'Social exclusion of young adults with immigrant backgrounds: Relational, spatial and political dimensions', *Tidsskrift for ungdomsforskning* 2.

Fangen, K. 2010. 'Social exclusion and inclusion of young adult immigrants: Presentation of an analytical framework', *Nordic Journal of Youth Research* 18(2): 133–56.

Feliciano, C. and Rumbaut, R.G. 2005. 'Gendered paths: Educational and occupational expectations and outcomes among adult children of immigrants', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28(6): 1,087–118.

Feres, P., Immervoll, H., Lietz, C., Levy, H., Mantovani, D. and Sutherland, H. 2002. *Indicators for Social Inclusion in the European Union: How Responsive are They to Macro-level Changes?*, Working Paper EM3/02. Cambridge: EUROMOD. Available at: <http://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/files/msu/emod/workingpapers/emwp302.pdf> (accessed 1 February 2010).

Fry, G., Hunter, S., Law, I., Osler, A. Swann, S., Tzanelli, R. and Williams, F. 2008. *Country Report on Education: United Kingdom*, EDUMIGROM Background Papers. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.

Furstenberg F.F. 2000. 'The sociology of adolescence and youth in the 1990s: A critical commentary', *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62(4): 896–910.

Gilroy, P. 1987. *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation*. London: Routledge.

Gropas, R. and Triandafyllidou, A. 2007. 'Concluding remarks', in A. Triandafyllidou and R. Gropas (eds), *European Immigration: A Sourcebook*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Hall, T., Coffey, A. and Williamson, H. 2000. 'Self, space and place: Youth identities and citizenship', *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 20(4): 501–13.

Kalter, F. and Kogan, I. 2006. 'Ethnic inequalities at the transition from school to work in Belgium and Spain: Discrimination or self-exclusion?', *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 24: 259–74.

Kertzer, D. and Arel, D. (eds). 2002. *Census and Identity: The Politics of Race, Ethnicity, and Language in National Censuses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lahav, G. 2004. *Immigration and Politics in the New Europe: Reinventing Borders*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lauglo, J. 2000. 'Social capital trumping class and cultural capital? Engagement with school among immigrant youth', in S. Baron, J. Field and T. Schuller (eds), *Social Capital: Critical Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lavenex, S. 2001. 'The Europeanization of refugee policies: Normative challenges and institutional legacies', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 39: 5.

Middleton, S., Barnes, M. and Millar, J. 2003. 'Introduction: The dynamic analysis of poverty and social exclusion', in E. Apospori and J. Millar (eds), *The Dynamics*

of Social Exclusion in Europe: Comparing Austria, Germany, Greece, Portugal and the UK. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Millar, J. and Middelton, S. 2002. 'Introduction', in M. Barnes, C. Heady, S. Middleton, J. Millar, F. Papadopoulos, G. Room and P. Tsakoglou, *Poverty and Social Exclusion in Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Modood, T. 2007. *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Mohanty, C.T. 1988. 'Under western eyes: Feminist solidarity and colonial discourses', *Feminist Review* 30: 61–88.

Olsen, B. 2009. *Unge innvandrere i arbeid og utdanning. Er innvandrerungdom en marginalisert gruppe? 4. Kvartal 2007 Hvor forskjellige er de i forhold til majoriteten?* Working Paper 41. Oslo: Statistics Norway. Available at: <http://www.ssb.no/emner/06/01/notat_200941/notat_200941.pdf> (accessed 1 February 2010).

Penninx, R. 2006. 'Introduction', in R. Penninx, M. Berger and K. Kraal (eds), *The Dynamics of International Migration and Settlement in Europe: A State of the Art*. IMISCOE Research Series. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 7–18.

Portes, A. and Rumbaut, R.G. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Raaum, O., Rogstad, J., Røed, K. and Westlie, L. 2009. 'Young and out: An application of a prospects-based concept of social exclusion', *Journal of Socio-Economics* 38: 173–87.

Rex, J. 2000. 'Multiculturalism and political integration in Europe', in R. Koopmans and P. Statham (eds), *Challenging Immigration and Ethnic Relations Politics: Comparative European Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rogstad, J. 2000. *Mellom faktiske og forestilte forskjeller: synlige minoriteter på arbeidsmarkedet*. ISF Report 17. Oslo: ISF.

Room, G.J. 1995. *Beyond the Threshold: The Measurement and Analysis of Social Exclusion*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Room, G.J. 1999. 'Social exclusion, solidarity and the challenge of globalization', *International Journal of Social Welfare* 8: 166–74.

Sernhede, O. 2002. *AlieNation is My Nation*. Stockholm: Ordfront.

Social Protection Committee. 2001. *Report on Indicators in the Field of Poverty and Social Exclusion*. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

Thomson, R., Holland, J., McGrellis, S., Bell, R., Henderson, S. and Shrape, S. 2004. 'Inventing adulthoods: A biographical approach to understanding youth citizenship', *Sociological Review* 52(2): 218–39.

Triandafyllidou, A. and Gropas, R. 2007. *European Immigration: A Sourcebook. Illustrated Edition*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Van Dijk, T.A. 1992. 'Discourse and the denial of racism', *Discourse and Society* 3(1): 87–118.

Weil, S.W., Wildermeersch, D. and Jansen, T. 2005. *Unemployed Youth and Social Exclusion in Europe: Learning for Inclusion?* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Wimmer, A. and Schiller, N.G. 2003. 'Transnational migration: international perspectives', *International Migration Review* 37(3): 576–610.