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Executive Summary

This is a preliminary report from the Common Measures project. One of the main goals of this project is to develop recommendations for how to measure ethnic discrimination in a way that is representative, comparable and allows for the description of trends. Recommendations endorsed by the group will be presented in the final report at the end of year two.

This report presents a general overview of how multiple data sources can be combined to deliver a more nuanced and accurate picture of discrimination. Different data sources describe different phenomena and each has intrinsic strengths and weaknesses.

Register data can be used to describe outcomes, outcome gaps and trends over time for the entire population. Registers, however, only provide a limited range of certain types of information. Surveys can be used to describe experiences of discrimination in the target population, but they are expensive and it can sometimes be difficult to generalise from them. Complaints and case descriptions provide valuable information about the discriminatory processes, which can help to identify discrimination and areas problems that need attention, but offer no description of levels and trends.

We examine the existing situation regarding data collection and the potential for triangulation and multivariate approaches in three countries: Norway, Denmark and the Netherlands. Three fields are covered in each country: education, labour market attachment and income. All three countries are able to provide register data on their populations in these fields, with the exception of the Netherlands (where information on education is not available at the individual level). This data already exists and can be used for comparison. Several surveys exist that describe experiences of discrimination within a country. Case descriptions exist in Netherlands and Norway but they are not systematised for comparison.

Triangulating these data sources could enable some of the above-mentioned weaknesses to be overcome, enabling us to draw more out of the data than is possible by simply combining the research results. Because such register data includes the whole population over time, if key common variables exist, all other sources of data can easily be triangulated with it.
Preface

This report has been co-authored by a number of contributors from different institutional backgrounds. Some of us are employed at public agencies combating discrimination; several are employed at national statistical offices; others at human rights institutions or at university research institutions. We have different professional backgrounds, ranging from the fields of law and political science to economics and demography. We live in Denmark, the Netherlands and in Norway. What we have in common is our participation in this multi-disciplinary project and our belief in the need for better ways to measure discrimination.

Even though many people have been involved in the process, the content and final form of the texts is the sole responsibility of the editors and the authors. Each chapter will reflect the background of the author(s), but we hope that readers will view this as strength rather than a weakness.

This report attempts to contribute towards improving our ways of measuring discrimination. But more work is needed, both on the conceptual level and in terms of practical research. In particular, we hope that someone will find the triangulations and research possibilities we point out in this report useful and develop them further into real-life applications.
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1. Introduction

Purpose of this Report
This report is a preliminary report from the Common Measures of Discrimination project. Institutions from Norway, Denmark and the Netherlands participated in this project.

Our basic idea is to improve the measurement of discrimination by linking different sources of data together. To date, our knowledge of discrimination has been based on information on the forms of discrimination gathered by complaints bodies, on surveys on perceived discrimination and on statistics on negative outcomes for ethnic minority groups in our countries.

For now, it is sufficient to note that no single method of measurement is sufficient to cover all forms of discrimination. Therefore, some sort of multidisciplinary approach is required.

The problem is that it is difficult to find a way to measure the extent of ethnic discrimination that covers both the victims' perception of being discriminated against, and the indicators of differential treatment that confirm this perception from a more objective perspective.

In this report, we focus on the combination of three different types of data: register data, survey data, and case records. We examine the comparability of data in three different areas (education, labour and income) between three different countries (The Netherlands, Denmark and Norway). Our present aim is purely methodological; we wish to explore possible means of collecting and organising data that in the long term can be used to develop indicators of the level of discrimination. The project partners have a common understanding on our point of departure: present measurements are neither representative nor suitable for comparison, and the measurement of discrimination may be improved by using a combination of data sources. The project does not aim to present any conclusions about the level of discrimination.

We will focus on discrimination based on ethnic background, but our general approach is not limited to any single ground of discrimination. Thus, it is possible to extend to other grounds of discrimination, such as gender, religion or age, and use these for an intersectional approach.

To effectively engage in European anti-discrimination legal developments, and to document the effectiveness of anti-discrimination policies, governments and equality bodies need reliable data to document the situation of people exposed to discrimination. One basic requirement for combating discrimination is to be able to correctly identify the persons or groups facing discrimination, the form of discrimination, and the domains of life where discrimination happens, as well as to assess the level of discrimination. Without an understanding of the problem, it is difficult or impossible to design proper measures to counter it. This report may also provide background information for policy makers, NGOs, researchers, and others who wish to document and to combat discrimination through various measures. The reader should bear in mind, however, that this report will contain discussions concerning representative and comparable measurements of discrimination, not suggestions on how to combat discrimination.

Presentation of Concepts
Linking and Mapping
- Linking data is used when we are able to connect several sources of data on the individual level. In other words, using some kind of pin-number or other personal identification allows us...
to combine separate pieces of information at the individual level. For example, we hope to link a person's level of education, their income, and their ethnicity in order to learn more about discrimination.

- **Mapping data** is used when we are connecting sources of data at aggregated levels, such as ethnic groups. For example, a survey can establish the level of experienced discrimination for several groups, which again can be mapped to registered complaints by the same groups or to registered income levels for the same groups, in order to learn more about discrimination.

**Objective and Subjective Discrimination**

- **Objective discrimination** is discrimination that is established based on criteria that are unrelated to subjective experiences. For example, less pay for the same or comparable work is an example of objective discrimination. In other words, objective discrimination is about unjustifiable differences in outcomes.

- **Subjective discrimination** is the experience of being discriminated. Often subjective and objective discrimination will go hand in hand, but they do not need to: a person might not notice that they are discriminated against; or they may falsely believe that they discriminated against. It is still unclear how these two forms of discrimination are related to each other empirically, and during 2006 we hope to prepare methodology for this kind of study.

Complaints handled by equality and anti-discrimination bodies and legal cases often start with the victim's subjective experience of discrimination, and the relevant bodies proceed to establish the degree of objective discrimination in legal terms.

**Direct, Indirect and Systemic Discrimination**

The two EU directives, Race Equality and Employment Equality directives, give protection against:

- **direct discrimination**, where a person is treated less favourably than another is, has been or would be treated in a comparable situation on one of the grounds of discrimination listed; **indirect discrimination**, where a provision, criterion or practice that appears to be neutral and non-discriminatory would in fact disadvantage someone of a particular racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, compared to others, unless it is objectively justified by a legitimate aim and it is an appropriate and necessary means of achieving that aim.1

In addition, these two directives give protection against **harassment and instruction to discriminate**. It can be difficult to grasp the concepts of direct and indirect discrimination. One attempt to explain them is provided by Ronald Craig:

Somewhat oversimplified, one may say that direct discrimination is when like cases are unjustifiably treated differently; while indirect discrimination is when relevantly different cases are unjustifiably treated alike (Craig 2005: 38).

A few examples from the field of education may clarify these issues. An example of direct discrimination would be to not accept immigrants into the police academy because they are immigrants. An example of indirect discrimination would be to require the applicants to the police academy to be of above average male height, if it is not a necessary requirement for performing the job, as this would exclude many minority women.
It should be noted that these legal definitions are sometimes interpreted as being designed to assign responsibility to a particular party. However, preamble 15 of the race directive opens up the possibility of using statistical measures as a tool for establishing direct or indirect discrimination. Without this, it would be difficult or impossible to claim indirect discrimination in situations where there is a discriminatory effect, but no particular provision, criterion or practice to go with it, in other words, systemic discrimination. In the United States, this form of discrimination is often labelled as disparate impact.

The definition of discrimination used in this report covers both direct and indirect discrimination, without attempting to assign responsibility. It is important to note that these two forms of discrimination include systemic discrimination. None of these definitions depends on existence of intent to discriminate. Both direct and indirect discrimination contain a comparable element ‘less favourably than another’ and ‘comparable to others’. Our aim is not to measure discrimination in a manner that would be approved by the courts. However, we believe that, when linked with information about risk populations, differential outcomes that can be observed in register data can provide a necessary first step. The potential plaintiffs in discrimination cases need to be able to document that it is possible that discrimination has taken place, in order to shift the burden of proof.

Target Population
The measurement of discrimination starts with the establishment of the target population, as it is necessary to define the groups of comparison. We call the potential victims of discrimination the ‘risk group’ or ‘target population’. However, the majority population must also be defined as a target population in order to provide a base for comparisons. These target populations will often be labelled using distinctions drawn from the protected grounds of discrimination. Even if there are boundary issues that will always provoke discussion, it is important to be able to set some benchmarks.

Categorisation by others is often not identical with self-identification. In this project, we operate not with self-identified groups, but by groups identified by national statistical agencies. Categorisation is a product of national history and changes over time. We do not attempt to create any new categorisations, but rather select a pragmatic way to define target groups. By using a person’s place of birth, their parent’s place of birth, and in some cases their grandparent’s place of birth, the national statistical offices have created a categorisation that is sufficient for our purposes, although not flawless.

Given the high quality of the available population registers in Denmark, Netherlands and Norway, the use of an individual’s parents’ birthplace(s) seems at present to be preferable to other methods of defining the risk population. There is, however, one very severe limitation, as registers do not contain information about national minorities or ethnic groups in Norway and Denmark. The existing registers must be supplemented with other forms of information in order to identify religious or ‘old’ national minorities.

Representativeness
At present most estimates of discrimination are based on samples that do not provide an unbiased estimate of discrimination in a risk population. It is important that the common measures of discrimination be representative and provide a picture of the entire risk population. In
other words, the relationship between the measurements and particular risk populations must be known.

**Comparability**
Comparability is a theoretical property; not one that is inherent in the data. We are interested in comparability along two dimensions: populations and countries. First, the indicators or measurements of discrimination contain a comparison between target group and general population; all measurements must therefore be comparable across population segments. Second, one must try to find similar measures in every country, but because the countries have different traditions and systems for data collection, it is unrealistic to expect to have identical indicators in all countries.

In general, it is advantageous to use multiple indicators to ensure that some measures provide means of comparison between countries. Simple indicators such as the level and distribution of income in the target population should be included. However, depending on the aim of the particular comparison, these may need to be adjusted; for example to the relative purchasing power in each country or to the majority population’s level and distribution of income. The number of useful comparisons which can be made increases in relation to the amount of data available about the target populations and countries.

**Measuring Discrimination**
How is it possible to measure discrimination, a behaviour most people would view as something negative that they would be reluctant to admit to? The definitions of discrimination currently in use avoid the use of intent, and focus instead on its effects.

The outcomes are a result of many small events. When many small behaviours (or omissions) are systematic, they can add up over the years to a substantial effect. If there is no systematic preferential or disparate treatment present, these differences will average out over time.

Disparate outcomes may well stem from root causes other than discrimination. Disparate outcomes, for example in housing or employment, may be caused by individual preferences, choices and disparate resources.

How does one move from establishing disparate outcome to measuring discrimination? The observation of discrimination in a single legal case has been described in following manner:

In summary, a finding of discrimination involves four essential elements:

1) an individual or group is in comparison, treated or affected differently than the comparator,
2) the difference is disadvantageous to the individual or group,
3) the difference in treatment or effect is causally linked to a characteristic of the individual or group protected by antidiscrimination legislation, and
4) there is no exception or justification permitting the difference in treatment or effect (Craig 2005: 43).

If we can establish the presence of the same elements through a more general measurement, we are likely to have measure of discrimination with high validity. This results in the following four challenges to be overcome if discrimination is to be measured accurately. These elements are parts of an argument, and they can appear in any order.

First, establish a differential outcome for a target population. Availability of data and target population definitions are
a precondition for establishing the existence of a differential outcome.

Second, establish that the difference is disadvantageous. An example of a disadvantage is lower pay for the same job. However, one must be careful not to make assumptions that are based upon universalistic ideas of what counts as a disadvantage. Alternatively, examples or surveys can be used to establish the target populations’ attitudes.

Third, establish causality. With the help of statistical techniques, it is possible to show that outcome differences are statistically significant, i.e. that it is unlikely the differences related to membership in target populations are the result of accident only. Statistical significance is sometimes mistakenly understood as establishing causality. The presence of causality is more a theoretical argument that needs to be ‘added’ to the data (Davis 1985). One way to do this is to refer to documented cases, where discrimination has been established as one of the causes.

Fourth, establish that there are no justifications or alternative explanations present for the relevant outcome difference. If one is able to establish disadvantage to a sufficient degree, it can help to make it unlikely that this outcome is sought for by the target population. Here the problem is that, in theory, there are always other alternative explanations available. In practice, some kind of standard should be established beyond which an outcome gap becomes unacceptable, together with a list of alternative explanations that need to be accounted for before the gap can be considered to be related to discrimination.

Together, solving these four challenges bring us one important step towards measuring discrimination.

A further qualification is necessary for some of these elements. Disparate outcomes are related to expected outcomes; for example, equal income for two groups with different levels of education could be interpreted as being unjustifiable. Therefore, in practice, the search for discrimination often starts from experienced discrimination that is brought into the attention of complaints bodies. Without such documented cases of discrimination, it is difficult or impossible to claim that any disparate outcomes (or unjustifiable equal outcomes) are related to discrimination.

The need for several types of information from several sources is apparent, and we will shortly turn back to the relation between the different sources of data and the measurement of discrimination.

Different Sources of Data

A recent European Commission financed research project concluded that:

no particular data collection method is enough in and of itself in order to obtain a satisfactory picture of the extent and nature of discrimination. Therefore, it is a necessity to adopt a multi-method and multi-disciplinary approach to measuring discrimination. It is only through consistent patterns of results obtained with different data collection methods that discrimination may satisfactorily be measured (Reuter, Makkonen & Oosi 07.12.2004: summary).7

Our aim here is to examine how different sources can provide different forms of information. We wish to develop a form of analysis based on linking or mapping the different sources that can establish discrimination, since none of these sources is able, alone, to provide sufficient and representative information about discrimination. In this context we choose to focus on sources available today: register data, surveys and complaints (or case descriptions).

7) See also the recent Measuring racial discrimination which also endorses the use of multiple methods (Blank, Dabady & Citro 2004).
One must either assume that or check whether these institutions are free from discriminatory practices. It would not be unheard of to find that public institutions are involved in some of the forms of discrimination also in evidence in the rest of the society.

Register-based data provides information about outcomes, and helps to identify some target populations. Register-based data has the advantage of covering the whole population; therefore, outcomes for small groups can be measured if the groups can be identified in a reliable manner. In addition, such data has, in general, high reliability. The weakness of register-based data is that many things we would like to know are not registered.

Many countries use censuses as a means to collect basic socio-economic data about their populations. Typically, such censuses are conducted every five or ten years. Denmark, the Netherlands and Norway no longer rely on censuses as means of collecting data, because the same information is available through their population registers. However, in countries where registers are not available, census data should be used instead.

Surveys can provide answers to a much wider range of questions than register data, but they are by nature more unreliable. In addition, most surveys target the general population, and are based on respondent numbers that are too small to provide reliable estimates of sub-populations that are of interest for the study of discrimination. Sometimes, risk-populations are targeted specifically, and these surveys can provide a substantial amount of useful information, but even then, selective non-response has sometimes been a problem. We believe more will be learned if surveys can be linked to information from register-based data.

Complaints registered by specialised bodies and the national justice system provide information about some of the forms of discrimination but not about the levels at which they occur. However, these qualitative descriptions offer important information concerning the nature of discrimination that can be used to argue that outcome differences are related to discrimination. Put simply, these complaints and court cases can tell us what the problem is, but they cannot tell us about levels of, or trends in, discrimination.

There are also forms of discrimination that cannot be studied through complaints, as they are too systemic in their nature. It is unlikely that anyone would file a complaint against a habitual seating order in the canteen, even if this can influence the flow of information within a company, and thus over time contribute to the career development of the involved parties. However, a measurement of outcomes can identify that one group has a lower income than expected.

How can we generalise from these different forms of data? Register-based data is as close to population data as it is possible to get. Registers offer a thin layer of solid data: they provide representative data, without the need to generalise, but offer few details. The extent to which a well-executed survey can be used generalise to target populations depends on the design of the survey. Surveys offer a slightly thicker slice of data that can potentially be used to generalise to target populations. Complaints and court cases provide information about the processes of discrimination and how they can be observed in specific cases. They do not
include information about the levels at which discrimination occurs, but they do not offer information about the form and mechanisms involved. One cannot generalise in a statistical sense to other cases, but this information is still extremely valuable for establishing the potential causal link from discrimination to outcome that is needed before discrimination can be suspected.9

History and Future of this Project

The participants in this project are from Norway, Denmark and Netherlands. The model we have been aiming at is to ensure participation from both specialists on discrimination and specialists on statistics in every country. The project is managed by the Centre for Combating Ethnic Discrimination in Oslo, and supported by Statistics Norway. Other participants are The Danish Institute of Human Rights, with support from Statistics Denmark, and Jessika ter Wal, with support from Statistics Netherlands.

The project is financed by a grant from the European Commission’s Directorate General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities (VS/2004/0464), and by contributions from the Centre for Combating Ethnic Discrimination and the Danish Institute of Human Rights.

The process of producing this report has includes two two-day workshops for all participants; one in Utrecht, Netherlands, and one in Copenhagen, Denmark, where the development process and contents of and the production of this report have been discussed.

The main purpose of the Common Measures of Discrimination project is to present recommendations to the EU. The project will present a final report in late 2006. During the period from March 2005 until October 2005, we have written a preliminary report, gathering information on data available in the three countries and discussing how to measure objective and subjective (perceived) discrimination. This report will be presented at a seminar for experts and stakeholders in Oslo in November 2005 to present our findings and get feedback from participants.

The Future of this Project

We have invited three new countries to comment upon our approach and to discuss how to extend our recommendations on methodology on data collection to a broader range of countries. Presently, two new participants are firmly committed: Portugal and the Czech Republic. At the end of the implementation phase in 2006, we will arrange a seminar to present our final recommendations and final report. In the interim, we will arrange several meetings with the project partners to coordinate our reports, the recommendations and seminars.

It is important to document discrimination to ensure that persons in risk populations receive the help and treatment they deserve, and in order to fulfil the requirements placed on EU/EEA member states in the Race directive and in the Employment equality directive. The publication of a Green Paper on equality and non-discrimination (European Commission 2004) initiated a consultation process in 2004 involving national, regional and local authorities, NGOs, social partners, experts and individual members of the public. In their annual report the European Commission wrote:

Some 93% of respondents viewed data collection as important for the development of effective policies for equality and
discrimination, though the need to protect personal privacy was stressed.

The vast majority of written responses highlighted the added value of EU funding in supporting policy action and antidiscrimination legislation. The preferred priorities for support are 'information and awareness raising' (60%) and 'analysis and monitoring' (54%) (European Commission 2005: 8).

Data collection and analysis and monitoring are viewed as being of high importance by a large number of the stakeholders. Therefore, the effort to improve measures of discrimination must continue until we have achieved reliable and valid measurements that can be used to establish levels and trends in and across countries.

The Structure of This Report
The rest of this report is divided into two main sections. The first section contains the country chapters on Norway, Denmark and Netherlands. The second section contains some reflections based upon a comparison of the country chapters, and a short text that includes material on which to base discussions concerning recommendations.

The Country Chapters:
The Introduction describes the largest minority groups and how they have traditionally been defined, some of the main sources of data, and the national status of measuring discrimination.

Discrimination happens in many domains of life, and measurements should focus on selected domains. We have focussed on education, labour force participation and income, because these three domains are central for individuals’ well-being, there is data available, and these domains look promising for comparisons across countries.

Education is the first domain of life that is described. The chapters attempt to answer the question of how we can describe what the education of a member of the target population brings to the labour market. What are the sources of information available? Is the international ISCED classification of level and field of education available? Is there information concerning education taken abroad available? We also provide some information about sources of information, both surveys and complaints, concerning experiences of discrimination in education.

Labour force participation and placement is the second domain that is described in each country chapter. Research questions that should guide this section include: What are the forms of discrimination seen in the labour market? How can we give a representative description of a risk-population’s experience of discrimination in the labour market? What can we learn by linking experiences of discrimination to measures of indirect discrimination in the labour market? How can we actually make this link? How can we measure indirect discrimination in the labour market?

There are also issues regarding experienced discrimination: What do complaints, court cases and other qualitative sources tell us about the most important forms of experienced discrimination in this area? What are the questions commonly used in surveys? What do these tell us? How well do the questions match the problems?

We would also like to measure outcomes through population data registers. What information is available in the registers? Which institutions maintain them? There are several indicators for labour market attachment: participation,
placement in branch of industry and occupation. Do they all follow the international classifications NACE\textsuperscript{11} or ISCO-88\textsuperscript{12}

\textit{Income} is the third domain that is described in every country report. These sub-sections should help us to understand what kind of information is available on income. This can be useful for studying what consequences education and labour-market participation have on income at the individual and household levels. Which measures of income are best suited for the comparative study of discrimination?

Households and families are important social units where resources and burdens are shared. If possible, we should be looking at households or families as a unit in this context, because the consequences of low income are felt on this level. However, it is possible that indirect discrimination must be studied at the individual level, as information concerning education and labour-market participation is recorded at the individual level. In other words, we believe family and household level information should be used to contextualise individual level discrimination.

Each country chapter also describes how the level and composition of income can be described.

Each country chapter ends with a short discussion of national level problems and possibilities for measuring discrimination.

Reflections, Comparisons and Ideas for Discussion

Chapter 5: Reflections Based on the Country Chapters discusses the cross-cutting themes from country chapters: defining target populations, measuring education, labour force attachment, income and the national summaries.

There is a discussion of triangulating register data, surveys, complaints and legal cases. Some attention is given to what we are looking for in the data (outcome gaps, unjustifiable similarities and disadvantage), and what kind of alternative explanations for discrimination should be included.

As already mentioned, this report does not contain recommendations endorsed by the whole group. That task is a natural follow-up in the next phase of this project. Nevertheless, we are trying to bring some of the ideas for recommendations out in the open so that they can be discussed and evaluated. These are presented in one short text: Chapter 6: Contribution to the Discussion of Recommendations presents reflections concerning the overall design of the issue, and compromises we need to make in order to achieve comparability.


\textsuperscript{12} ISCO is ILO’s classification. See http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/stat/class/isco.htm
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Introduction
The aim of this chapter is to present the different sources of statistical and other data available in the Norwegian context, and examine how these might be used to document the nature and extent of discrimination. No single approach or method of measuring ethnic discrimination allows us to address all of the important issues or to answer all of the questions of interest. We believe that different data sources could be used to provide new insights and valuable information about discrimination. In this chapter we will emphasise register data as a source of data that can be used to demonstrate differences in outcomes. If we combine register data with other data such as survey data or complaints, it is likely that we can find out more about both the nature of discrimination and how it is perceived, and how common the phenomenon is.

In accordance with the Norwegian Government’s National Plan of Action to Combat Racism and Discrimination (2002-2006),1 documentation of racism and discrimination in Norway is now being compiled. The Centre for Combating Ethnic Discrimination (SMED), a specialised body, annually publishes reports based on individual cases which they have handled (1999–2005). SMED also analyses the state of legal protection against ethnic discrimination in Norway. The Directorate of Immigration publishes biannual reports on discrimination in Norway. NGOs, such as the Anti-Racist Centre in Norway and OMOD (Institution Against Public Discrimination) also contribute documentation.

However, documentation regarding the nature and extent of ethnic discrimination in Norway is fragmented and a more comprehensive approach is needed to provide a better picture, and to fully engage in the development of European anti-discrimination policy and legislation. Along with other countries, Norway reports on ethnic discrimination to a number of international bodies,2 but most of the measurement that are used today seem neither to be representative nor to provide a basis for describing trends, levels, and distributions. They also tend to lack a good and comparable definition of the risk population. What are needed are indicators that are comparable enough to allow comparisons over time, and between countries.

Some national minorities in Norway have historically faced severe discrimination – pervasive and open denial of civil, social, political, educational and economic opportunities. Today, large differences in outcomes among ethnic groups and people with different immigrant backgrounds in Norway continue to exist in employment, income and wealth, housing, education, criminal justice, health and other areas. Although many factors may contribute to such differences, their extent suggests that various forms of discriminatory treatment persist in Norwegian society and serve to undercut the achievement of equal opportunity.

The definition of discrimination in the relevant EU directives’ calls for a common European approach to measure the nature and extent of discrimination. The concept of indirect discrimination in particular relies upon statistical reasoning. Rather than extending the traditional range of legal sanctions applicable to discriminatory acts, the issue with indirect discrimination is to inspect all apparently neutral procedures and practices in order to identify their possible discriminatory consequences and, subsequently, to promote equality actively (Simon 2005, Goldston 2001). Apparently neutral procedures may be revealed to be discriminatory only if their effects on protected

---

2) In making recommendations and expressing general concerns, both CERD (United Nations’ Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination) and the ECRI (European Commission against Racism and Intolerance) have mentioned the lack of data and monitoring of the situation for ethnic minorities in Norway.
3) The race directive 2000/43/EC and employment directive 2000/78/EC.
groups are examined. Such effects are regarded as discriminatory only if they are significant, in other words not reducible to chance, and if they are not justified by relevant criteria (Blank et al. 2004).

Differences in outcomes between different groups can be seen in lower levels of education and especially employment rates, and higher rates of poverty. Large and persistent outcome differences do not in themselves provide direct evidence of the presence or magnitude of ethnic discrimination in any particular domain. Because discriminatory behaviour is rarely observed directly, researchers must infer the existence of discriminatory practices by trying to determine whether an observed adverse outcome for an individual would have been different had the individual been of a different ethnic or immigrant background. (Blank et al 2004). In other words, we should try to answer the counterfactual question: What would have happened to an individual with ethnic or immigrant background if he or she had been an individual without such an affiliation? Understanding the extent to which any study succeeds in answering that question requires that significant effort be expended in assessing the logic and assumptions underlying the causal inferences drawn by the researcher.

**Do We Know the Ethnic Composition of Norway?**

Before we can recommend ways to measure the extent of ethnic discrimination, we must know who it is who is exposed to ethnic discrimination in Norway: We must define the target groups or the risk population. According to the recommendations from international bodies such as CERD and ECRI, every country should preferably have records on the ethnic composition of the country, and ethnic affiliation should be based on self-identification. An example of this is a country like UK. UK conducts a decennial household census where respondents are asked about their ethnic group and can choose between five categories with several subgroups and open categories. The last census was conducted in 2001, and from this census it is possible to show the distribution of population by age, ethnic identity, religion and on different administrative levels such as regions or districts.

**From ethnic identity to personal identification number**

In Norway the population statistics are different, as they are based not on self-identification in census data but on administrative register data. The main source for population statistics, both on stocks and flows, is the System for Population Registration within Statistics Norway. Based on the Population Census of 1960 the Central Register of Population (CPR) was established in 1964. Between 1964 and 1990, it was located within Statistics Norway, and run jointly by the tax authorities and Statistics Norway. From its inception, the CPR included all people who were registered as being settled in Norway from the time of the Census, and assigned them a unique Personal Identification Number (PIN-code). When people die or emigrate, a PIN-code is never re-assigned, and all relevant information is kept in the historical archives. The person will stay in the register indefinitely, but one status variable will be given a value that excludes these people for statistical purposes, such as when creating population stock statistics. This means that the PIN-code can be used for linking all the various registers that are based on this system, but only those relevant for each purpose will be linked. The use of the registers is
regulated by the Statistical Acts (from 1907, and 1989), and by the laws regulating the registration of individual information. These laws give Statistics Norway access to all official registers, and the right to use them for statistical and research purposes, given that protection of individual privacy is properly assured.

All children born alive to parents resident in Norway are included in the register, as are live births to immigrants who have been granted permission to stay. Their inclusion is based on the UN definition of usual place of residence (UN 1998), but linked to an intention to stay for at least six months as opposed to the UN recommendation for actual stay of at least one year. All vital events (births, deaths, marriages, national and international migration etc.) and demographic characteristics such as age, marital status, citizenship, number of children, place of birth, national background (including parental country of birth), and year of first immigration are registered under this PIN. From this information it is possible to reconstruct individual demographic biographies for the period over which the register has existed. In addition, a number of registers in the private and public sectors also use the same PIN. Those from the public sector include: school attendance, educational attainment, labour market participation, registers of income and wealth based on tax returns, social security, criminal records and driving licenses.

The register system briefly described above will not provide an ethnic composition of population-based self-identification. By using parental country of birth as a proxy, it is possible to identify the immigrant population in Norway, and use these objective categories to define the population exposed to discrimination. The strength of this approach is that these categories allow us to make comparisons over time and between groups. The weakness is that it does not allow individuals to claim their own ethnic identity. By using country of origin we will for example not have the possibility to differentiate between people from Sri Lanka identifying themselves as Sinhalese or Tamils. However, this shortcoming is also apparent in the censuses and self-identification approach, which provide few and broad ethnic categories to choose from. Using broad categories may hide larger differences in outcome within a group than between groups.

Indigenous Population and National Minorities

The CRP system does however not include identification of the individual members of the indigenous group, the Sámi population, and the minorities granted national minority status (Jews, Roma, Romani, Kvener and Skogfinner). This is obviously a shortcoming since people with these backgrounds have historically experienced discrimination. According to a recent government white paper (no. 15 2000–2001) there are approximately 11 000 eligible voters registered to vote for the Sámi parliament, but the exact number of Sámis in Norway is probably much higher than this figure. The number of Jews is estimated at around 1 100, the Roma population at 300-400, Romani several thousand and the Kvens between 10 000 and 15 000 (according to the same white paper). Although Norway has always been a multicultural society, as the figure below shows, it is the flow of immigrants the last 30 years that has changed the composition of the population most dramatically.

6) Østby, L. http://www.compstat.org
7) Kvener are of Finnish descendent and live in Northern Norway. Skogfinner are also of Finnish descendent, but live in Southern Norway.
Figure 2.1 above shows that the immigrant population has increased substantially since 1970. The number of immigrants from Western countries has doubled in 35 years, while the number of immigrants from non-Western backgrounds has increased at an even faster rate. In 1990 non-Western immigrant accounted for half of the immigrant population, but today the proportion is 3 out of 4.

The Immigrant Population

At the beginning of 2005, the immigrant population (people with two foreign born parents, who were themselves born either in Norway or abroad) made up 8 percent of the population, or 365,000 people. These people came from more than 200 different countries, and there are non-Western immigrants in every municipality (435) in Norway except two. 53,000 of these people are from one of the other Nordic countries, 45,000 from Western Europe and North America. Approximately 61,000 are from an immigrant background from Eastern Europe, and 205,000 from Turkey, Asia, Africa and Latin America.

If we apply a broader definition that includes those born in Norway who have one foreign born parent, the immigrant population increases by 173,000, to a total of nearly 540,000. However, for the purposes of this paper we will apply the narrow definition of the immigrant population. This does not mean that the Norwegian born with one foreign-born parent (mixed couples) do not experience any discrimination. However, research in Norway and Sweden shows that mixed couples and their descendants are usually better off than first-generation immigrants and their descendants.

Figure 2.2 shows that in the immigrant population as a whole, the largest number of people were of Pakistani descent, at 26,950, followed by those with backgrounds from Sweden (22,900), Denmark (19,200), Iraq (18,400) and Vietnam (17,900). About two out of three first generation immigrants come from non-Western countries. Ninety-five per cent of the people in the Western immigrant population were first-generation immigrants, while the corresponding figure for the non-Western immigrant population

was 78 per cent. People with Pakistani parents made up the largest group of people born in Norway with two foreign-born parents, at 11,800. People born in Norway to Vietnamese parents were the second largest group, at 5,800, followed by those whose parents came from Turkey, Sri Lanka and Somalia. People with Swedish and Danish parents only accounted for 1,000 and 1,400 out of the total, respectively. The reason why so few people with Swedish or Danish parents are born in Norway compared to other large immigrant groups, may be that Swedes and Danes have children with a person of Norwegian origin to a larger extent than other groups, and if two Danes or two Swedes become a couple and have children they are more likely to move back to their country of origin than other groups. Ninety per cent of people born in Norway to two foreign-born parents have parents born in a non-Western country (Forgaard and Dzamarija 2004).

Education
In order to understand the outcome differences in the labour market we must know, among other things, the level and field of education immigrants in Norway have, compared with others. It is probably also useful to show how minorities perform in the educational system and how employers react to their qualifications. The aim is of this section is to illustrate what data sources are available in the domain of education.

This section includes information on available register data, data from surveys and complaints on discrimination in the domain of education.

Education Completed Abroad
In the spring of 1991 information was collected on degrees obtained by foreign-born individuals who had immigrated to Norway for the first time between 1 November 1980 and 31 December 1990, and who were aged 16 or over at the end of the first year after their arrival. This survey was called "Education Completed Abroad".

A similar survey was also conducted in 1999. Respondents to the latter survey included everyone with a foreign background registered as resident in Norway and listed in the Register of the Population’s Highest Level of Education (BHU Register) as having an unreported level of education. The non-respondents to the 1991 survey were also included. In addition, Norwegians who lived abroad when the BHU Register was created were included in the 1999 survey. The survey contains both level and the broad field of education, following the ISCED97 codes.

To summarise, information on education completed abroad is collected through surveys, for which the latest survey was in 1999, while education pursued in Norway is directly registered.
Differences in Levels of Education

Considering immigrants’ educational attainment according to world region, immigrants from Asia and Africa have the lowest levels on average. Educational attainment varies significantly according to country background. Figure 2.3 shows that immigrants aged 30–44 years from the Philippines, Poland, Russia, India, China and Iran, have on average a higher level of educational attainment than the average among all people in Norway in the same age group. 42 per cent of the immigrants from the Philippines have completed tertiary education. Among non-immigrants the portion is 30 per cent. 23 per cent of Russian immigrants have completed lengthy tertiary education, i.e. of at least 4.5 years’ duration. This is more than three times as much as for people outside the immigrant population, where the portion with lengthy tertiary education is 7 per cent. Immigrants from Turkey, Somalia, Pakistan and Thailand are worst off when it comes to educational attainment: the portion with the highest level of education at tertiary level, short or long, is around 10 per cent, but there are many immigrants for whom we do not have any educational information.

Figure 2.3. Immigrant Population, Highest Level of Education

Immigrant population 30–44 years, with tertiary education as highest level of education, by country background. Selected non-western countries and Norway total, 2001. Per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Tertiary education, short</th>
<th>Tertiary education, long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual-level Data on Education Completed in Norway Available in Registers

Information about primary and lower secondary education in Norway is collected from the Primary and Lower Secondary Information System (GSI), and includes all compulsory education under the Education Act as well as adult education at this level. Primary school consists of 1st to 7th grade. Lower secondary school consists of 8th to 10th grade. Only schools approved by the Ministry of Education and Research under the Education Act are included. The statistics are based on annual reports by the schools and municipal authorities to central authorities. Every autumn the schools report their situation as it is on October 1st and their plans for the current school year. The schools also report on minority language pupils, where ‘minority language pupils’ refers to people whose mother tongue is a language other than Norwegian or Sámi. Mother tongue refers to the language that is used in a person’s home. Consequently, the definition of minority language pupils differs from the regular definition of the target population, based on parent’s country of origin.

Statistics on upper secondary education include pupils attending education with a duration of at least 300 hours per year, irrespective of school-approval by law. Data is collected from administrative registers from the counties’ main enrolment system, VIGO. The main purpose of VIGO is to manage the enrolment of pupils in upper secondary schools. However, the database contains data on all pupils registered in county upper secondary schools. Data from private upper secondary schools are also reported through VIGO. VIGO also includes pupils in vocational education, meaning people who are in apprenticeship training and will sit for a qualifying examination.
Statistics on tertiary education include universities and university colleges that are approved by the Ministry of Education and Research. Information about the Population’s Highest Level of Education, enrolled students at a specific point of time (1 October) and graduates is assembled and organised in the National Education Database (NUDB). Sources for this information are mainly various administrative registration systems used by the educational institutions and others, such as the State Student Loan Fund. This database contains also information about the field of education and can be presented using the ISCED coding.

To sum up the possibilities and limitations of the above data: it is possible to follow pupils, on an individual level, from secondary school through upper secondary school and to higher education by means of administrative registers. It is possible to analyse their performance in terms of marks, number of dropouts, etc.

Experiences of Discrimination in Education

In a living condition survey among non-Western immigrants (1996), Statistics Norway asked questions on perceived discrimination regarding housing, the labour market and healthcare. Questions on perceived discrimination in education were not included.

There have been few studies of the situation in schools in Norway that emphasise the perspective of discrimination. Some studies argue that negative stereotyping of pupils with immigrant or minority background is not unusual (Mauseth 2004, Høgmo 2001, Seeberg 2003). Although girls with immigrant background work as hard, or often harder, than Norwegian pupils on their coursework, their performance is worse. Differences in school performance, as measured by marks, can to some extent be explained by a pupil’s parents’ socio-economic background (Hægland et al 2004), but it is also

Immigrants in Upper Secondary Education

Ninety-six per cent of all pupils who completed primary and lower secondary education in 2002 transferred to upper secondary education the following term. The proportion for first generation immigrant pupils was 91 per cent, and for pupils born in Norway with two foreign-born parents the proportion was 95 per cent. Seventy-eight per cent of immigrant pupils in upper secondary education were first generation immigrants. Pupils with origins in Pakistan represent the largest immigrant group. Of these, 2 out of 3 pupils were born in Norway, and a third were born in Pakistan. The next largest immigrant group had Iranian backgrounds, of which 98 per cent were born in Iran. Other relatively large groups had origins in Vietnam, Iraq, Somalia and Bosnia. The proportion of 16 to 18 year-olds in the immigrant population who attended upper secondary education in 2003 was relatively low. The total average for this age group was 90 per cent, but only 73 per cent of the first generation immigrants were enrolled in upper secondary education. The percentage of people born in Norway with two foreign-born parents was 87. Figures of throughput-rates in upper secondary education show that 56 percent of immigrants that enrolled in 1994 had completed five years later, while 39 per cent dropped out. Similar figures were recorded in 1997. Immigrant pupils from Africa were least likely to complete upper secondary education in 1994, as 39 per cent completed within five years and 11 per cent were still in upper secondary education five years after they started. This figure had decreased to 6 per cent for pupils who enrolled in 1997. Immigrant girls had lower dropout rates than immigrant boys. While 30 per cent of girls dropped out in 1994 and 1997, the corresponding figure for boys was more than 40 per cent (Fjeldseth 2004).
necessary to analyse how schools handle pupils with special needs and different backgrounds (Bakken 2003).

**Complaints**

The Centre for Combating Ethnic Discrimination (SMED) provides free legal aid to people who have experienced ethnic discrimination. Based on data from SMED's administrative system, the table above shows cases handled by this complaint body in the period from 1999-2005. The table shows incidents of discrimination or perceived discrimination, and not prevalence. (See table 2.1.)

The number of incidents differs every year. These changes could reflect underlying trends in the phenomenon of discrimination, but an increase in the numbers of cases handled by SMED might also reflect that more people with ethnic minority background know about the services SMED provides. The changes may also be influenced by how useful the service is perceived to be in the different domains, or by the coverage and attention of discrimination-related cases in media.

SMED has handled 87 cases of perceived discrimination in the educational system during the last 7 years. The different cases cover a lot of different topics ranging from education for Roma pupils to problems regarding the recognition of foreign higher education and the teaching of the subject Christian Knowledge Religious and Ethical Education (Christian Knowledge) in schools. This subject was introduced in schools in 1997. According to a circular from the Ministry of Education, Research and Church affairs regarding diverse education and limited exemptions, the subject Christian Knowledge is intended to open a dialogue between pupils with different religious beliefs. Instead of the previous practice of dividing the class into different religions who then studied their own faith, it was considered desirable to have everyone together for a dialogue on religion. In addition to such dialogue, the intention was to teach the history of Christianity as the principal religious culture in Norway.

---

**Table 2.1. Cases Handled by SMED 1999–2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour market</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-care and Social Services</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public places</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration authorities</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>179</strong></td>
<td><strong>247</strong></td>
<td><strong>253</strong></td>
<td><strong>214</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
<td><strong>275</strong></td>
<td><strong>239</strong></td>
<td><strong>1551</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SMED

---

**Sample Case Received by SMED:**

The mother of a Muslim pupil asked the school for information about the exemption rules for her child. She wanted him to participate in classes, and not be excluded, but that he be excused from certain areas which were deemed unsuitable. The Principal’s office responded that the school had a duty to provide diverse education. The school refused to offer an alternative class, but suggested that the boy could have a free period during the class(es) in question. The mother also noted that stories are told to her child from different religions, without explaining to the child the origins of those ‘stories’. She was of the opinion that such a practice was not proper education.
In this chapter we have indicated that there are several different data sources available for analysing differences in the highest level of education achieved by pupils and students with different immigrant backgrounds. It is possible to analyse their performance (grades, drop-out rates, throughputs) and transitions from one level of education to the next.

Except for at the primary and secondary level, data are available at the individual level. In primary and secondary school and kindergartens information is available at the group level using a different definition, that of minority language pupils. The difference in definition and the fact that this information is collected and reported on group level makes comparison over time and between regions difficult.

The fact that education statistics on education are individual-based makes it simple to link to other individual-based statistics at Statistics Norway. Comprehensive use of the education statistics is made in labour market statistics, statistics on living conditions and income and wage statistics. The education statistics are also used in various sample surveys directed by Statistics Norway. Both levels and fields are reported in accordance with the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED). Any education completed abroad is categorised only into the nine broad fields of education, while education completed in Norway also has the different sub-categories available for differentiation.

In the forthcoming survey on living conditions (to be conducted in 2005/2006 among non-Western immigrant groups) there will be a panel of questions regarding education as well as perceived discrimination. Questions on the parents’ highest level of education and occupation will also be included.

**Employment**

Employment is probably the most important domain in which to measure discrimination, since being outside the labour market usually has a huge impact on people’s lives. It is through work that most people receive income, and through their earnings that they have the possibility to have a place to live and resources to follow through on their life-plans. The workplace is also an important arena in which to network, socialise and to integrate.

Statistics Norway reports regularly on several labour-market statistics. Some relevant examples will be described in this section.

**Register-based Employment Statistics for Immigrants**

In many countries, the employment statistics are based on an annual Labour Force Survey (LFS). This is also the case in Norway. Although the sample size of 24,000 people (12,000 family units) of the LFS is large, it is small if you want to analyse sub-groups or smaller regions. For immigrants the non-response rate is also high. The forthcoming survey in Norway on living conditions among ten non-Western immigrant groups will include questions from LFS; respondents will also be interviewed in their mother tongue, so it is hoped that this will provide acceptable response-rates. Meanwhile statistics collected at the regional level (counties and municipalities) and figures on employees who are immigrants from the Register-based Employment Statistics are recommended.

Labour market data is based on several registers. The most important ones are the Register of Employers and Employees, the Register of End of the Year Certificates (Register of Wage Sums), the Register for Personal Tax Payers, the Register of Unemployed and the Central Co-ordinating Register for Legal Entities (business register).
The Register of Employers and Employees is the main source for data on salaried employees, but the Register of Wage Sums gives additional information. These are both job-registers. The tax register is the main source of data on self-employed people. The Register of Unemployed holds data on unemployed people and people in job-creation schemes. The business register contains information on the various places of work. Several other registers also provide additional information: e.g. the register of conscripts, registers of employees in central and local government, register of sick leave etc.

**Classification**

Labour market variables are based on several different sources. Statistics Norway has established a system to jointly utilise these. The systems comprise modules for consistency management between various data sources, selection of the most important job and classification as individual employed.

Employment statistics for immigrants include all first generation immigrants aged 16–74 years who are registered as currently employed or self-employed and settled in Norway. First-generation immigrants are those who were born abroad of two foreign-born parents. An employee is a person aged 16–74 who performs work for pay or profit in the service of another. To be registered in the Register of Employees the employment must be of at least six days' duration and comprise a minimum of four hours a week (this registration is required).

---

**Employment and Unemployment among Immigrants**

In total 138,357 first generation immigrants were registered as employed (employees and self-employed individuals included) by the end of November 2002. These people constituted 57.5 per cent of this population group aged 16 to 74 years. In the entire population in Norway the employment rate decreased from 70.9 per cent to 70.1 per cent.

Immigrants from the Nordic countries had the highest employment rate of 72.1 per cent, while African immigrants had the lowest rate of 43.7 per cent.

In the whole population males and females had an employment rate of 73.5 and 66.5 per cent respectively. Among first-generation immigrants the corresponding figures were 62.5 and 52.7 per cent respectively. Among the 57.6 per cent employed immigrants in the 4th quarter of 2002, self-employed individuals constituted 3.7 percentage points.

The Nordic and Western European first-generation immigrants had the highest rates of self-employment, slightly above 5 per cent in each group. Among the non-Western immigrants, those from Asia had the highest rate of self-employment, at 3.5 per cent.

Norwegian-born children of foreign-born parents had a total employment rate of 61.1 per cent, which is 3.5 percentage points above the level of the parent generation. Non-Western immigrants are strongly over-represented in hotel and restaurants and in industrial cleaning.

In November 2003 African immigrants had the highest unemployment rate at 17.4 per cent. This high level must be related to a relatively large portion of newcomers in this group. Next to this group we find the Asian immigrants with a rate of 12.7 per cent, and immigrants from Eastern Europe and South- and Central America with about 10 per cent each. 29,299 refugees were registered as employed (both employees and self-employed) in the 4th quarter of 2002. These people constituted 48.2 per cent of the refugee population between 16 and 74 years who have settled since 1986. This rate represented a decline of 1.9 percentage points compared to the 4th quarter of 2001.

Refugees from Chile and Sri Lanka had the highest employment rates of 66.6 and 65.2 per cent respectively (figure 3). Those from Afghanistan and Somalia had the lowest rates, 26.1 and 30.1 per cent respectively. These differences must be seen as a reflection of the differences in the length of residence in Norway.

The industrial classification of employment statistics is in accordance with the revised Standard Industrial Classification (NOS C 182, Issued 1994 Revised 2002), which is based on the EU standard of NACE Rev. 1. The occupational classification employment statistics is in accordance with the Standard Classification of Occupations (NOS C 521), which is based on ISCO 88 (COM).

**Registered unemployment among immigrants**
Statistics Norway publishes annual statistics on registered unemployment among immigrants. The sources for these statistics are the Register of unemployed (under the Directorate of Labour), the Central Population Register, and Statistic Norway's Population statistics.

The unemployment statistic is a total count of registered unemployment among immigrants. However, only first-generation immigrants are included. The reason why descendants or second-generation immigrants are not included in official statistics is because it is a small group (64 000) and 4 out of 7 are still below the age of 16. However, for specific research questions it is possible to include them.

An unemployed person is someone without waged labour who is registered as a job seeker at the job centres which are under the control of the Directorate of Labour. In addition he or she is not currently participating in labour market schemes (job programmes).

**Perceived Discrimination in the Labour Market**
In 1996 Statistics Norway conducted a living condition survey among non-Western immigrant groups. In this survey one out of seven reported that they had been harassed at work due to their immigrant background. Iranians and people from Turkey were most exposed to such experiences.

A more recent survey among people with background from Turkey, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Pakistan resulted in similar findings; one out of seven reported that they had experienced being treated less favourably because of their immigrant background (Rogstad 2004).

In 2005–2006 a living condition survey among non-Western immigrant groups is to be conducted by Statistics Norway. This survey will have a sample of 5000, or 500 from each of the ten largest groups of non-Western immigrants. A special survey with a sample of 1500 immigrants their and descendants who are aged between 16–24 years will be added to the original sample. Most descendants of immigrants in Norway are still very young; approximately 80 per cent are still below 16 years of age.

**Complaints on Perceived Discrimination in the Labour Market**
The Centre for Combating Ethnic Discrimination (SMED) provides free legal aid to people who have experienced ethnic discrimination. The table below shows labour market-related cases handled by this complaint body in the period from 1999–2005. The table shows incidents of discrimination or perceived discrimination, and not prevalence.
The table shows that SMED handled 361 cases on perceived discrimination in the labour market from 1999–2005. One out of three cases (31.6%) were related to hiring, but firing made up around one fourth of the cases. Experiences of discrimination and harassment in the workplace (79 cases) were also an important ground for contacting SMED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related to</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiring</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firing</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>361</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These cases give us information about discrimination in the labour market concerning types of problems, types of situations and which groups are complaining.

### Causes of Differences in the Labour Market

There are a variety of explanations for differences in outcomes between different groups in the labour market (Rogstad 1997, 2000, 2001). Economic cycles, duration of residence, language skills, gender, and lack of education or network can be factors along with discrimination in helping to explain why some enter the labour market and others don’t. In Norway the higher unemployment rates among immigrants have been partly explained by discrimination among the employers (Støren, 2004). Still, participation in the labour market is higher among immigrants with higher education compared to other immigrants (Blom, 1998).

### Income

Several studies have concluded (e.g. Andersen et al. 2003, Statistics Norway 2004) that a marginal attachment to the labour market is the single most important reason for people falling below the low-income threshold. Another reason for the rising number of non-Western immigrants who live on low incomes could be demographic changes. In 1996 there were many recently arrived refugees from Bosnia-Herzegovina in Norway. By 1999 many of these refugees had entered the labour force. The rising proportion of immigrants with low incomes in 2002 could be explained by the recent arrival of many refugees from Iraq and Somalia, who are living mainly on social assistance.
The household is considered to be the best unit of analysis when describing economic living conditions. The household is defined as all individuals living in the same dwelling and sharing meals.

Information about household composition is collected through annual surveys conducted by Statistics Norway by using personal interviews. However, these surveys do not have large enough sample sizes to give representative income figures for immigrants on the basis of their countries of origin. Figures are only given for immigrants from different continents, which often obscure significant variations according to country of origin.

Income differences among immigrants and refugees

- Non-Western immigrants are highly over-represented in the low-income group.
- A weak attachment to the labour force is the main reason for low incomes.
- Non-Western immigrants are also highly over-represented in receiving dwelling support and social assistance, but there are considerable variations according to country of origin.
- Immigrants from Somalia and Iraq are most dependent on social assistance and have the lowest level of income.
- Families from Bosnia-Herzegovina, Chile, India and Sri Lanka have relatively high incomes from work and most of them are economically self-sufficient.
- Non-Western single parents have low incomes from work and are especially dependent on income transfers.


The household is considered to be the best unit of analysis when describing economic living conditions. The household is defined as all individuals living in the same dwelling and sharing meals.

Information about household composition is collected through annual surveys conducted by Statistics Norway by using personal interviews. However, these surveys do not have large enough sample sizes to give representative income figures for immigrants on the basis of their countries of origin. Figures are only given for immigrants from different continents, which often obscure significant variations between single countries.

However, income figures for immigrants from different countries of origin can be obtained at the family level, by using information from the Central Population Register. It is important to bear in mind that the family unit and the household unit may differ from one group of immigrants to the next. This is especially the case among many non-Western immigrants, where it is more common that many families are part of the same household.

Identifying Indicators of Low-income Status from Survey Data

Statistics Norway conducts an annual Income and Property Survey for Households. These are sample surveys conducted annually, with a sample size ranging from roughly 10 000 households to 28 000 households. Based on this survey a number of different income indicators are established. The indicators are given for several different groups in the population, among them non-Western immigrants and refugees. The aim of the indicators is to provide information about changes over time.

One part of the survey consists of a panel survey, i.e. a survey where the same individuals are followed over several years, making it possible to give figures for persistent low income status among some groups of the population. The indicators are updated every year.

Income Statistics for Persons and Families Using Registers

Income statistics for individuals and families are based on information drawn from various administrative registers. Income data are received by linking different administrative registers and statistical data sources for the whole population as of 31 December of the fiscal year. Income and biographical data are collected from the following sources:
One out of three non-Western immigrants belong to the low-income group

Non-Western immigrants are highly over-represented in the low-income group (see table below). In 2002 every third immigrant from a non-Western country of origin belonged to the low-income group, when using the EU-standard method for measuring poverty. For refugees alone the portion was even higher, at 36 percent (2002), compared to 11 per cent for the population in general. This means that the probability of a non-Western immigrant having low-income is three times higher than for a person in the general population. The low-income threshold is lower when using the OECD-standard method for measuring poverty. The probability for non-Western immigrants belonging to the low-income group is five times higher than for the population in general when this method is used.

Table 2.3. Percentage of people in households with annual after-tax income per consumption unit below various distances from the median income


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OECD method</th>
<th></th>
<th>EU method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All immigrants*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants from non-Western countries*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All people</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People aged 25–65 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) People in households where the main income earner has this characteristic.

Source: Income and property statistics for households, Statistics Norway

- Data from tax returns (wages and salaries, self-employed income, pensions etc.)
- Tax Register (taxes, net income etc.)
- End of the Year Certificate Register (unemployment benefit, various tax-free transfers)
- National Insurance Administration (family allowances, basic and additional amounts, cash benefit etc.)
- Ministry of Social Affairs (social assistance)
- State Student Loan Fund (loans to students, scholarships)
- State Housing Bank (dwelling support)
- Education statistics from Statistics Norway (highest completed level of education etc.)
- Family-related statistics from Statistics Norway (family type etc.)

The above statistics cover most of the types of cash income received by Norwegian families. From this data source Statistics Norway is able to distinguish different sub-groups of the population, for instance immigrants grouped by their country of origin.

http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/05/01/inntpf_en

13) http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/05/01/inntpf_en
Summary and Recommendations on Data Collection and Measurements in Norway

The aim of this chapter has been to describe different data sources that could be useful in trying to measure both the nature and the extent of discrimination. The EU-directive on equal treatment (2000/43/EC) includes a definition of discrimination, inspired by the UN CERD definition, which draws attention to disparate outcomes. The concept of indirect discrimination is intrinsically linked to statistics by its logic and objectives. The definition is based on the quantitative concepts of significant effects and comparisons between groups. The group concept is highlighted and treatment is no longer personalised but rather collective and only related to individuals in the terms of their affiliation to a protected group (Medis 2004).

At the beginning of this national chapter we briefly introduced the Norwegian System for Population Registration. This system allows Statistics Norway to link different administrative registers and follow different groups of people at the individual level through the educational system and into the labour market. Previous analyses of immigrant populations in Norway show huge differences in living conditions between different immigrant groups, and between immigrants and those without immigrant background (Østby 2004b, Tronstad 2004). It is however important to keep in mind that the huge differences between immigrant groups can be explained by differences in duration of residence, country of origin and own and parents’ educational background etc. Any analyses on the immigrant population must take into account the diversity of this population.

To date there has not been any comprehensive study of perceived discrimination in Norway. A survey on living conditions conducted among non-Western immigrants in Norway included some questions regarding harassment at work, denial of goods and services (housing) and hate-crimes (Blom 1998). The forthcoming survey on living conditions survey (to be published in 2006) among non-Western immigrants will, amongst other questions, include some questions on perceived discrimination. These questions are based on the questionnaire developed in Sweden (Lange 1997) and used in several European countries. The same survey also includes questions from the surveys on living conditions which are conducted on a regular basis and could be used to measure differences in outcome. 5000 respondents from ten different immigrant groups will be sampled and interviewed in their preferred language (Norwegian or mother tongue). With the consent of the interviewed, it may be possible to link answers in this survey with several administrative registers. We believe that the combination of survey data and register data could provide be a strong tool for measuring disparate outcomes.

A third source of data described briefly in this chapter is the complaints and cases handled by SMED. In its role as a complaints body, SMED acts on behalf of a victim. These cases represent incidents of perceived discrimination. From this data source, it is not possible to conclude anything about the prevalence of perceived discrimination. But after having handled an impressive 1550 cases over seven years, these cases tell stories about the nature of discrimination.
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Introduction

Purpose of this Report

The available sources for the measurement of discrimination on the grounds of ethnicity in Denmark encompass information gathered by both public and private institutions, among which Statistics Denmark (Danmarks Statistik) provides basic and detailed register data on every person living legally in Denmark.

The main sources of information may be characterised as 1) register data; 2) survey data and analyses; and 3) case law from the Danish courts and decisions or reviews from administrative committees established by legislation within the framework of public authorities or independent institutions.

In this chapter the terminology used is slightly different from the rest of the report. Here ‘surveys’ is used to refer to research in a wider sense, and not limited only to sample surveys as a methodology. This poses a limitation for the possibility for analysing linking and mapping within and across countries, while still allowing us to achieve other goals.

Register data on outcomes is collected by Statistics Denmark in a variety of areas, including education, employment, housing, social benefits and services, income and taxation and immigration and emigration. Register data is collected on the basis of a personal identity number given to every citizen at the time of birth or at the time of receiving a residence permit.

Analyses of register data and survey data collected as part of both larger and minor surveys on specific issues related to immigration and integration are provided by a number of institutions and ministries. Analyses of register data are carried out by Statistics Denmark, including analyses on differences in outcomes among groups in the Danish society, such as differences between the majority population and minority groups. Other institutions, such as the sector research institution under the Ministry of Social Affairs, the Danish National Institute of Social Research (Sosialforskningsinstituttet), conduct various surveys and independent evaluations and reports on employment, integration and labour market conditions, economic and family-related issues, and other national and international social conditions and development trends of significance for the living conditions of the population.

Moreover, surveys based on register data are conducted by researchers at universities, research institution or networks, and by private survey bureaus. These institutions are also involved collecting data in specific areas, such as integration and discrimination. Among the latter, Catinet Research conducts regular omnibus surveys on integration issues in which the question of perceived discrimination among ethnic minority groups is addressed explicitly. CASA, the Center for Analysis, is an independent institution which provides surveys in the area of social service and the labour market. The Rockwool Foundation Research Unit also publishes specific surveys on immigrant issues. However, to date only one major survey with the specific aim of highlighting and documenting experiences of perceived discrimination in a number of areas has been conducted in Denmark, by the now-disbanded Board on Ethnic Equality.

Data on complaints handled within the court system and administrative bodies with a monitoring function are not registered in a central public database. Judgments and judicial rulings are accessible via the website of the publishing house Thomson (a publisher of case law) in the Weekly Law Reports (Ugeskrift for Rettsvæsen). Likewise, complaints from administrative bodies, including the Complaints Committee for Ethnic Equal
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Treatment' established by the Danish Institute for Human Rights', may be found on the internet and in annual reports. A pilot project aiming to register all complaints of discrimination received by legal aid institutions was initiated in August 2005 by the Danish Institute for Human Rights. In the long run this data collection will help to increase our understanding of perceived discrimination among ethnic minorities in Denmark.

Together the three main categories of data sources represent new means of measuring ethnic discrimination and may allow for a more detailed picture of causes and impact of discrimination. Measuring discrimination by linking or mapping registers, through surveys, and by extrapolating from complaints data may improve our knowledge and understanding of ethnic discrimination in Danish society.

The purpose of this report is, however, limited to providing information on the availability and accessibility of sources of data on differences in outcomes and perceived ethnic discrimination in Danish society in the following areas: i) education, ii) labour market placement and participation, and iii) income. In consequence, the present report describes relevant data contained in public and other databases as well as that comprised by and presented in surveys which have been conducted. Similarly, the methodologies applied in surveys and analyses are described, but assessed and discussed only if other researchers have created a basis for criticism.

Register Data on the Population of Denmark

Statistics Denmark was founded in 1850 and is an independent and autonomous institution which produces statistics on Denmark. Statistics Denmark is the central statistical authority in Denmark. Statistical information on demographic issues in Denmark is almost exclusively based on information that is recorded in the Government’s Central Population Register. This register contains no information on ethnic identity, religion or language, with certain exceptions such as in relation to citizens of foreign countries, persons born outside of Denmark and information on whether a person is a member of the Danish National Church.

Most of the data for statistics of the population in Denmark comes from administrative registers within governmental agencies rather than census data.

All inhabitants in Denmark are registered in the Central Population Register (CPR) with a unique 10-digit personal number. Information on place and date of birth, sex, emigration and immigration status, addresses, civil status, as well as names and personal numbers of parents, spouses and children are all found in the register.

The personal number is a key linking data from other population registers, on e.g. highest completed education, labour market attachment, income, use of day care, receipt of social benefits etc.

The registers contain information on many aspects of Danish society, including the composition and educational level of the population, dynamic statistics about fluctuations in the population, including statistics on births, deaths, relocations, marriages and divorces, as well as immigration and emigration. Statistics Denmark develops statistical descriptions of the labour force through register-based labour statistics and interviews in the Labour Force Survey. Statistics on the labour market include statistics on earnings, monthly unemployment statistics, and statistics on labour-market policy measures. Statistics Denmark also produces annual cohesive social statistics, describing recipients of all public transfer payments. The webpage of Statistics Denmark,
StatBank Denmark provides detailed statistical information on Danish society. The Act on Statistics Denmark outlines the framework for the institution. The institution is governed by an independent Board, which lays down the plan of work within the budgetary framework set out in the Finance Act. The activities of Statistics Denmark are governed by the Act on Statistics Denmark Consolidated act No. 599 of June 22, 2000 cf. Consolidated act No. 1189 of December 21, 1992. Other national legislation governing the operations of Statistics Denmark includes the general provisions of the Danish Public Administration Act and the Danish Penal Code, as well as the Act on Processing of Personal Data. As far as supra-national regulation is concerned, as a member of the European Union, Denmark is bound by approximately 200 legislative acts, whose purpose is to ensure the development of uniform statistics amongst the member nations.

Other international regulation includes the United Nations fundamental principles concerning official statistics.

**Definition of Risk Populations**

Register data on immigrants and descendants are contained in a database, IEPERS, which holds information on individuals’ ethnic background, including ancestry (Person of Danish Origin, Immigrant and Descendant), country of origin, citizenship, year of immigration, duration of stay in Denmark and (beginning in 1997) type of residence permit. The information in this register is sourced from the Central Personal Register. No information on ethnicity, religion, race or sexual orientation is provided, nor is there any self-identification information.

Information such as sex, age, marital status, municipality and county of residence, type of household, number of children in the household etc can be found in other registers.

Target populations are defined on the basis of information about their own and their parents’ country of birth and nationality, and concern immigrants and their descendants. An immigrant is defined as a person born abroad whose parents are both foreign citizens (or one of them if there is no available information on the other parent) or were born abroad. If there is no available information on either of the parents and the individual was born abroad, then that individual is also defined as an immigrant. A descendant is defined as a person born in Denmark whose parents (or one of them if there is no available information on the other parent) are either immigrants or descendants with foreign citizenship.

Immigrants entering Denmark as refugees are registered in the CPR when they obtain their residence permits. Information on the type of residence permit is recorded in the registers, but is only available for immigrants who have obtained residence permits since 1997. These records reveal the immigrants’ country of origin together with their year of arrival.

It is not possible to provide for information reflecting the ethnic composition of the population based on self-identification. Other determinants for defining minority or risk groups, such as religion, political or sexual orientation, ethnicity and language skills are also not available via administrative register data.

Large differences in outcomes exist between target populations defined by country of origin, as well as between immigrants from the same country of origin. It is therefore important to include characteristics such as gender, age, type of residence permit, time of residency and age of immigration, when measuring such differences. This is possible via the above mentioned population registers.

---

4) StatBank Denmark may be found at www.statbank.dk
Immigrant Population

The composition of the immigrant population in Denmark has changed over time. (See figure 3.1.)

The five non-western countries of origin with the most immigrants and descendants in Denmark are: Turkey (54,854), former Yugoslavia (44,843), Iraq (26,351), Lebanon (22,232) and Pakistan (19,301). (See figure 3.2.)

Figure 3.1. Number of Immigrants in Denmark, 1980 to 2005

Comments on figure 3.1: On 1 January 2005 the number of immigrants in Denmark was 343,367, or 6.4 percent of the Danish population. In 1980 immigrants from non-Western countries accounted for one third of the immigrant population, but by 2005 they accounted for two thirds. In all, the immigrant population has increased by two and a half times during this period.

Figure 3.2. 20 Largest Groups of Immigrants and Descendants in Denmark, by Country of Origin, 2005

Comments on figure 3.2: The 20 countries of origin with the most immigrants and descendants in Denmark make up 75 percent of the total amount of immigrants and descendants in Denmark. Immigrants and descendants from Turkey are by far the largest group, and account for 12.1 percent of immigrants and their descendants. The five largest groups of immigrants and their descendants from non-Western countries are from Turkey, Iraq, Lebanon, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Pakistan.
National Minorities and Indigenous Peoples

Apart from information on foreign citizens and persons born outside Denmark, the registers do not include information about ethnic groups, their religion or language which could be used to conduct statistical analyses on ethnic minorities in Denmark. As a consequence, it is not possible to identify and collect data on national minorities and indigenous peoples. To develop further the picture given in figure 3.2 above, a number of minority groups will be mentioned in the following discussion, irrespective whether or not they are recognized as national minorities or indigenous peoples. These groups do, however, resemble minority groups that are recognised in other Scandinavian countries as national minorities.

• The German Minority

Denmark ratified the Council of Europe’s Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities in 1997. In connection with the ratification, Denmark declared that the Framework Convention will apply to the German minority in South Jutland. Therefore the only officially recognized national minority in Denmark is the German minority in South Jutland. The Danish CPR system does not include information on the basis of which national minorities may be identified. Thus, it is not possible to create an overview of attachment to the labour market of the German minority in Denmark or of educational levels or other forms of outcome for this group of people. Affiliation to the German minority is based on free individual choice. No official data on the size of the German minority in South Jutland is available, but members of the German minority have stated that it comprises about 15–20,000 people.

• Greenlandic and Faroese Minorities

As Greenland and the Faeroe Islands are part of the territory of the Danish Kingdom, individuals from these countries move to Denmark for the purposes of education or employment. In 1996 Denmark ratified ILO Convention No. 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries. This Convention applies to the indigenous population in Greenland; however, they do not enjoy the status and protection of national minorities or indigenous peoples while residing in (mainland) Denmark.

The only way to obtain a picture of their attachment to and participation in Danish society is by using information in the registers on country of birth and parental country of birth as a proxy. The estimated number of individuals of Greenlandic origin in Denmark is around 10,000.

• The Roma Minority

Persons with a Roma background living in Denmark reflect three waves of migration. The first group entered Denmark hundreds of years ago and is, today, seen as fully integrated in the Danish society. The second group entered the country during the 1960s, and the latest group came to Denmark from the Balkans in the 1990s. None of these groups have achieved status as national minorities.

There is no official data on the size of the Roma population, but the Ministry of Education has stated that the number of Romany people in Denmark is probably higher than 1,500. Persons belonging to the Roma population cannot be tracked by register data. Background information on country of origin is of little value due to the geographical variety in country of origin.

• The Jewish Minority

Today, approximately 7,000 Jews live in Denmark. Denmark was the first Scand-
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6) As a point of departure c.f. the survey *Oplevet Diskrimination, en undersøgelse blandt etniske minoriteter* pages 24-36: 75 percent of the Bosnians perceive themselves as Muslims. Almost all of the Somalis, Lebanese and Turks perceive themselves as Muslims.

7) Tøgby, Line; Møller, Birgit: *Oplevet Diskrimination, en undersøgelse blandt etniske minoriteter*; Nævnet for Etnisk Ligestilling 1999.

8) Western countries are considered to include: EU countries, Iceland, Norway, Switzerland, North America, Australia and New Zealand.

inavian country that permitted Jews to settle when they arrived in the 17th century. About one-third of the minority are Polish Jews or their descendants who fled Poland after anti-Semitic campaigns there in 1968.

The register data compiled by Statistics Denmark does not contain information on affiliation with the Jewish community.

Religious Minorities

Danish ecclesiastical legislation primarily covers the Danish National Evangelical Lutheran Church. According to section 4 of the Danish Constitution, the Evangelical Lutheran church is the Danish national church and as such it is subsidised by the state. Other religious communities do not receive any financial support from the state. On the other hand, in contrast to members of the Danish National Evangelical Lutheran Church, members of other religious communities are allowed to deduct contributions to their respective religious communities on their income tax returns.

Surveys on Discrimination

Surveys with the sole purpose of identifying and analysing direct and/or indirect discrimination are rarely seen in the Danish context. More often information on discrimination is found as an integrated aspect of surveys whose goal is to uncover explanations for disparities between non-Western ethnic minorities and ethnic Danes in the fields of e.g. education and employment, or in surveys with a broader perspective on immigration and integration.

However, a survey with the specific purpose of addressing perceived or subjective discrimination was initiated and implemented in 1999 by the Board on Ethnic Equality, on the basis of the recommendations of 6 March 1998 made by the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI). Statistics Denmark carried out the interviews by telephone using bi-lingual interviewers, so the interviewee could choose the language in which he or she would answer the questions. Only 19 percent of the interviews were conducted in Danish. The survey was based on 1,132 interviews of randomly selected persons from non-Western ethnic minority backgrounds, which included persons of Turkish, Lebanese/Palestinian, and Somali origin as well as persons from Bosnia who had arrived in Denmark after 1991. The interviewed persons were between 18 and 66 years old and held a permanent residence permit obtained before 1 January 1996 (i.e. meaning that the person in question had lived in Denmark for at least 3 years). Especially for Somalis and Bosnians, this was a relatively short period of time. Therefore it was also necessary to translate the questionnaire into the four relevant languages. Both citizens and non-citizens were included and answers by proxy were not accepted. Palestinians were a special case, since this group was particular difficult to identify in CPR-registers. The solution was to include persons registered as Lebanese as well as stateless persons, while excluding stateless persons not born in the Middle East.

Initially 2,400 persons were randomly selected, 600 from each country of origin (Turkey, Lebanon/Palestine, Somalia and former Yugoslavia/Bosnia). For some of the groups in question, 600 persons constituted a relatively large percentage of the total number of individuals in the ethnic group in Denmark, which could be criticised in relation to the requirement of total independency among the respondents. It proved difficult to reach the initial sample of 2400 persons. Telephone numbers were
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particularly difficult to obtain; however, only between 7 and 13 percent refused to participate in the telephone interviews. The response rate for telephone interviews was significantly better (Bosnians: 63 percent, Somalis: 63 percent, Lebanese/Palestinians: 67 percent, Turks 69 percent), than the response rate for questionnaires send by mail (Bosnians: 33 percent, Somalis: 13 percent, Lebanese/Palestinians: 16 percent, Turks 19 percent).

On average 47 percent of respondents of Lebanese/Palestinian origin responded, 58 percent of respondents of Bosnian origin responded, 40 percent of respondents of Somali origin responded and 48 percent of respondents of Turkish origin responded. The most significant factor influencing the response rate seemed to be the area of residence, where individuals living in big cities appeared to be less responsive, while age, education, gender and marital status played a less significant role.

Surveys containing large enough samples of the target populations can be relevant for the study of discrimination. The private survey bureau Catinet Research has been conducting its surveys on integration every six months since 1999. These omnibus surveys are based on immigrants’ and refugees’ own perceptions and experiences. The survey is based on approximately 1,000 telephone interviews and approximately 50 questions which are repeated in each survey, in addition to supplementary questions relating to events which have been debated intensely in the media. The survey focuses on seven groups, namely persons originating from Pakistan, Turkey, Somalia, former-Yugoslavia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Palestine and stateless persons.

**Sample Questions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you within the last year, because you belong to an ethnic minority, been exposed to: Harassment at your workplace?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you within the last year, because you belong to an ethnic minority, experienced animosity or hostility from: Housing association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have never been in contact with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other areas with the same categories of answers:

- Employment service
- Trade union
- School or educational institution
- The municipality

Other Questions:

- What is your primary occupation at the moment?
- What level of education have you achieved in Denmark?
- Do you think your work corresponds to your education and qualifications?

**Answers:**

- More than once
- A single time
- Never
- Not relevant
- No information
- Often
- Sometimes
- Never
- Have never been in contact with
- No information
The respondents can choose between answering in their mother tongue and Danish when they are interviewed. The majority choose their mother tongue.

The survey contains both immigrants who have obtained Danish citizenship and those with foreign citizenship, the rationale being that such procedure allows for a more holistic approach to the process of integration as it includes persons who have stayed in Denmark for both longer and shorter periods.

The persons are randomly chosen from amongst approximately 300 names from each nationality in the central telephone register. The 300 names are deduced from approximately 25,000 names identified in the telephone register by researchers as not being ‘typically’ Danish names, and subsequently verified by phone calls. An adequate demographic representation of each sub-group has been achieved by selection through a particular software program.9

The interviewed persons have been asked to state their country of origin, and they are then categorised as belonging to a particular ethnic minority group based on their own statement.

In the latest omnibus survey10 (first six months of 2005), two questions concerning perceived discrimination in connection with education, employment and spare time were included:

Do you experience more or less discrimination than you think an ethnic Dane experiences?
1. I experience much more discrimination.
2. I experience more discrimination.
3. I experience neither less nor more discrimination.
4. I experience less discrimination.
5. I experience a lot less discrimination.
6. I don’t know.

Where did you yourself experience discrimination?
1. Among colleagues at work.
2. From the management.
3. From customers.
4. In the workplace (unspecified).
5. Amongst fellow students.
6. From teachers.
7. From the management at school.
8. At the school/place of education.
9. In job training.
10. In the process of applying for housing.
11. In public offices.
13. While shopping.
15. In the media.
16. By politicians.
17. Among Danish friends.
18. In restaurants and pubs.
19. In discos and nightclubs.
20. In sports clubs.
22. Other.
23. Don’t know.

Since the integration of immigrants and other issues regarding ethnic minorities have been the subject of intense political and public debate in recent years, there is a substantial amount of recent research material, surveys and statistics on integration issues available. These surveys have been conducted by the central administration i.e. the Ministry of Refugees, Immigration and Integration Affairs, as well as independent researchers and institutions. The surveys typically concentrate on factors influencing the performance of (non-Western) immigrants compared to ethnic Danes as regards education, employment and social welfare.

Research based on surveys often shows ethnic minority population as a marginalised group in the labour market and with a lower general level of income.

9) A description of the software program is not published or specified in the survey, which could be explained as part of a business secrecy strategy.
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Surveys also reveal that a relatively large part of the ethnic minority population has experienced discrimination in the labour market or elsewhere, at least when measured subjectively.11

Response Issues
In discussions about statistical methodology, questions on non-response or low response rates and their implications on validity and representation, as well as their explanations are often raised. The report on the aforementioned survey on perceived discrimination12 contained explanations and recommendations on these issues.

The survey was based on telephone interviews conducted by bilingual staff, supplemented by questionnaires, due to problems in collecting the telephone numbers of the selected persons. 979 persons were interviewed by telephone and 153 questionnaires were collected. Although only a few refused to participate, there were major difficulties in obtaining telephone numbers and establishing contact, and problems with language and translation. Furthermore, the chosen categorisation proved to be an issue, since e.g. some people with Turkish background considered themselves Kurdish. The report suggested that face-to-face interviews were the most rewarding, but also very costly and time-consuming. Telephone interviews were seen as better than questionnaires sent by mail, since the latter increase the non-response rate for marginalised groups.

Complaints Data
The Complaints Committee on Ethnic Equal Treatment was established in accordance with the mandate given to the Danish Institute for Human Rights under the Act on Ethnic Equal Treatment of 28 May 2003 to handle individual complaints in the area of ethnic discrimination.13 Only a limited number of cases exist. From May to December 2003, 15 complaints were received; in the period January 2004 to December 2004, 69 cases were received; while within the period January 2005 to November 2005, 77 complaints were received. Thus, the number of complaints received since the establishment by the Danish Institute for Human Rights of the Complaints Committee on Ethnic Equal Treatment is 161 in total.

46 cases are still pending (29 percent). 45 cases (28 percent) have been rejected as ill-founded or have been found to fall outside the mandate. In 40 cases (25 percent) the plaintiffs withdrew the complaints or did not respond to requests to provide more information.

No violation of the act was found in 20 cases (12 percent). In three cases (2 percent) a violation was found. The number of cases where a violation was found also includes a case where a general recommendation was issued.

So, from mid-2003 to mid-November 2005, the Complaints Committee has reviewed 125 cases, including 19 cases reviewed ex officio. Discrimination has only been found in 3 cases, and 9 cases have led to general recommendations as to compliance with the Act on Ethnic Equal Treatment. In 1 case free legal aid has been recommended by the Committee and has been granted.

The Committee has initiated a pilot project in order to have legal aid institutions throughout the country register data on received cases in which the complainant perceives that discrimination has occurred. Two legal aid institutions in Copenhagen are participating in this pilot project.

In addition to the national complaints office there are local complaints

11) Misllykket integration, Rockwool Fonds Forskningsenhed 2000; Gunnar Viby Mogensen og Poul Chr. Matthiessen.
12) Non-response in total by Bosnians: 42 percent; by Somalis: 60 percent; by Lebanese/Palestinians: 53 percent and by Turks: 52 percent.
13) Established by the Danish Institute for Human Rights as part of its mandate as the specialised body in Denmark in accordance with Article 13 of the EU Racial Equality Directive.
committees. The Citizens Advice Service is employed by the Copenhagen City Council to make it easier for citizens, users, traders and businessmen in the City of Copenhagen to lodge complaints. The Citizens Advice Service can, amongst other things, assist a person if he or she feels he/she has been unfairly discriminated against by the City. This applies, for example, if he or she has been unfairly treated in relation to others in similar situations, or if the individual in question has been unfairly treated on account of race, skin colour, religion, political persuasion, nationality, social status or ethnic origin. In such cases, the Citizens Advice Service is able to provide mediation between the complainant and the City's employees. However, no data is available yet on perceived discrimination, since the institution was only established in 2004.

In 1992, the Director of Public Prosecutions initiated a reporting obligation to obtain an overview of systematic or organised criminal behaviour based on racial or religious animosity. The police districts are obligated to report on crimes that are perceived as racially or religiously motivated. Up through September 2005 the Danish Security Intelligence Service had registered 51 incidents of racially motivated violence, compared to 37 in 2004. According to the annual statistics compiled by the National Police 2004, 27 incidents of hate speech (prohibited under Danish Criminal Code s. 266b) were reported to the police, and from these 15 charges were issued. From January 1 to September 30 2005, 40 incidents of racial epithets were reported and 15 charges were issued.

Education
Education or lack of education seems to be one of the major barriers to labour market attachment. If we want to measure the outcomes for risk groups in terms labour market attachment and income levels, it would help to link such data to data on education. Data on the risk groups’ accomplishments and grades in the educational system could also serve as a useful indicator for measuring differences in outcomes.

Information on Education
Register data on pupils’ accomplishments in 9th and 10th grade are available for students who completed these grades in 2001 and onwards. The data includes marks on final exams as well as marks for the whole year’s work. For the traditional general upper secondary schools, individual data is available on the completed average mark for the years since 1980. For the vocational-oriented general upper secondary schools data on the individual level is only available on the completed average mark for the years since 2001. There is no data available at the individual level for achievements in higher education.

Information on education within the target population is made available by the Ministry of Refugees, Immigrants and Integration in the so-called “Database on Immigrants”. Information in the database builds on register data from Statistics Denmark. (See figure 3.3.)

Classification of Educational Level
Data on the highest level of education completed are found in the Register on Education and Employment (BUE), classified by CPR-number. For the highest level of education completed, there is a specific education classification (4-digit), followed by an 8-digit classification code, which classifies the various types of education by level (2 digits), area (4 digits), groups of education (6 digits) and specific educations (8 digits). The 4-digit education classification is compatible with the
ISCED classification. The levels of the 8-digit classification are also comparable with the levels of ISCED (although there are 9 levels in the Danish system and only 6 in ISCED).

Dates of beginning and completing education as well as the names of institutions and schools are also found in BUE. This information can be used to analyse the risk groups’ paths through the educational system, e.g., do they take longer to complete their educations, do they have higher drop-out rates, what is the time span from completing an education to obtaining a job, etc.

Country of Education
Since 1999 data on immigrants’ educational attainments at the time of their arrival in Denmark have been collected via surveys. In 1999 all immigrants who were 18–59 years of age, were 16 or more years of age at arrival and who had not completed a Danish education (tertiary or vocational training and education), were included in a survey on immigrants educational attainments. The response rate was 50 percent. Educational data for the other half of the selected group were imputed. The survey has been followed-up annually, by sending the questionnaires to the new cohorts of immigrants. The process is somewhat delayed, as information on persons who immigrated in 2003, was not completed until mid-2005. The response rate is between 41–43 percent. The data from the annual follow-up surveys are not imputed. All data are
included in BUE. If the immigrant completes a Danish education, the Danish education will overrule the education completed abroad in the register. It is possible to separate the highest level of completed education from education completed in Denmark and that completed abroad. The original data on an immigrant’s educational attainments from abroad is also available in BUE.

When comparing educational background and labour market attachment, it is important to separate information on education completed in Denmark and education completed abroad, as a Danish education evidently gives better access to the labour market than an education completed abroad.

Based on these register data it is possible to perform detailed analyses of education level, performance and transitions from one level of education to the next.14

**Education from Abroad**

- 61 percent of immigrants from Western countries with a particular education have completed their education abroad.
- 76 percent of the immigrants from non-Western countries with a particular education have completed their education abroad.

**Educational Performance**

**Drop-out Rates**

A recent analysis has revealed a higher drop-out rate of ethnic minorities than of native Danish children for both the general and vocational upper secondary levels.

Analyses have been conducted on educational progression to determine whether ethnic minorities and native Danes behave differently at different stages in the educational system.15 The analyses show that about nine out of ten native Danish children start an upper secondary education upon completion of grade school, while this is the case for only two-thirds of the immigrant children who arrived in Denmark between the age of 6–12. The drop-out rate of ethnic minorities is twice that of native Danish children from both branches of upper secondary education. The main problem for ethnic minorities in the educational system seems to be the very high drop-out rate from vocational upper secondary educations. The analyses also show that children from different countries of origin behave very differently, as do men and women.

**Barriers**

Survey research can be used to identify barriers. Some research shows that male immigrants in particular meet barriers in the educational system. Some barriers come from within ethnic minority cultures, such as different attitudes towards education, methods of upbringing, various perceptions of the roles and responsibilities of men and women, early marriage and pregnancy/children. Other barriers stem from the educational system and Danish society per se.16

**Skills**

As far as basic reading skills are concerned, in 2003 the international PISA test shows that Denmark ranks among Norway, USA, Iceland and Germany as 16th out of 30 countries. Surprisingly Denmark stands out as a country where immigrants born abroad perform better in basic reading tests than descendants of immigrants born in Denmark. The tests show that every other bilingual pupil lacks adequate reading skills after completing primary and lower secondary school (7–16 years).
Access to Traineeships
Specific surveys have been conducted concerning access to traineeships for immigrants and descendants. Trainee positions in the labour market are integrated into the curriculum for educational programmes for the vocational upper secondary level. The main focus of the said surveys was to highlight the representation of immigrants and descendants among applicants and contractors in order to establish whether an increase in the number of immigrants and descendants being able to obtain a traineeship position had been achieved within the period of 1993-1998. The point of departure for the survey is the statistical overrepresentation of ethnic minorities applying for, but not obtaining a traineeship. The survey covers not only immigrants and their descendants from third countries, but also from within the European Union.¹⁷

Labour Market Participation and Placement
Information on participation
Data at the individual level on labour market attachment, level of qualification and placement and subdivisions of persons outside of the labour market and branch of industry are all found in the same register on statistics on the labour force (RAS).

Classifications
The classifications in the RAS register are based on the recommendations from ILO concerning labour force statistics. The register is based on the labour force attachment of the population at the end of November each year. An individual’s occupational status is created from a combination of different registers, such as the work place register, the unemployment register and the register on salaries from the taxation authorities, amongst others. The reference period is the last week of November. The gross population of employees includes all those who are employed in the last week of November, according to the work place register, and who have earned the equivalent of 80 hours of minimum wages, and are not registered in the unemployment register.

In the stratification below, seven groups fall outside the labour force, including retired persons, persons receiving social welfare benefits and children (this subcategory can be broken into 24 groups in all). “Others outside the labour force”, as indicated in level 16, refers to people who are not included in any register:

1. Self-employed
2. Assisting spouses
3. Senior managers
4. Employees – upper level
5. Employees – medium level
6. Employees – basic level
7. Other employees
8. Employees, not specified
9. Unemployed
10. Temporarily outside the labour force
11. Retired from the labour force
12. Pensioners
13. Recipients of social assistance
14. Children
15. Persons in education
16. Others outside the labour force

The occupational status categorisation is a hierarchical stratification. As a consequence, each person is placed in the category representing the highest level of occupation achieved, considering which activity counts the most after specific weights for each activity.

It is possible to obtain information about a combined status at the group level, which would enable us to conduct studies on groups receiving different kinds of social benefits and/or their engagement in different types of labour market policy activities by linking the RAS with the Register on Social Benefits or the Statistical Register for Labour Market Policy Measures.

**Linking Education to Labour Market Participation**

On the basis of register data from Statistics Denmark on education and vocational training on the individual level and information on activity in the labour, it is possible to create a picture of the activity rate in the labour among persons belonging to the risk population. (See figure 3.5.)

Research shows that the chances of employment increase significantly if immigrants have completed their education in Denmark rather than abroad and have good language skills in Danish. The employment frequency for non-Western immigrants with a Danish higher education is 84 percent, while it is only 53 percent for immigrants with a comparable foreign education.

Moreover, a recent research project confirms the tendency of highly educated immigrants to establish themselves in typical immigrant small business sectors, where there is no specific use for their educational background. The report also shows that there is very little economic

![Figure 3.5. Activity Rate for Residents, 16–66 Years Old, 2003](image)


**Comments on figure 3.5:** Immigrants from non-Western countries have markedly higher activity rates if they complete a Danish education than if their educational attainments are from abroad. The higher the educational level the larger the difference between immigrants with Danish and foreign educational attainments. Immigrants from non-Western countries with Danish vocational training and education and higher education almost have the same activity level as persons of Danish origin with the same educational level.
18) Indvandreres tætte netværk: Kasalysator eller hæmsko for innovation og vækst? Shahamak Rezaei; Marco Goli 2005


motivation, compared to the amount received on transfer income, if one only looks at the registered income of the small businesses.18 A Danish-German comparative migration survey makes it possible to study the impact of an immigrant’s level of education on arrival in Denmark on subsequent labour market participation.19

Activity and Employment Rates
Register data on participation in the Danish labour market can be used to show labour market attachment rates for the population between the ages of 16 and 66 years. (See table 3.1.)

Register data indicate that immigrants from non-Western countries who have completed Danish vocational training and/or education are employed at lower levels of qualification than persons of Danish origin with similar educational background.

69 percent of immigrants with Danish vocational training and education are employed at the basic level of qualification. This is true of only 57 percent of individuals of Danish origin with a similar level of education. More immigrants with educational attainments from abroad are self-employed and/or assisting spouses than are immigrants and persons of Danish origin who have Danish vocational training and/or education.

Table 3.1. Activity and Employment rates for Persons of Danish Origin and Immigrants in Denmark, 16–66 Years Old, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity rates</th>
<th>Employment rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men  Women Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons of Danish origin</td>
<td>82 75 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants from:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western countries</td>
<td>69 60 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Western countries</td>
<td>59 44 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>71 50 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>61 49 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>36 15 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>46 21 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>66 51 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>60 44 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>68 34 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>31 14 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>72 59 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>76 58 67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Comments on table 3.1: Male immigrants from non-Western countries have an activity rate of 59 percent, whereas the rate for female immigrants is 44 percent. In comparison, the activity rates for men and women of Danish origin the activity rates are 82 and 75 percent, respectively. Activity rates for immigrants from Western countries are placed between these two groups, with 69 percent for men and 60 percent for women. Among Pakistanis and Somalis the activity rates for the men are twice as high as for the women. Immigrants from Somalia have a very low activity rate, 31 percent for men and 14 percent for women. Over all, immigrants from Sri Lanka and Vietnam have higher activity rates than immigrants from Western countries.
Employed immigrants from non-Western countries who have obtained a Danish long-cycle higher education (tertiary level education) are occupied at the same level of qualifications as persons of Danish origin with the same level of education. 76 and 75 percent respectively of the employed immigrants and persons of Danish origin with a Danish long-cycle higher education are employed as top managers or as employees at the highest level. (See figure 3.6.) Only 37 percent of the employed immigrants with a long-cycle higher education from abroad are employed as top managers or employees at the highest level. A larger share of the employed immigrants with educational attainments from abroad are self-employed or assisting spouses than are persons of Danish origin with a Danish long-cycle higher education.

Figure 3.6. Immigrants from Non-Western Countries 16–66 years old with Vocational Training and Education, 2003

Figure 3.7. Immigrants from Non-Western Countries 16-66 years old with Long-Cycle Higher Education 2003


20) Tertiary level education.
Danish origin or immigrants with a Danish education at the same level. (See figure 3.7.)

Information on Placement within the Labour Market
The target populations’ placement on the labour market can be established by comparing the data from various industry sectors with individual-level data for the relevant risk population. Data in both areas are collected by Statistics Denmark and integrated in statistical analyses conducted by the Ministry of Refugees, Immigrants and Integration; these are made available in the “Database on Immigrants”.

Classifications
The variable Industry Sector in the RAS is a classification by 6 digits, which is a subdivision of the 4 digit long NACE. The 825 Danish branches of industry can be categorised in 60 main groups, 222 groups and 501 subgroups; these are comparable with the categories in NACE with very few exceptions.

It is possible to describe branches of industry in which the target populations are concentrated. In this future this might be used to analyse the extent to which some industries are more prone to structural discrimination than others, e.g. in the form of lower salaries, a higher level of complaints or increased numbers of industrial injuries.

Table 3.3a. Employed Men 16–66 Years Old, by Industry Sector and Ethnic Origin, 2004 (percent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Sector</th>
<th>Danish origin</th>
<th>Immigrants from Western countries</th>
<th>Immigrants from non-Western countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, fishing and quarrying</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, water and gas supply</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail, hotels and restaurants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, storage and communication</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial intermediation, business act.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and personal services</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity not stated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Sector</th>
<th>Danish origin</th>
<th>Immigrants from Western countries</th>
<th>Immigrants from non-Western countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, fishing and quarrying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, water and gas supply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail, hotels and restaurants</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, storage and communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial intermediation, business act.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and personal services</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity not stated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on table 3.3:
29 percent of employed male immigrants from non-Western countries are employed within the sector Wholesale retail, hotels and restaurants. This only applies to 18 and 19 percent respectively for persons of Danish origin and immigrants from Western countries. While more than half of the employed women from Denmark and Western countries are employed within the sector Public and personal services, this only accounts for 38 percent of the immigrant women from non-Western countries. Financial intermediation and business activities is the second largest sector for employed immigrant women from both Western and non-Western countries, accounting for 16 and 23 percent respectively. The sector includes cleaning services. More than 93 percent of the employed men from all three ancestry groups are occupied within five or six of the eight main sectors. More than 91 percent of the employed women are concentrated in only four sectors, namely Manufacturing, Wholesale retail, hotels and restaurants, Financial intermediation and business activities and Public and personal services.
Experienced Discrimination
in the Labour Market

Research on experienced discrimination includes qualitative analyses based on interviews with individuals belonging to the risk population. The surveys focus on general discrimination in the labour market, but also more specifically with the recruitment process, and often aim to explain the reasons for discrimination and identify the barriers leading to exclusion from the labour market.

In the table below interviewees were asked to state whether they had experienced discrimination solely based on their ethnicity within a specific time-frame (during last five years for the first three questions, and during the last year for the last question).

The figures are interesting, whether or not the case can objectively be made that discrimination is occurring, since they tell us about the extent to which the members of these target populations feel included or marginalised in the society. (See table 3.4.)

Of the four groups, the Bosnians experienced the least discrimination and bad treatment in the labour market based on their ethnicity. The Lebanese experienced discrimination in the labour market more often than the other groups, while the Somalis experienced more discrimination in their spare time. Some of the Turkish respondents experienced being teased at the workplace. One possible explanation for the lower levels of discrimination experienced by the Bosnians could be the similarities in appearance and culture relative to those of ethnic Danes.

Surveys dealing with discrimination in the job application process suggest that 39 percent of the non-Western job applicants (immigrants and their descendants) had experienced discrimination, 24 percent felt certain they were being discriminated against and 15 percent suspected they were being discriminated against. More males than females felt they had been discriminated against.

The exact extent of discrimination in Danish society is very difficult to measure, although surveys definitely show discrimination is an issue. The barriers in the labour market which form part of the complex background in this area can be summarised as being the following:

- Lack of educational qualifications
- Lack of language qualifications

Table 3.4. Experienced Discrimination in the Labour Market among Members of Four Target Populations (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bosnia</th>
<th>Somalia</th>
<th>Lebanon/</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palestinian refugees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not receive a job, where you fulfilled the requirements</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not being promoted</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being sacked</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being harassed/teased at your workplace</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages are based upon the number of respondents for whom the question was relevant, i.e. those who have applied for work etc.

i) This group consists of people with Lebanese citizenship and those stateless persons born in the Middle-East.

ii) One or more times during the last year.

Source: Møller & Togeby (1999).

21) Mislykket integration, Rockwool Fondens Forskningsenhed 2000, Gunnar Viby Mogensen and Poul Chr. Matthiesen; and Oplevet Diskrimination p. 49.
22) p.68 Køn, Etnicitet og Barrierer for Integration, SFI, February 2005 05:01.
23) In Danish: arbejdsmarkeds-politiske system.
• Attitudes and gender patterns in relation to family life and working life
• Discrimination and prejudices
• Barriers in the labour market system

Complaints Data
The available complaints data on educational matters consists of cases drawn from the Complaints Committee for Ethnic Equal Treatment and from the courts.

On educational matters, the Committee has dealt with 15 complaints, equalling 9 percent of the total number of complaints received. On labour market issues the Committee has dealt with 7 complaints (4 percent) on cases of dismissals, 6 complaints (4 percent) on recruitment, 2 cases (1 percent) on employment conditions and wages. 3 cases have been initiated ex officio by the Committee. In total 18 cases (29 percent) relate to the labour market.

Examples of decisions before the Complaints Committee for Ethnic Equal Treatment

Decision of 20 October 2004 (File No. 711.2)
The Complaints Committee was unable to handle a complaint that the municipality of Rødovre had registered a person as having left the country, as a statement in the case would necessitate production of evidence in the form of questioning both parties and witnesses, which is beyond the mandate of the Committee. The Committee recommended that cases governed by Article 24 of the Act on the Civil Registration System be handled such that the administration of the provision would prevent the risk of especially serious consequences for individuals of non-Danish background.

Decision of 1 September 2004 (File No. 730.4)
The willingness of an employee of a technical school to accommodate the demand of certain employers not to receive individuals from non-Danish ethnic backgrounds as trainees was found to be a violation of the prohibition against direct differential treatment, cf. Article 3 (1) of the Act on Ethnic Equal Treatment. There was no documentation that the school in general had been open to accommodate certain employers’ demand not to receive persons from non-Danish backgrounds as trainees. It was also not documented that the complainant had been subject to reprisals from the defendant following a complaint about differential treatment.

The Complaints Committee for Ethnic Equal Treatment – Own-Initiative Cases

Decision of 19 August 2004 (File No. 770.3)
The Complaints Committee for Ethnic Equal Treatment recommended that a housing association ceased to inquire about the nationality of the applicants when recommending the allocation of hostel and youth apartments.

Supreme Court and High Court Case Law

In a High Court case, a young Muslim woman was denied training in a department store because her head scarf was found to be incompatible to the internal dress code. On the basis of the Act prohibiting discrimination, the High Court decided that the denial represented indirect discrimination and held the warehouse liable in tort (U.2000.2350Ø).

However, the most recent case in this area (Supreme Court U.2005.1265H) arrived at the opposite conclusion. The argument was that the strict dress code left no doubt that a head scarf would not be accepted, since all head coverings were prohibited; hence it was not illegal unequal treatment.

In another Supreme Court case the anti-discrimination act was invoked due to the dismissal of a Somali man who had – on several occasions – refused to say his prayers in a place that was placed at his and his Muslim colleagues’ disposal by the employer. As the employer had informed the employee of the possible consequences of not obeying the ban on saying prayers in certain areas, the Supreme Court found that the dismissal was legitimate (U.2001.83H).
Good register data is available on income. The data on personal income combines information from the taxation authorities and other registers on social benefits etc. At the individual level income can be specified as either primary income, investment or property income, transfer income (social benefits), or gathered as the total amount of income, before or after tax. Equivalence income, a weighted income measure calculated per person in a family, by family income and number of children and adults in the family, is also a very useful way of comparing income between groups. Differential outcomes on income/salary can be studied by comparing different groups’ occupational level of qualifications with income level. (See table 3.5.)

**Table 3.5. Share of Population 17–64 Years Old by Personal Income, Ethnic Origin and Gender (percent).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Danish origin</th>
<th>Immigrants from Western countries</th>
<th>Immigrants from non-Western countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 DKK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-149,999 DKK</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000-249,999 DKK</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000-349,999 DKK</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350,000 DKK and above</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 DKK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-149,999 DKK</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000-249,999 DKK</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000-349,999 DKK</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350,000 DKK and above</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments on table 3.5:** Less than half of the men of Danish origin have a personal income below 250,000 DKK, while this applies for 58 and 78 percent respectively of the male immigrants from Western and non-Western countries. Almost all women (90 percent) from immigrant backgrounds from non-Western countries have a personal income below 250,000 DKK. 64 and 74 percent respectively of the women of Danish and Western origin are in this income group. Immigrants from Western countries are differentiated from persons of Danish origin and immigrants from non-Western countries by having a larger share of persons without any personal income at all. This applies to 11 percent of the men and 13 percent of the women from Western countries.

**Income Register Data**

The incomes of both immigrants and their descendants are significantly lower than the incomes of ethnic Danes. Immigrants from non-Western countries have an average income of 152,317 DKK annually, whilst the income of non-Western descendants is on average 115,140 DKK. The average income for an ethnic Dane is 244,469 DKK.
The category can also be described as the low income group (lavindkomst gruppe) or the at-risk-of-poverty group. See Appendix 2: Bemærkninger til SFI’s rapport Børnefattig-dom i danske kommuner 1984-2001 (Danish only), http://www.fm.dk/db/filarkiv/9414/Lavindkomstgruppen_mobiliet_sammensaetning.pdf

There is a significant disparity in the age composition of the groups mentioned in table 3.6, which may partly explain the lower incomes seen among ethnic minorities. The differences in the average income are also to some extent the result of the duration of their stay in Denmark and their attachment to the labour market. Gender-specific variation is influenced by the lower rates of labour market participation for women originating from certain countries. (See table 3.6.)

Economic Poverty
One way to look at outcome gaps is to examine poverty levels instead of the absolute levels of income. Economic poverty can be defined as an income which is below 50 percent of the median income of all citizens in the country.24 According to the table above, 11.5 percent of the immigrant population can be defined as relatively poor (compared to 3.6 percent of the ethnic Danes). 21 percent of those defined as poor in Denmark are immigrants, although immigrants make up 7.7 percent of the population, meaning that immigrants are over-represented among the poor. (See table 3.7.)

Social Benefits
Information about income composition is one source that can be utilised in the seeking out measures of discrimination. One important source of income is social benefits. (See figure 3.8 on next page.)

Table 3.6. Average Personal Income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>15209</td>
<td>175385</td>
<td>13579</td>
<td>145054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>8416</td>
<td>134832</td>
<td>6069</td>
<td>120764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>6056</td>
<td>141605</td>
<td>4903</td>
<td>133606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>7392</td>
<td>166328</td>
<td>7156</td>
<td>140866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>5170</td>
<td>182765</td>
<td>4523</td>
<td>116652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former-Yugoslavia</td>
<td>5421</td>
<td>197196</td>
<td>5155</td>
<td>164714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>4723</td>
<td>118892</td>
<td>4436</td>
<td>132391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>6258</td>
<td>176219</td>
<td>4144</td>
<td>137252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>3772</td>
<td>188521</td>
<td>3751</td>
<td>153607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3.7. Relative Poverty Figures, 2002 (percent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Share of relatively poor in the target population</th>
<th>The target populations’ share of the relatively poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Danes</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Finance.
Discussion

Despite the existence of detailed register data on almost all aspects of life of all citizens in Denmark in the official databases of Statistics Denmark, it is not an easy task to combine this information with other data sources. In addition, register data are collected on the basis of the personal registration number and represent as such data on the individual level. This data may linked to surveys conducted by Statistics Denmark, such as the annual survey on immigrants' educational attainments. In contrast, data stemming from surveys based on qualitative analyses cannot be linked to register data.

Surveys conducted in Denmark are typically analyses based either on register data from Statistics Denmark or on data collected within the framework, purpose and design of the particular survey in question. To date surveys based on register data have focused on issues such as integration, labour market participation, criminal activities and other topics involving the risk population. Some of these surveys do, however, address discrimination issues on the basis of a combination of register data and qualitative analyses. Most analytical surveys build on data obtained through questionnaires or interviews with a group of people living in Denmark who share a particular set of special characteristics such as ethnic background, cultural or religious traditions, names different from the Danish majority etc. Representativeness as a criterion is seldom applied in these analyses, and in consequence they must often be seen as providing examples or indications within the general context rather than fully

Figure 3.8. Proportion of Population aged 17–64 years by Amount of Social Benefits Received, Ethnic Origin and Gender, 2003.

Comments on figure 3.8: Four fifths of male immigrants from Western countries and persons of Danish origin receive less than 50,000 Dkr in social benefits annually. Only 56 percent of male immigrants from non-Western countries receive less than 50,000 Dkr in social benefits. Almost half of female immigrants from non-Western countries receive more than 50,000 Dkr in social benefits. This is also true of 69 percent of women of Danish origin and 72 percent of immigrant women from Western countries. NOTE: All parents receive up to 13,000 Dkr annually for each child under 18 years of age, and this is normally included in the mother’s income.
documenting the extent of differences between the majority and minority populations or among minority groups. Only one survey has had experienced or perceived discrimination as its sole focus, although omnibus surveys conducted biannually have integrated questions concerning perceived discrimination into the interviews.

Therefore, such data may be used in mapping of data sets to reveal information on discrimination on an aggregate level, but cannot be used in linking individual data, since the indicators used to identify persons belonging to the risk population do not conform with those used in the register and survey data collected by Statistics Denmark.

The amount of data collected on individual complaints is still rather limited, since the Complaints Committee on Ethnic Equal Treatment was only recently established by the Danish Institute for Human Rights as a result of the transposition of the EU Equal Treatment Directive.

Only one discrimination-related case is currently being reviewed in the Danish court system, but this may lead to a highlighting of issues of racial discrimination. An increasing number of individual complaints may be expected if the case is resolved in favour of the claimant.

From a longer-term perspective, however, cooperation and knowledge-sharing between complaints-handling and counselling entities are essential for raising awareness about access to justice. This is particularly true of cooperation between the Parliamentary Ombudsman and other complaints-handling bodies such as the Complaints Committee on Ethnic Equal Treatment, the Citizens Advice Service in the municipality of Copenhagen and legal aid institutions throughout the country. Other bodies such as the Consumer Ombudsman, the Press Board and the Board on Gender Equality are also able to deal, if only indirectly, with cases of discrimination or double-discrimination issues, which will contribute to increasing the focus on this area. To benefit fully from such cooperation it will be necessary not only to create a common understanding on how to register complaints, but actually to create a set of tools, e.g. common database standards and categorisations, that the aforementioned complaints-handling bodies could use to collect and compare data on complaints on ethnic discrimination horizontally.
Identification of the Principal Producers of Statistics, 
Surveys and Individual Complaints

Statistics and Surveys
Statistics Denmark  
http://www.dst.dk  
The Danish Immigration Service  
http://www.udlst.dk  
The Danish Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs  
http://www.inm.dk  
The Danish Ministry of Employment  
http://www.bm.dk  
The Danish National Institute of Social Research  
http://www.sfi.dk  
The Rockwool Foundation Research Unit  
http://www.rff.dk  
CASA – Center for Alternativ Samfundsanalyse  
http://www.casa-analyse.dk  
CATINET A/S – the Nordic research institute  
http://www.catinet.dk  
Academy for Migration Studies in Denmark (AMID)  
http://www.amid.dk  
UC2 – Resource Centre for Bilingualism and Interculturalism  
http://www.uc2.dk

Complaints Handling
The Danish Institute for Human Rights  
http://www.humanrights.dk  
The Complaints Committee for Ethnic Equal Treatment  
http://www.klagekomite.dk  
Dokumentations- og rådgivningscenteret om racediskrimination  
http://www.drcenter.dk
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4. Measuring discrimination in The Netherlands

Introduction
This section discusses the definition of risk populations in the Netherlands. Subsequently, the state of the art in measuring the position of minorities and their (experiences of) discrimination is presented, together with the main data sources that provide information covering several of the domains presented in the remainder of the chapter: education, employment and income.

Definition of Risk Populations
The definition of risk populations is not only important in the production of official statistics and crucial in setting the boundaries for the design of cross-national comparative research. It is also particularly important in the design of survey questionnaires and letters. The way in which target population individuals are addressed especially in postal or internet surveys may influence the responses obtained, both in terms of the number of refusals and the perspective on questions asked.\(^1\) Self-classification of target populations, not just in terms of (sub-)ethnicity but also e.g. hyphenated identities especially in the case of immigrants’ descendants, has to date not been practised in Dutch surveys or population registers.

In the 1980s Dutch minority policy defined as ethnic minorities those ethnic groups considered to be “socially disadvantaged”. Monitoring those specific target groups of social policy and measuring differences in outcome went hand in hand with policy implementation and evaluation. In 1983, ethnic minorities were listed as including Surinamese, Antilleans/Arubans, Moluccans, Turks, Moroccans, Italians, Spaniards, Portuguese, Greeks, Yugoslavs, Tunisians, Cape Verdians, Roma/Sinti and a group known as caravan dwellers (an indigenous semi-nomadic group). Indonesians and Chinese were not considered to be a minority because of their socio-economic situation, but Moluccans, a sub-ethnicity within the Indonesian group, which is not registered as such in the official registers, were. The transition from minority policy to integration policy in recent years has decreased the importance of the specific definition of the target groups of minority policy. More and more policy is aimed at the broad category of people having a non-Western background, as specified by Statistics Netherlands. Only recently the government declared that it would stick to the definition of these categories of the population of foreign origin.

Since August 1999 Statistics Netherlands has employed a standard definition for the classification of the population of foreign origin in the Netherlands (Keij, 2000). The ‘standard definition’ is a mixture of the previous definitions, which were replaced by the new definitions, and is now widely used in the Netherlands by ministries, local government and the media. The commonly used definition is actually an operational definition derived from a more refined conceptual definition.\(^2\) The operational definition is that a person has a foreign background if at least one of his or her parents is born abroad (Alders, 2001). Individuals with a foreign background (or origin) are distinguished in two different ways.

• Firstly, individuals who were born abroad constitute the first generation and are distinguished from individuals who were born in the Netherlands and are referred to as second generation.

By Jessika ter Wal, Utrecht University\(^3\)
Secondly, individuals with a foreign background are classified as Western or non-Western, according to their country of birth. If they are born in the Netherlands (the second generation), the classification is based on the mother’s country of birth. If she was also born in the Netherlands, the background is determined by the father’s country of birth. The category ‘non-Western’ includes individuals with a Turkish, African, Asian and Latin-American background. Individuals from a Japanese or Indonesian background are classified as Western on the basis of their social and economic position in Dutch society. The group of individuals with an Indonesian background consists mainly of individuals (with parent(s)) originating from the former Dutch East Indies. Individuals with a Japanese background are mostly employees of Japanese companies and their families. The category ‘Western’ consists of individuals from Europe (excluding the Netherlands and Turkey), North America, Oceania, Japan and Indonesia (including the former Dutch East Indies).

Demographic data on the portion of the population which has a foreign background are obtained from the Dutch population registers. The Dutch population statistics as compiled by Statistics Netherlands are based on automated municipal population registers. This system is known as the GBA, which stands for ‘Gemeentelijke Basisadministratie personengegevens’ (municipal basic registration of population data). The GBA was introduced on 1 October 1994. It is a fully decentralised, comprehensive and cohesive population registration system. Due to legal provisions there is no centralised population register. Every municipality in the Netherlands has its own population register, containing information on all inhabitants of that municipality. This information is listed for each inhabitant in a so-called personal file. In the registration system each inhabitant is given a unique personal identification number (PIN), which enables the municipalities to link the inhabitant’s information with the information for their spouse, parents and children. For this reason, each personal file contains both the inhabitant’s PIN and also those of their parents, spouse and children. However, the latter occurs only if the parents and the children are or were included in the population register of that municipality after 1 October 1994.

The personal files of inhabitants contain several categories, such as personal data and data on parents, children, citizenship and marital status. Data on parents, spouse and children are restricted to PIN, date of birth and place of birth. These are invariable data that do not require updating. All data on these relatives that may be subject to updating, such as marital status and citizenship, are stored on the relative’s own personal file only. These data may be found by linking the personal files through mutual PINs.

The country of birth of a person is always entered on the personal file. However, the country of birth of one or both parents is not always included, in particular in the case of immigrants. In the population statistics an imputation technique is used to estimate the missing information. If the country of birth of the father is unknown it is assumed to be the same as the country of birth of the mother (and vice versa). If the countries of birth of both father and mother are unknown, the country of birth of the person in question is used.

The total size of the population with a foreign background is about 3.1 million.

4) Up to October 1994 the population registers consisted of a paper card system.
The population with a Western origin is slightly smaller (1.4 million or almost 9%) than that with a non-Western origin (1.7 million or 10.4%). The largest groups of non-Westerners are Moroccans, Turks, and people from Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles/Aruba.

The categories do not contain specific information about migration types, but information on migration motive has been available in the SSD since 1995. In the following paragraphs, data sources and classifications for the measurement of educational levels and occupations will be discussed. In general, it is possible to produce data according to international standard classifications. For that reason no detailed information on national classification will be considered, although in the Netherlands, as in most other countries, the national classifications differ from the international classifications but are still the basis of the application of the international standards.

**State of the Art**

Information on the measurement of discrimination is provided by different sources. For the purpose of the present study three main types can be distinguished, of which the current characteristics will be described in more detail below.

Firstly, sources concerning ‘differences in outcome’ measure the socio-economic position of the main ethnic minority groups. Official monitors and statistics enable (in)equality between the majority population and ethnic minority groups in the areas of education, employment and income to be revealed. Regular analyses of such data are produced by official bodies and/or research institutes and are often based on a combination of register and survey data, for example the annual Labour Force Survey combined with register data.

Secondly, survey data about experienced discrimination form a crucial source of information for obtaining a better understanding of discrimination from the victim’s perspective. To date however, there have been no large-scale surveys aimed at analysing experienced discrimination in the Netherlands. Existing surveys targeted specifically at this aspect have been mostly smaller sample studies commissioned by non-governmental organizations with a specific interest in the perspective of the victims of discrimination. Nevertheless, a limited number of questions on experienced discrimination have been included in larger official surveys aimed at general monitoring of ethnic minorities’ position. In addition, some academic work, generally as part of wider research questions about the target population and/or source population’s attitudes, has addressed questions of experienced discrimination and its causes and consequences, in particular among young people (e.g. Verkuyten & Brug, 2002).

The third type of source discussed in this chapter is represented by the complaints data registered, both by the network of anti-discrimination bureaus and by official agencies such as the Equal Treatment Commission, the police and courts who treat discrimination complaints. Although the registration of complaints is better organised than in many other EU countries, there are many shortcomings. The agencies cooperate and strive to harmonise and improve registration, in addition to producing yearly reports and regular evaluations.

Survey research, including the official surveys among migrants and descendants in the Netherlands, suffers from the problem of non-response (Houtkoop & Veenman, 2002; Schmeets & van der Bie, 2005). Non-response rates are particularly high in the Netherlands. This phenomenon makes survey estimates

---

5) The migration motive is obtained from the Central Register of Foreigners of the Immigration and Naturalisation Services, which is kept on all non-Dutch immigrants who have migrated since 1995.

6) Experimental designs have been used both by anti-discrimination bureaus and universities to gather additional proof of discrimination by employers, e.g. in area of placement in labour market (Kruisbergen & Veld, 2002).
questionable, because it introduces a potential bias that is difficult to measure.

On the basis of surveys conducted in the 1990s, Statistics Netherlands reports an average response of 35% for non-Western migrants and of 60% for the Dutch majority population (Snijkers & Schmeets, 2003). A more recent assessment, based on the survey Permanent Research Quality of Life between 1998 and 2004, saw an increase in response among ethnic minorities of almost 20 percent (51% total response for non-Westerners and 56% for Western foreigners). This increase is attributed to increased number of contact attempts by the interviewers and an overall improved fieldwork design (Schmeets & van der Bie, 2005).

The lower response rate seen among ethnic minorities can be explained by the different background characteristics of minorities compared to the majority population (Schmeets & van der Bie, 2005). If groups from minority and majority populations with the same background characteristics (in particular, level of urbanisation, and socio-economic position) are compared, then the percentages of participation in survey research differ only minimally. Also, the lower response among minorities is not the result of a higher refusal rate, but of a higher difficulty in reaching respondents, together with linguistic problems. Techniques for statistical correction and weighting models are used to counteract this problem, but it is of course preferable to increase the response rate as such. Therefore Statistics Netherlands also conducts research to see which methods may best increase the response rate.

To date, no research appears to exist that has systematically linked survey and register data in order to measure discrimination. As far as access to official survey data for researchers is concerned, Statistics Netherlands presents an exceptional possibility in comparison with other countries. Via the Data Archiving and Networked Services (DANS) of the Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences, the data from LFS of Statistics Netherlands, as well as SPVA data from previous waves, are both made available to researchers (with some restrictions related to risks of disclosure). However, data from the SSD, as described below, are not available through DANS, but in principle researchers can analyse SSD data through an on-site visit to Statistics Netherlands, and are even allowed to bring their own data to link SSD data.

This chapter deals with available sources for information regarding i) education; ii) labour force participation and placement, and iii) income. First some data sources that cover more than one of the three domains are presented, including some information on the design and methodology of these sources. Later on, the specific applicability of these and some other data sources is presented for each of the three domains (education, labour market and income) together with some examples of outcomes.

### Multi-domain sources

**Labour Force Survey**

The Labour Force Survey (LFS) is one of the main data sources of Statistics Netherlands used to produce official statistics on the labour market. It is also an important data source on education, especially on educational achievement. The survey is an EU-harmonised sample survey among individuals who live in the Netherlands, excluding individuals in homes and institutions (the institutional population). Since 1987, it has also been one of the main sources for keeping track of the labour market position of residents of foreign origin. The sample size of the survey in 2003 was about 82,000
addresses of which an initial response was obtained from about 47,000 households, including 95,000 individuals (stratified by municipalities and households). From 1990 to 2003, reported response rates varied between 54 and 60%. The guidelines for the survey stipulate that all individuals 15 years old and above in the household are to be interviewed.

Other members of the household are allowed to respond on a proxy basis for individuals who are not present at the time of the interview, reducing the number of households returning an incomplete response. As the results of the LFS are based on a sample, they are subject to a margin of error, and for that reason values which fall under a certain threshold are not published. Since 1999, in accordance with EU guidelines the LFS surveys have taken the form of a rotating panel study using a combination of one computer-assisted personal interview (CAPI) and four three-monthly telephone interviews (CATI) as follow-ups. Panel attrition is selective: non-response in CATI-interviews among respondents of foreign origin is relatively high.

Annual LFS-results can be broken down into the four major categories of non-Western foreigners (of Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese and Antillean origin) and a residual sub-category of 'other non-Westerners'. This residual category includes some large groups such as Chinese residents and more recent ones such as asylum-seekers. For these categories a distinction is generally made between the first generation (born abroad) and the second generation (born in the Netherlands).9

Strengths and Weaknesses of LFS

The LFS has several strengths. The annual replication allows for trend analysis, the sampling of individual respondents within households remedies the gender bias in (especially Turkish and Moroccan) samples, and extensive Dutch data allow for the comparative analysis of 'expected outcomes' for members of ethnic minorities while setting equal their (supposedly) relevant socio-demographic characteristics. But a major limitation is that the surveys are in Dutch, so that non-Dutch speaking members of ethnic minorities are not well-represented. In general this need not be a problem, because others may answer on a proxy basis except in the case of purely subjective questions. However, according to the Social Cultural Planning Bureau (SCP), lower estimates of Turkish and Moroccan unemployment rates in LFS 2002 as compared with SCP’s SPVA survey of the same year are most probably due to (positive) selectivity of the LFS samples of ethnic minorities (Dagevos, 2003). One argument is thus that the non-response rate among those with lower levels of education is higher due to this linguistic selectivity.

Social Statistics Database

The Social Statistics Database (SSD)11 has been developed by Statistics Netherlands to contain all of the relevant information on individuals, families, households, jobs, benefits and living quarters, from which consistent statistical outcomes can be produced with more regional detail and with more information on specific population groups in society (Al & Bakker, 2000).

9) The number of single ethnic groups within the category of "other non-Western foreigners" within the LFS is too small to analyse data for separate groups of asylum migrants.

10) The section on risk population definitions (page 72) provides additional information on this classification.

11) In Dutch it is called Sociaal Statistisch Bestand (SSB). This paragraph draws heavily on the description of the SSD in Van der Laan (2002).
Respondents of Statistics Netherlands surveys generally do not object to their data being used for this purpose. There are other domains where complete registers are available, but until now they have not been used by Statistics Netherlands.

The files of the Population Register form the backbone of the database, as all the other files are linked to this register. Linking on a personal identification number appears to be successful: between 96 and 98 percent of the records are linked. If such an identification number is absent, the sources are linked to the postal code, house number, date of birth and sex. This procedure for linking sources without the use of PIN results in 93 to 95 percent linked records (Arts et al. 2000).

The combined register data are used as a sample frame for surveys, in order to collect the survey data in the most efficient way. For that purpose, the method of prestratification is used. If for example information is needed on poverty, low-income households are over-represented in the sample. This is possible as the sample frame contains information on household income. In order to improve the linking procedure, personal identification numbers have recently begun to be included in the samples taken from the Population Register. The success of the linking procedure is then almost 100%.

Because in the end the SSD will comprise a very detailed picture of every inhabitant of the Netherlands, data-security and privacy are important issues. Surveys must be conducted on the basis of informed consent, so that respondents know their data may be used for linking. Statistics Netherlands cannot take any risk that individual data will be disclosed, because in that case there will be no support from the Dutch population. In addition to this lack of support, legal conditions prevent Statistics Netherlands from using such detailed data.

Figure 4.1. Percentage having paid work, cohort 1999, males.

Figure 4.1 is presented as an example of the output that might be produced from the SSD. It is based on the immigrant-panel in which data for cohorts of immigrants are brought together from various data sources. This figure presents the labor market position in September of the relevant year for all individuals 15-60 years of age entering the Netherlands in the period September 1998 – September 1999. For each year the data refer only to individuals who are living in the Netherlands at the time of the survey, so individuals who have left the country again have been excluded in the computation of the percentages.

12) Respondents of Statistics Netherlands surveys generally do not object to their data being used for this purpose.
from publishing individual data. Therefore, a strict security regime has been established (Schulte Nordholt 2002).

With respect to statistics on the population at risk of discrimination, the SSD proves to be a very important database in various respects:

• Most registers provide statistical data on the total (relevant) population of individuals and households which makes it possible to produce statistics on small sub-populations. In this way detailed information might be presented on specific risk populations.13

• Data from many sources can be linked on the individual level, enabling research on statistical relations that otherwise would demand very extensive surveys or even be impossible.

• Data collection of dedicated surveys on the position of non-Western foreigners can be carried out very effectively by starting from pre-stratified samples.

• Registers or surveys that contain data referring to the situation of individuals or households but no specific demographic characteristics can still be broken down by foreign origin after being linked to the population registers in the SSD.

• The harmonisation of many statistics will be the self-evident consequence of the common use of SSD-generated variables.

• By combining the registers of succeeding years it will be possible to produce longitudinal data. One example is the immigrant panel by which longitudinal data enable statistical description and analyses of the integration path of cohorts of new immigrants.

Living Situations of Foreigners in Cities (LAS)
The LAS14 is a survey on the quality of life of non-Western foreigners (from 15 to 65 years old) in the 50 largest cities, compared to that of native Dutch inhabitants. Many domains of daily life are covered in the survey questionnaire: it contains questions on socio-demographic and socio-economic characteristics as well as on leisure, division of household tasks, social interaction, safety and health. Questions refer not only to the factual situations of individuals but also to their evaluations and opinions. The respondents were also asked to fill in a time-use diary. Data collection took place in 2004 and results will be published in the near future.

Social Position and Use of Social Provisions by Foreigners (SPVA)
Employment and educational data are gathered in another survey published by the Social Cultural Planning Bureau and specifically targeted at minorities, the SPVA.15 At intervals of approximately every four years it measures ethnic disadvantage and equal access to social provisions in the Netherlands by ethnic groups as compared to a Dutch reference sample. It maps the position of the four largest minority groups: Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese, and Antilleans/Arubans. The last SPVA was conducted in 2002. In 2003, the survey was replicated in almost the same form among the five largest groups of foreigners from refugee countries: Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran, former Yugoslavia and Somalia. This has the advantage of creating a data source that allows data on these asylum migrants to be analysed by ethnic origin, which was not possible with other previous data sources such as the LFS.

13) The ongoing SSD was also used as the source of the last Census (which made it a 'Virtual Census'). For this reason the costs of the production of Census data were only a small fraction of the costs of a census produced by actual data collection.

14) In Dutch: Leefsituatie Allochtonen Stedelingen.

15) In Dutch: Sociale Positie en Voorzieninggebruik Allochtonen.
In the SPVA, the so-called ‘head of the household’ is interviewed and core information is gathered about other household members, including children. In addition, a shortened version of the main questionnaire for heads of households is also presented to one other adult member of the household (age 15 to 65). Typically, most statistics on the socio-economic attainment of minorities based on SPVA use only data from (predominantly male) heads of households. But even when other adult respondents are included, SPVA data are not fully representative of the female population who are selectively underrepresented, in particular Turkish and Moroccan women. Unfortunately, this feature of the sampling design limits the usefulness of SPVA for the purpose of monitoring the equal access of women from ethnic minorities to education and to the labour market. Another limitation of the SPVA data is the focus, at least until 2002, on the four major minority groups.

**Experienced Discrimination in Surveys**

This data source is relevant for the measurement of discrimination because it provides information about the way and extent to which systematic inequalities are actually perceived by the victims. It also provides information about experiences in human interaction that cannot be derived from sources about outcomes. Several recent studies have included questions about perceived discrimination.

**SPVA 2002**

Besides measuring inequalities in positions regarding employment and education, the SPVA 2002 contained two very general questions about perceived group and individual discrimination without a specification of domain:

- 1) Some people say that Turks/Moroccans/Surinamese/Antilleans [specific ethnic group of respondent] are discriminated against by Dutch people. What is your impression? Does this happen never, almost never, every now and then, often or very often?
- 2) Does it ever happen to you that you are discriminated against by Dutch people? Does this happen never, almost never, every now and then, often or very often?"

**ERCOMER Study of Islam**

In 1999, the European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations at Utrecht University (ERCOMER) conducted a survey of Turkish and Moroccan migrants in Rotterdam (N=1184), divided into older, first generation migrants, and descendants/youths (Phalet, van Lotringen & Entzinger, 2000). The survey used CAPI and had a non-response rate of 30% among Turks and 36% among Moroccans (Phalet & Güngör, 2004: 5). The main part of the questionnaire dealt with religious identity, but it also included a few questions about experienced discrimination. For the measurement of experienced discrimination, three reliable and validly composed scales were used.

The first scale consisted of the perception of prejudice against the ethnic in-group and experiences of discrimination as a group. The questions about group discrimination referred to different domains, such as unequal treatment by the police, unequal access to public services, and harmful treatment at school or in the workplace. Respondents were asked to give their opinion on the following statements using a five-point scale from ‘totally disagree’ to ‘totally agree’:

- When something goes wrong, Turks/Moroccans are always the first to be checked by the police.
- When Turks/Moroccans need some public service, they are always made to wait longer than Dutch people.
• Streets where Turks/Moroccans live are less well-kept by the municipality than streets where Dutch people live.
• When a company is not doing well, Turks/Moroccans are the first victims.
• Turkish/Moroccan youths at school are treated more severely than Dutch youths.
• When you get to know Dutch people better, they all turn out to be racists.

The second scale was a composed index of experiences of personal discrimination:
• Generally speaking, how often do you have the feeling that you are discriminated because you are Moroccan/Turkish? (never, now and then, regularly, often, don’t know/no answer)
• Do you think that compared to a couple of years ago, there is more, less or the same amount of discrimination now? (more, less, the same, don’t know/no answer)
• Do you start feeling more Moroccan/Turkish because you are discriminated against? (no, yes, don’t know/no answer)

The third and final scale referred to concrete incidents of verbal or physical harassment to which the victim attributed a racist motive. This question form was borrowed from the British Minority Survey (Modood et al, 1997, in Phalet and Güngör, 2004) and takes into account the uncertainty about the motive of the perpetrators. For both forms, a two-composite question was asked: first, whether the individual had experienced aggression/physical violence, and second, whether the individual had the feeling that this had happened for a racist reason (yes, no, don’t know for sure, no answer/don’t know). The same questions were asked about verbal insults. Finally, one general question about positive discrimination was included: ‘Given equal abilities, minorities should be given priority in getting a job.’

The results from this study have been analysed in a recent SCP publication about Islam in the Netherlands (Phalet & ter Wal, 2004), in order to analyse the correlations of experienced discrimination with ethnic and religious identification among Turkish and Moroccan youth. The analysis, controlling for background variables, showed that experienced discrimination increased the religious commitment among Turkish and Moroccan respondents (Phalet & Güngör, 2004: 51). On the group discrimination items, Turkish youth experienced the most discrimination due to the decay of their neighbourhood, followed by police checks and access to social services. Moroccan youth experienced most discrimination from police checks, then decay of their neighbourhood, followed by employment.

**NCB survey**

In 2001, a survey of foreigners organised by the Netherlands Centre for Foreigners (NCB) included a number of questions about experienced discrimination (Hoogsteder, Schalk-Soekar & van de Vijver, 2001; N=559). It measured experiences both at the level of perceived group discrimination and at the personal/individual level.

**EUMC survey**

In 2002, the EUMC commissioned ERCOMER to conduct a postal survey of individual experiences of discrimination among five migrant populations in the Netherlands, following the questionnaire used in Sweden by Anders Lange (Lange, 1997; ter Wal, 2003). It was conducted among Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese, Indonesian and former Yugoslavian immigrants and their...
The ETC registers and publishes the complaints and requests received, cases treated and their results; see www.cgb.nl. The National Expertise Centre on Discrimination (in Dutch LECD) gathers the annual discrimination figures of the Public Prosecutor. The police has improved registration systems in several of its regions, which should make it possible to reveal the number of reported cases of discrimination (but this is not a uniform system). The results of this study have not yet been published by the EUMC.

The EUMC survey used the questionnaire previously designed and used by Lange (1997) and thus contained the following questions about discrimination in the labour market and workplace:

- Respond to this question only if you are unemployed: Do you think you are unemployed because employers prefer to hire Dutch rather than people from your country of origin?
- Has it happened during the past 5 years that you have not been offered a job for which you had applied and for which you were qualified, because of your foreign background?
- Has it happened during the past 5 years that you were confronted in your job with insults or have you been harassed in any other way at your work, because of your foreign background?

Complaints Data

Complaints data are relevant for measuring discrimination, because they provide information about a large array of different types of experiences in different domains and on different grounds. Hence, this type of data may reveal also forms of discrimination that are frequently experienced but not captured by the official surveys and register data. Indeed, besides the more structural forms of discrimination in education and employment, experiences of discrimination in terms of everyday interaction and subtle forms of differential treatment on the job or at school may be revealed by complaints data. In addition, court cases on discrimination also provide valuable information on changing understandings of the concept of indirect discrimination e.g. in the implementation of selection or promotion criteria in employment and education.

Firstly, the local Anti-Discrimination Bureaus (ADBs) register complaints using a common system based on the discrimination grounds in the Equal Treatment Act. Their National Federation reports these results yearly (LVADB, 2003).

The LVADB classifies the complaints in different categories: debatable treatment (with sub-categories: refusal of good/service, application of rules and other), hostile treatment (with sub-categories: demonstrations, insults, slogans and other), violence (distinguishing between attempted or actual violence), threats and other.

Secondly, the Equal Treatment Commission (ETC), the Police and Public Prosecutor register complaints that have been reported to them and which they have reviewed. Here, classification is related to existing legislation and legal practice. This type of data provides an idea of the relative volume of complaints in different domains, during different years, among different groups, showing trends and developments. The ETC is now the only body that reports on the treatment of a complaint or information request from beginning to end; this type of data is useful for singling out which types of complaints are considered ‘justified’ in the legal
sense and those who are eventually held to be ‘unfounded’.

In the ten years between 1994-2004, 46% of requests received by the ETC resulted in a judgment, in 15% the case was otherwise settled between parties (or the request was not pursued by the person concerned), 37% of cases were apparently unfounded (the ETC was not authorised to judge the case or the request was inadmissible) and in 2% of cases the file was closed by the ETC. In the same period, sex constituted the ground for 35% of the requests and 44% of the judgments, while race constituted the ground for 25% of requests and 22% of the judgments. About 80% of the requests to and judgements by the ETC are employment-related.

From a conceptual point of view it is important to notice that in its latest report the ETC recommends that the government use the term ‘differential treatment’ rather than ‘discrimination’ (as the two are not equivalent) due to proposed new legislation for integration in the Netherlands (CGB, 2005).

The National Expertise Centre Discrimination (LECD) publishes only those cases that result in criminal prosecution: e.g. refusal of entry and insults, mostly taking place on the street, in sport, bars, or other public meeting place. The Police and Public Prosecutor register complaints only as racially motivated offences if it is the main complaint. In 2002, 86% of discrimination cases that were received and treated by the Public Prosecutor were on the grounds of origin or ethnicity (LECD, 2003). For civil law cases, no LECD reports exist, but the LBR does register these in its case law database. This database contains all decisions of Public Prosecutor, ETC, civil law cases, decisions of the National Ombudsman, the Publicity Code Commission (Reclame Code Commissie), the Council for Journalism and international organisations.

A disadvantage of complaints data is that they only represent reported, registered and reviewed discrimination cases, which gives this data source an inherently selective character. In a way, the anti-discrimination bureaus and agencies may only reveal the tip of the iceberg as far as actual experiences are concerned. The changing nature of discriminatory treatments themselves for example makes it more difficult to report them as explicitly discriminatory or to match them with the grounds of the existing law (e.g. RADAR, 2003). Other factors may also hinder or facilitate actual reporting of discriminatory experiences by victims, as recently evaluated by the Equal Treatment Commission itself (CGB, 2005; Brounts & Breij, 2005).

In order to measure the discrepancy between requests received and actual experiences of unequal treatment, the ETC conducted a survey in 2004 (N=2,199, representative net sample of people of 18 years and older). The research showed that in the year preceding the interview, from mid 2003-mid 2004, about 15% of respondents personally experienced ‘discrimination or unequal treatment’ in one way or another, i.e. on all grounds of the equal treatment act, including sex, age, etc., not just race. When compared with the Dutch population (16 million) this is equivalent to a figure between 1.6 and 2 million inhabitants of 18 years and older (CGB, 2005). The number of victims who actually take action against discrimination is clearly much smaller.

The ETC tends to receive requests for the most serious cases, where a decision on the basis of the Equal Treatment Act (ETA) was deemed necessary. Since the ETC treats requests for cases of discrimination
on all grounds of the Equal Treatment Act, the proportion of complaints on the grounds of race/nationality is only as large as the proportion of the population that can file such complaints (i.e. the proportion potentially eligible to complain about sex discrimination is much larger).

In other cases, registration is sometimes not accessible and remains internal to an organisation, or there is no uniform system, as with the police. But the quality of the complaints registration systems in the Netherlands has definitely increased in recent years. International comparison is now much more viable than was the case even a few years ago, due to the introduction of a national electronic registration system based on the Equal Treatment Act, and the adaptation of the ETA to the directives based on article 13 of the Amsterdam treaty. Various national agencies coordinate and aim to harmonise the work of the various local anti-discrimination bureaus as well as the registration of complaints by the courts and police. Some of the more active bureaus also produce additional data, e.g. by carrying out regular situation testing on labour market discrimination. However, there is still much room for improvement in terms of the reliability and comparability of complaints data sources overall. In order to increase reliability, the agencies need more resources and institutional support for a well-developed infrastructure and centralised monitoring system. They also need assistance in developing more effective cooperation with other agencies such as the police, to ensure better registration of the reported instances of discrimination.

Education

Information about Educational Performance

Information about educational performance provides insight into the different resources and socio-cultural capital which members of ethnic minority groups bring in particular to the labour market and the resources that they may have to improve their position.

The state of affairs regarding information on education in the SSD can be summarised as follows:

a) Data on pupils/students are available in specific registers and can be linked to other registers in the SSD.

b) Data on educational attainment are available from several surveys and these samples can be linked to SSD registers.

c) Currently, there is an SSD project in progress aimed at integrating data on educational attainment from all available sources, which should result in a specific SSD module containing data on the educational attainment of almost 40% of the population. By using detailed weighting procedures in this module it will become possible to produce reliable statistical output on rather small population groups. This will provide however no solution for the quality problems in connection with the coding of the educational careers of foreigners in other countries.

School achievement can be measured against available cohort data. Data on cohorts of students have been collected by Statistics Netherlands since 1965, and for non-Western foreigners since 1989. The students are followed through their educational career, including tertiary education, until they enter the labour market. SPVA surveys offer largely retrospective data on the school careers of ethnic minority pupils. This data is complemented by two other sources: the PRIMA research follows pupils through primary education, and the VOCL research starts at the beginning of secondary school education.
Both cohort studies are complementary to the SPVA surveys for several reasons:

- they include a sizeable category of ‘other non-Western foreigners’ in addition to the four major minority groups;
- they allow for dual comparisons with disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged children and youth of Dutch origin, using parental education as an indicator of social disadvantage; and
- they relate ethnic origin and socio-economic background of the parents to standardised measures of school achievement (using CITO test scores19) (Gijsberts 2003).

The VOCL is a cohort survey that follows students up through secondary education, and started in 1993. Universities play a key role in the research, and the data files are made publicly (but not freely) available for academic research. This research relates educational choices, progress and achievement in secondary schools to the school advice (based on CITO) and the performance of students in year 1 and 2, their family background (ethnic and social class origins and educational support at home) and the school context (ethnic and socio-economic composition and school effectiveness). Only students from a clustered sample of schools are surveyed. Due to the large numbers involved, the school careers of male and female students in the Statistics Netherlands category of ‘non-Western foreigners’ (Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese, Antillean and other) can be analysed and compared with the careers of disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged male and female students of Dutch origin. Initial and final performance measures have been analysed for successive cohorts of pupils as a function of gender, the ethnic and social class origins of the parents, and the ethnic composition of the schools (Gijsberts 2003). Data on school leavers (i.e. including drop-outs) are linked to VOCL and describe the passage to the labour market for each student from the cohort who leaves education.

Classification of Educational Level

ISCED classifications of primary, secondary and tertiary education can be used. A distinction is usually made between the highest level of education attended and the highest diploma obtained. The definition commonly used is ‘effective educational level’, i.e. the highest level of education for which one has a diploma. For the Dutch majority population and their descendants Statistics Netherlands is able to measure the highest obtained educational level on sample basis (in particular via the LFS). For people having followed education abroad this is difficult. An attempt has been made to determine the educational level for a year cohort of new immigrants (by ROA or ITS).

Education pursued abroad is registered but classifications are general and based on ISCED. In other words, there is no attempt to find precise counterparts of foreign education with comparable education in the Netherlands. The foreign education remains recognisable in the data file as having been pursued abroad.

Language competence is monitored separately. In SPVA 2002, respondents were asked to define their own language competence and the frequency with which they use the Dutch language. This is therefore not an objective indicator. In addition the interviewer was asked to give a separate assessment of the language competence of the respondent. Results show difference in language competence between first and second generation immigrants and between post-colonial immigrants and those recruited as labour immigrants. Immigrants with a good

19) The CITO measurement represents an important source of information for comparing educational achievement across students from different ethnic groups in the Netherlands. The test is held during the last year of primary education and serves as the basis for advice about which level of secondary education can be followed.
command of the Dutch language tend to have a higher income and higher professional status than immigrants who do not have these skills (SCP/CBS/WODC, 2005).

Risk-populations and Education

One of the main indicators of discrimination-related problems connected with education is the percentage of students finishing their educational career at the secondary level without diploma. The percentage of migrant youth without a diploma (‘start qualification’), i.e. who have at most primary education, can be measured.

Dropouts can be identified via the available sources with cohort data on educational achievement in secondary schools and the SPVA. These identify the numbers in the cohorts of those who have left school without a diploma. These sources, however, do not measure whether those who have not obtained a diploma in the regular school system did obtain a place to pursue education on the job or via subsidised training.

Based on register data Statistics Netherlands is able to produce integral data about youth who have left secondary education by ethnic origin, covering the entire population. It is also possible to analyse the academic achievement of students in tertiary education. Thus, it is possible to make use of information about educational careers at the individual level, as well as in combination with other characteristics such as educational level and the socio-economic position of a student’s parents.

Early School Leavers

By using register data on students in secondary educational institutions in combination with demographic characteristics from the population register it has become possible in the SSD to construct an indicator that is a rather close operationalisation of the ‘school leavers’ indicator for sub-populations such as groups of foreign origin.20

The indicator can be produced for various specific secondary school types. Disaggregations are also possible by age of students, regional location of schools or region of student residence.

Experiences of Discrimination in Education

In 2003, complaints concerning education amounted to 6.2% of the total complaints received by the national ADBs. In 2002 this percentage was somewhat lower (5.3%). The category of education in these figures refers to complaints about treatment (or the absence thereof) received from organisations in the educational domain: these cover issues ranging from enrolment, admission, policies regulating dress or suspension, to relations between teachers and students and between teachers and parents/guardians. Complaints about the internship policies of schools are not classified here, but are registered under ‘employment’ following the practice of the Equal Treatment Commission. An example of a case treated by an ADB is that of a school that refused entry to a Moroccan student who had had a conflict with a member of the school’s staff (an assistant at practice lessons), and who had been insulted with discriminatory language by this staff member. Mediation by the ADB and other organisations for the parties concerned led to the school taking back the suspended student.

The ETC presents an annual report of the complaints it receives and reviews; often ADBs present cases to the ETC which they cannot solve themselves through mediation. Examples of the
ETC’s 2003 judgments show the importance of religious and segregation issues in the Dutch educational context. In one case a prohibition to wear a niqaab (a scarf covering the face) at school was found to constitute a justified instance of indirect discrimination, on the ground of religion, because the prohibition serves the aim of identification and communication.21 In another case a school accepting a maximum of 15% students having Dutch as their second language was found to indirectly discriminate on the grounds of race, because pupils of non-Dutch origin more often belong to the category speaking a language other than Dutch at home (CGB, 2003).

The National Education Complaints Commission registers complaints related to education on the basis of its mandate, established by the 1998 Quality Law (including complaints concerning discrimination, sexual intimidation, violence, bullying and aggression). On the basis of the same 1998 law, school boards are obliged to register incidents of undesired behaviour, including discrimination, and to take action against such behaviour. Parents, guardians, students, and personnel of the school can present complaints to the school board. However, it does not mention discrimination separately in its reports, but subsumes this under decisions about more broadly classified incidents.22

Labour Force Participation and Placement

In order to measure outcomes in relation to the labour market, statistical analyses have relied on the SPVA special survey data and on the general labour force survey data (Dagevos 2003). In addition, Statistics Netherlands can also produce data on the position of minorities in the labour force from employment databases (establishment surveys and social insurance registers) by analysing company information at the individual level. However, the data about companies can be published and made available to third parties only in the form of aggregates; any disclosure of individual company information is prohibited.

In the following paragraphs the available data sources and classifications for producing information about labour market participation and placement are presented. The ways in which experienced discrimination in the labour market is currently measured in the Netherlands are discussed at the end of each paragraph.

Participation

Labour participation data are important in measuring structural forms of disadvantage. To establish whether these disadvantages or inequalities are caused by discrimination, such data clearly need to be supplemented by further research. Statistics Netherlands has data drawn from several sources concerning labour participation and unemployment, via both surveys (LFS) and registers (employment data). The LFS data are more up-to-date. Register-based information, on the other hand, offers more detailed information, including information regarding people of foreign origin (see information on integrated job files on page 95).

Classifications

Statistics Netherlands (CBS) is able to compile data following international EU and ILO definitions. In the national definition of Statistics Netherlands a 12-hour limit is used which is not relevant for international comparative research.23 According to this definition, people who are not available for work (e.g. students,
housewives) are not included in the definition.

Those without paid employment of at least 12 hours are not per definition unemployed. Only when they are actively seeking such a job are they counted as part of the unemployed labour force. Information about people who are not officially unemployed but are willing to work (more) is published on the level of non-Western foreigners only (i.e. not for single ethnic groups). The unemployed labour force overlaps only partially with those receiving benefits. People receiving disability benefit are usually not counted as part of the unemployed labour force and are not obliged to look actively for a job. Only once they are qualified as partially or fully fit by medical assessment are they obligated to seek work (and are also counted then as unemployed).

The Statistics Netherlands Statline database distinguishes between employees with 1) permanent or 2) flexible jobs, 3) self-employed and 4) family workers. Self-employed are distinguished in 1) own company, 2) partner in a company, and 3) other self-employed (probably freelancers).

To measure the degree of participation, research by CBS such as the Structure of Earnings Survey (EU-harmonised institutional survey) works on the basis of the duration of work/year, using the number of working hours agreed between employer and employee, subtracting hours not worked due to official and own holidays, reduction of working hours, and extra free hours for the elderly. The duration of labour is calculated using the data for the month of December.

In the SPVA survey questionnaire the hours worked per week are indicated based on contract and actual hours worked; for those with more than one job, the number of hours of the various jobs are added together. The LFS data refers to standard contractual hours, but data about other hours (such as overtime) is also collected. In the questionnaire used in Lange (1997) and ter Wal (2003) the degree of participation was instead measured as the number of days worked on a paid job during the last four weeks, including days worked part-time.

Placement
Information about placement, i.e. occupational status and contract type, can help to indicate the representation of ethnic minorities in different segments of the labour market, and may thus reveal higher risks of job instability. Registering contract types (temporary jobs/ flexible contracts, and full-time/ part-time distinctions) is important in measuring discrimination because it may reveal forms of indirect discrimination in placement. Indeed, current statistics reveal that ethnic minority members who are employed, are more exposed to job insecurity than their native Dutch counterparts, and have more temporary contracts, more subcontracting through interim bureaus, and more frequent switching between jobs. Classifications and sources for information about placement are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Classifications
The economic activities of business units or enterprises are classified according to the national systematic hierarchical classification SBI 1993. The four highest levels of SBI-1993 are almost identical to the EU-harmonised international classification NACE -Rev. 1. The fifth level is a more detailed national-level differentiation. At the two highest levels both SBI 1993 and NACE-Rev. 1 correspond to the ISIC-Rev. 3.1.2 In 2003 some minor amendments were applied to NACE as

---

24) Nomenclature statistique des activités économiques dans la Communauté Européenne.
well as SBI. A major revision of ISIC and NACE will take place as of 1 January 2007 that will also be implemented in the SBI.

In classifying the size of companies it is generally considered useful to follow the classifications used by Eurostat and international organizations. Statistics Netherlands distinguishes between sectors: public sector; privately-owned companies; and subsidised companies. It also distinguishes among different sizes of company: 0-250 employees; 250-1000 employees; 1000 employees or more.

Occupations are classified according to the national occupational classification (SBC 1992). The basic principle of classification is according to level and type of the qualifications required to practise an occupation in combination with (maximally three) areas of work.26 Statistics Netherlands classifies the level of profession into five main categories: i) higher and university; ii) medium; iii) lower; iv) elementary; v) unknown. This classification is based on the skills required to carry out each particular profession.

The Labour Force Survey is the major data source for categorising occupations. The following data supplied by the respondent are used in classifying someone's occupation: the general design, main activities, level of management, management activities, number of personnel managed and business type. Sometimes data on educational career or job status are also used. Since 2004 the coding process has been computerised, which makes it possible to have the classification of most occupations take place directly during the interview.

Experienced Discrimination in Placement and Participation

In 2003, the most frequently reported form of labour market discrimination to the ADBs was that of discrimination in the workplace (i.e. discriminatory remarks/expressions and bullying by colleagues or superiors), amounting to 42% of complaints received. Complaints about placement (hiring and selection) amounted to 24%, and were the second most important form of discrimination. Complaints about an experienced (threat of) losing one’s job were responsible for 12% of cases handled. Other forms of discrimination in the labour area were less frequently reported to the ADBs: contract conditions (11%), mediation (5%) and promotion/career development (4%).

In 2003, for the first time at the national level complaints about discrimination in the neighbourhood outnumbered (with 20% of complaints) the complaints on some aspect of participation in the labour market (17%; IV-ADB, 2003). However it appears that in 2004 the labour market-related complaints were again the most common (report not yet published).

Statistical data can be used as evidence in cases of discrimination in lay-offs and redundancies (employment discrimination). The relative proportions in the data on the personnel in the company can give insight into patterns of staff management, e.g. when only minorities are laid off, or proportionately more minority than majority employees are affected. This presumption is reinforced when personnel of minority origin are replaced with native Dutch personnel. It happens for example that employers may lay off a minority employee then hire a young Dutch person through a commercial employment agency (de Fey, Kellermann and Nieuwboer 2004: 204).

26) The basic principles of SBC 1992 are very similar to the international standard classification of occupations (ISCO 1988), but there is more divergence at the more detailed levels. The number of occupations in the SBC 1992 (1211) is three times the ISCO 1988 number. The coding process in Statistics Netherlands makes it possible to produce statistical data for both occupational classifications to meet national as well as international demands. On a more general level it is possible to use a linking scheme to translate the codes from both classifications.
are unemployed because employers prefer to hire Dutch rather than people from your country of origin?

- Has it happened during the past 5 years that you have not been offered a job for which you had applied and for which you were qualified, because of your foreign background?
- Has it happened during the past 5 years that you missed a promotion while you wished to advance in your career, or that you were made redundant, because of your foreign background?
- Has it happened during the past 5 years that you were confronted in your job with insults or have you been harassed in any other way at your work, because of your foreign background?

### Income

Several data sources provide information on income levels. These include specific surveys, registers – which has also been mentioned above as part of the multi-domain sources – and other surveys based on tax register data.

#### Structural earnings survey

The Structural Earnings Survey (SES)\(^{27}\) is derived mainly from the much larger Survey on Employment and Earnings (SEE).\(^{28}\) The SEE is a large-scale survey among enterprises which is EU-harmonised to some extent, but only recently on the basis of EU-imposed obligations.\(^{29}\)

The data are mainly obtained by electronic data interchange (EDI) from payroll administrations. The survey contains information about the earnings and working hours of employees as well as some characteristics of their jobs. The SEE has a complicated sampling design: for most of the larger enterprises the data is available on register basis, whereas for the smaller enterprises a sample is taken. The SEE has more than 3 million records. The unit of the SEE is a job: individuals can have more than one job.

The Structural Earnings Survey is produced to present data on earnings in relation to the educational and occupational level of employees. The survey is the result of linking the SEE data on earnings with data on employees from the Population Register (GBA) and the Labour Force Survey (LFS). The data population of SES 2002 consists of jobs of employees who are between 15–64 years and living in the Netherlands. Data on demographic characteristics (like foreign origin) are derived from the GBA, while data on educational attainment and occupation derive from LFS. Because of the much smaller size of the LFS, the SES is only a small sub-sample of the SEE. Earnings are presented as gross monthly earnings as well as gross hourly wages (excluding overtime hours and special remuneration).

#### Integrated jobs file SSD

Both integrated files together with other register data in the SSD (see page 78, above) make it possible to produce labour market data on much smaller sub-populations compared to the Labour Force Survey, which is especially important for producing statistics on the socio-economic position of people of foreign origin. Two components of the SSD are an integrated jobs file of employees and an integrated jobs file on self-employed people.

The integrated jobs file of employees is created through a micro-integration process in which the following sources are used:

- A jobs register, the so-called Employee Insurance Schemes Registration System for Employees (EIS-Employees).\(^{30}\) Number of records: almost 7 million.
Survey on Employment and Earnings (SEE), as explained above. One of the main reasons to use the SEE in addition to the jobs register is that it supplies information on two variables missing in the register, namely 'time usually worked' and 'place of working'.

FIBASE register. The FIBASE register is a fiscal administrative database, in which data are stored on labour and social security income that is subject to advance tax payments. The FIBASE register is also used to fill in missing data on (often small) jobs. Number of records on jobs at the end of 2000: 7.2 million.

The integrated jobs file of self-employed individuals contains micro-integrated information on employers and self-employed people without employees. The information itself is obtained from the register of final income tax assessments on profits of self-employed people (FITAP). This register unfortunately does not collect data on the exact period during which income was earned. Therefore, it is assumed that those who were registered anytime during the reference year were also employers or self-employed people without employees on specific reference dates, but this assumption might lead to an overestimation of the number of employers and self-employed people without employees on this date. On the other hand, the information on some self-employed people will arrive with a large time lag. Their tax assessment may be arranged much later, perhaps because of a dispute with the fiscal authorities. Number of records in FITAP: almost 1 million.

In the long term, more and more accurate description of socio-economic careers will become feasible from register data. By combining register data on jobs, social security and pensions, it is possible to produce statistics on people who combine various positions like having a small paid job together with social benefits, or pensioners who still have paid work. Next to this, the longitudinal character of the data will also allow for more efficient statistical mapping of labour market dynamics, including departure from and re-entry into the labour market.

Data sources on income

Tax registers are the basis of two main and strongly related data sources of income in Statistics Netherlands: the income panel survey IPO and the regional income survey RIO. Since both data sources are linked to the population register (GBA), income statistics are available on individuals and households of foreign origin. In the longer term the sources will become an integral part of the SSD (page 78).

The IPO is the main data source of income statistics and has existed as a panel since the mid 1980s. It aims to provide annual statistical descriptions of the components and distribution of the incomes of individuals and households in the Netherlands. This survey is based on an administrative sample of approximately 75,000 'core individuals', supplemented by members of their households, for a total of about 210,000 individuals. The Dutch Tax and Customs Administration provides most of the data on income, but these data are enriched with some data from other administrative sources, such as registers which collect information on student grants or housing benefit. The survey is a register-based panel, so the administrative non-response rate is very small (1%). The panel is complemented yearly with samples of 0-year old children and of immigrant individuals and households. The IPO enables statisticians to describe the distribution of different sources of income.
The RIO is very similar and aims to provide regional data on the composition and distribution of incomes. The data sources and procedures are also very much the same, but the number of variables derived from the tax register is much smaller. On the other hand, the sample size of the RIO is much larger and consists of about two million households (or 5.5 million individuals). The main reason for this size is of course that RIO aims to produce statistical outcomes on a low regional level. Since 1995 RIO has also been a panel survey. In the (near) future the RIO should develop into a complete register that will largely replace the functions of IPO.

Income statistics are mainly produced at the household level, but are also available at the individual level, after some assumptions have been made as to how to attribute various common income components in the household to individuals in the household or even to disregard some minor components. To date there has been no harmonised classification of households by foreign origin.

The Labour Inspectorate also produces...

In the figure below the socio-economic position of households of foreign origin consisting of couples with children in which the breadwinner is 25–34 years is pictured in comparison to similar native Dutch households (defined according to the origin group of the breadwinner in the household). Compared to the native Dutch household (=100) four characteristics are pictured from left to right: the mean standardised disposable income, percentage of households in which breadwinner is in paid work, percentage of two-earner households among all households and percentage of owner-occupier households. Westerners followed by Surinamese are rather close to the mean socio-economic level of native Dutch households, while the indicators are suggesting that Moroccans are lagging far behind.

Figure 4.2. The socio-economic situation for couples with children where the main breadwinner is 25–34 years, 2001.
data on wages based on information gathered from companies, but presents results for Western and non-Western foreigners together, so that the percentages are different. Self-reported forms such as the Wage Indicator Survey 2002 utilise employee data submitted by visitors to a website and are thus not representative.

**Disadvantage as a Consequence: Poverty Indicators**

Under the Dutch Constitution, securing the living conditions of the population is an object of concern for the government. In principle, the existence of welfare provisions implies that no citizen should be forced to live below the social minimum. Data indicating dependency on social benefits are available from Statistics Netherlands, showing the number of benefit recipients as a percentage of the corresponding sex, age and ethnic background groups in the Dutch population. Information at the individual level is available in SSD (see above).

However, poverty is not defined by welfare dependency only. Different definitions are applied in the monitors devised for specific government policies aimed at tackling poverty. Ideally, poverty levels should be measured by determining the size of the group of people whose income is involuntarily below the minimum required for the satisfaction of ‘accepted’ basic needs. Rather often, it is assumed that the extent to which households are able to meet their basic needs depends on their disposable income, and poverty is therefore measured by the number of households whose income lies below a certain level. But in monitoring poverty, it may be more useful if the income thresholds and levels are based on more nuanced definitions: the social policy minimum, the low-income threshold, and the relative poverty threshold (Vrooman & Hoff, 2004).

### Table 4.1. Share of private households on (long-term) low income and Income below or around statutory minimum, by ethnic group, 2000 (percent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low income</th>
<th>Long-term low income</th>
<th>Income below or around statutory minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Western ethnic minorities of whom:</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccans</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinamese</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antilleans / Arubans</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-Western ethnic minorities</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous population</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Netherlands data collection started in 2005 for a new European poverty monitor (SILC).\textsuperscript{31} 32 Until information from SILC becomes available, existing registers will be checked to see whether it is possible to gather income data from them. The Socio-Economic Panel data from CBS of 2002 contains a number of questions that may be useful in monitoring social exclusion. Other surveys at the European level that provide information about aspects of social exclusion are the European Social Survey (ESS) and the Living Conditions and Quality of Life in Europe project. The ESS project developed a questionnaire which was used in 24 countries (including the Netherlands) in the autumn of 2002 (Jehoel-Gijsbers, 2004).

Experienced Discrimination Related to Income

The Dutch Equal Treatment Commission has taken up cases of wage discrimination based on ethnicity since 1994. There is no case law from the courts on wage discrimination with regards to race or ethnic origin. The only reference point are the rulings of the ETC. From 1998 to 2003, the number of rulings on wage discrimination with regards to race or ethnic origin was 29. Of these, 13 cases were decided in favour of the complainant. In the remaining 16 cases, wage discrimination could not be established. Of the 13 positive rulings, eight were very similar and concerned the application of the collective labour agreement for Cultural Minorities and Interpreters.\textsuperscript{33} Before 1996, not a single wage discrimination case based on race was brought before the ETC; in the succeeding years, the number increased somewhat. In 2003, the ETC handled only one case.\textsuperscript{34}

In equal pay cases, statistics are used as supplementary evidence only. At present, the ETC’s investigative powers are limited. Of its own accord, the ETC can only investigate a whole branch or an individual case, but not a company or small groups of companies. The ETC is currently developing ‘Quickscan’ equal pay, a software program designed to indicate differences in pay within one company or a small group of companies. With this information the ETC will be able to investigate whether or not the instant case involves discrimination.

At present, the ETC investigates any structural differences in pay related to race and nationality using a diagram, with a different pay curve for each category of employees (e.g. different curves for employees of Moroccan origin and employees of Dutch origin). In this diagram a curve of the average salary of all employees is also included. These pay curves show the relationship between the level of the job and the salary level per category of employees (sometimes this also includes a ‘correction’ because of the details of the situation of the employees involved). In principle the corrected pay curves should not differ. By making a separate pay curve for the complainant and the employee(s) he or she is comparing his or her salary with, it is possible to determine whether there are individual or structural differences in pay between certain categories of employees. This method helps the ETC to determine whether or not there is unequal pay on the basis of race or nationality.

The ETC has experience in using average wage levels of other workers in comparable jobs, which has led to satisfying results. Where a suitable comparator has not been available within the company of the complainant, the ETC has looked to other companies in order to find a comparator. For example, in the case of a complaint by a Turkish employee and an
Antillean employee of a printing company (Case 2001-52), the ETC established that co-workers of Dutch origin who performed similar work earned more than employees from ethnic minority backgrounds.

Discussion

Different methodological choices in surveying target populations’ experiences of discrimination need to be considered. Firstly, in the organisation of survey and register data linkages, it is important to consider two technical aspects: which linking keys exist and what is their possible use?

Secondly, conceptual issues of delimiting what is considered (indirect) discrimination are at stake. Statistical analyses of labour market outcomes as a function of ethnic origin can suggest but never fully demonstrate direct or indirect discrimination. Alternative explanations for the dramatic ‘ethnic gap’ in e.g. employment refer to differences in resources between immigrant and native populations that are relevant to their work performance, but that are not captured by the classic indicators of human capital: formal qualifications and age or experience (Veenman 2001). For example, the job search techniques of ethnic minorities may be less effective than that of native Dutch competitors, because they lack valuable social skills and personal networks. Also the strategies used by employers to reach them may be in need of adaptation. Some ethnic minority members may also be at a disadvantage due to ambivalent or negative work attitudes, possibly as a consequence of previously experienced discrimination.

A methodological approach which has been used and which allows for rather reliable information is that of triangulation using situation testing (Bovenkerk, 1993; Bovenkerk, Gras & Ramsoedh, 1995). It provides additional information helpful in ruling out competing explanations of statistical analyses of ethnic penalties by complementing these with two alternative research methods (triangulation). Triangulation in the field of labour market has been based on combining data from victim studies with employer studies that report discriminatory attitudes and behaviour among employers as ‘gate keepers’ of the labour market. In his review of research on discrimination, Veenman (2003) gives a very good overview of the main research methods and findings, and their limitations, in the Dutch context.

One type of employer research is aimed at demonstrating unequal treatment by employers, using a ‘situation test’ where employers are confronted with matched applicants of ethnic and Dutch origin. Research among Dutch employers using the situation test has clearly demonstrated that ethnic applicants are more often turned down in job interviews than an equivalent applicant of native Dutch origin (e.g. Gras, Bovenkerk, Gorter, Kruiswijk & Ramsoedh, 1996). Complementary evidence comes from employer studies focusing on ethnic attitudes and behavioural intentions rather than actual behaviour, that test the presence or absence of a motive to discriminate against ethnic minorities. According to Veenman (1995), about one in ten Dutch employers is overtly opposed to hiring immigrant applicants. But negative images of the work performance of ethnic minorities – which may motivate discriminatory practices – are much more widespread. Moreover, it has been shown that these images are not usually based on actual negative experiences with ethnic minority employees (Kruisbergen & Veld, 2002).

A third methodological issue concerns
the design of questionnaires on experienced discrimination and the desired level of comparability with previous surveys in this field (e.g., Lange, 1997). In order to be able to compare results, the questionnaire should be as similar as possible in the formulations used for relevant items. However, in some cases questions may appear to work less well in different national contexts, and reformulation may be useful (ter Wal, 2003). In other cases, the existing questionnaire may be extended. For example, an additional useful question to the questionnaire used by Lange (1997) might be whether the respondent has received hostile treatment (insults or other harassment) from colleagues, superiors, or clients/patients. Finally, in terms of time- and resource-saving strategies, it might be an idea to reduce the number of answer options in the questions about discrimination in Lange (1997) to “no” or “at least 1-2 times”, thus deleting the options 1-2 times, 3-4 times, and 5 times or more.35

As far as the content of questions is concerned, when designing questionnaires or questionnaire sections about subjective discrimination, non-domain specific and very generic questions are too imprecise and are not recommended, especially if this data will later be compared with complaints data. It may be interesting however to be able to combine questions about perceived individual and perceived group discrimination for some areas/domains, as has been done in previous research in the Netherlands.36

Fourthly, cross-national comparative research needs to take into account different national terminologies of discrimination. While following the same European legal framework, official bodies may choose to adopt a different definition of discrimination, as is the case for the Dutch ETC, in order to be better aligned with the general official and civil society orientation on these issues. Moreover, categorisation of grounds of discrimination may not be the same in all countries. The Dutch Equal Treatment Commission and the ADBs use religion as a separate discrimination ground. Other countries may perhaps interpret discrimination on the grounds of religion as a racialised or ethicised feature, so that it would be classified as discrimination on the grounds of race/ethnicity. More generally, shifting definitions and practices in terms of ‘race’ and ethnicity need to be taken into account from a comparative perspective. When confronted with different juridical definitions of (indirect) discrimination working with an operational definition for the purpose of the research must be considered.

Finally, different definitions of risk populations must be considered when aiming at comparison; the Netherlands has a particular background in this respect too. In the Dutch case, one specific characteristic is that of the large number of descendants of immigrants or second-generation immigrants, and the importance of generational differences in education and employment statistics. When comparing with countries that do not have such a (large) second generation, this must be taken into account. Comparability is also affected by the ethnic groups or sub-sample of ‘risk populations’ selected for a survey. Following Lange (1997), the design of the EUMC surveys was based on continental categories (one group for each continent), and sought to have at least one group with the same national origin across countries where possible (e.g., Moroccans). Cross-national comparison also requires that different definitions of risk populations be taken into account, due to different immigration histories and policies devised for ethnic minorities or immigrant populations.

35) In presentation of results the specification of the proportion of respondents that have been discriminated against “3-4 times” or “5 times or more” is often not used, so collapsing the answer categories into two main ones would not reduce the comparability with previous data.

36) There may be interesting differences between perceived group and individual discrimination, also when allowing for comparison with perceived disadvantage among a control group of majority origin (Swyndegouw and Phalet, 1999).
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5. Reflections based on the Country Chapters

Eero Olli, SMED

The three country chapters on Denmark, the Netherlands, and Norway have described how target populations are defined, as well as giving an overview over the available data sources that can be used to measure discrimination, particularly in the domains of education, the labour market and income. In addition, the country chapters have given a brief summary of what is considered possible with regard to using these sources to say something about discrimination within each country. This chapter aims to draw comparisons between the three country chapters. This will allow us to draw some preliminary conclusions on the potential of the available material, and pinpoint issues that need to be solved before more robust ways of measuring discrimination can be found.

Linking Registers Together

One thrust of this project has been our belief that the existing register data has underutilised in the study of discrimination to date. The country chapters suggest that it is possible to link data at the individual level about education, labour market and income together with information about country-backgrounds, time of immigration and so forth. We had not expected that the same possibilities existed in the Netherlands as in Norway and Denmark, because of the lack of a centralised population register, but even there, register data is used extensively. Having data of the whole population available allows for a much more detailed analysis of outcomes, and provides new possibilities for statistical matching and forms of analysis that seldom are possible with surveys. Common to all three countries is that the individual level linking of registers, i.e. to build micro-datasets, can only be done by, or within, the national statistical offices. The main reason is the legal protection of privacy. Should these agencies be given the task of finding measures for discrimination using register data, there should not be major difficulties in actually obtaining the necessary permissions and performing the linking we are suggesting.

Defining Target Populations

The three countries differ in terms of the composition of their minority populations. In addition, there are differences as to how the minorities are defined. The common definition available is to use a combination of an individual's and their parent's places of birth to build a measure distinguishing first- and second-generation migrants, together with their country of origin. The positive side of this definition is that it is available in registers, it is stable over time, it is reliable, and likely to be comparable. But there are several problems. An individual's place of birth does not equal ethnicity, religion, nor race. Since we are analysing these data in the context of ethnic discrimination, this is a valid reservation. A category such as place of birth does not enable us to distinguish old national minorities like the Sami in Norway or the Germans in Denmark. In other words, there are many questions that cannot be answered without supplementing register data with information about ethnicity, religion or membership in protected national minority groups. And in some cases there are legal restrictions prohibiting either the building of these types of registers, or the linking of these register to other registers.

There are also differences as to how the second generation is defined, but as long as the original variables are available, 1) Norway is currently building a register of membership in religious communities, which will be used for distributing state funding to these organizations. However, linking this information with other personal information is explicitly prohibited.
recategorisation is a simple procedure. It is possible to include variables that distinguish second generation immigrants who have one majority-origin parent (as in the Netherlands) from the second-generation immigrants with two foreign-born parents (as in Denmark and Norway).

At present our approach includes only immigrants, which is a limitation as far as the study of discrimination is concerned. However, if our aim is to find a practical and comparable measure of discrimination, it is perhaps sufficient. In developing tools to enable us to measure discrimination we accept that it is worthwhile to explore the possibilities of existing sets of register data on immigrants in combination with other sources of information. Immigrants represent a large group of people, and findings on discrimination are of interest in general, as well as in the context of integration. It is also easy to include some of the other protected grounds of discrimination such as gender and age by using existing registers. It is important to bear in mind that persons of immigrant origin do not represent all those exposed to discrimination on ethnic grounds. In the long term, we hope that some of the methods and findings will be transferable to other ethnic minorities and other grounds of discrimination.

**Education**

In modern societies education has become increasingly important as a required qualification in the labour market. Without the ‘right’ education many avenues of advancement are closed.

Both Norway and Denmark keep registers of the highest level of education which members of the population have obtained within the country. For immigrants this register is supplemented by information about the highest level of education obtained abroad, collected through surveys. In other words, information on education obtained within the country is good, whereas the quality of the information obtained abroad is weaker, due to the lack of information for some immigrants.

Registers detailing the highest levels of education obtained are not available in the Netherlands. Currently, information about the highest level of education obtained in the Netherlands or abroad is collected through several surveys, some of which also include information on language competence. Statistics Netherlands is working on the linking of information on educational attainment from surveys and other data sources into the SSD to provide such data on the individual level.

In other words, in Norway and Denmark it is possible to describe both the level and field of education at the individual level, with the help of the international ISCED standard. In the Netherlands, it is currently possible only to describe the level of education for target groups with the help of ISCED, while the field of education is described with a native standard. Individual-level descriptions are not available yet.

**Labour Force**

Discrimination can occur in many areas of life, including the labour market. We believe that a measure of discrimination should include labour market attachment for two reasons. Firstly, participation in the labour force is the means of gaining an income and livelihood, and becoming an integrated member of the society. Secondly, the labour market is a field where internationally comparable data already exists and which could potentially be utilised within our project.

In many European countries the Labour Force Survey is much-utilised source of information concerning labour
market attachment. However, despite its relatively large sample size, it is not sufficient to capture smaller target groups, such as ethnic minorities, in large enough numbers. Therefore, other registers are used to supplement information from LFS.

Statistics Norway combines several registers that enable individual-level analysis of employment, self-employment, unemployment etc. International classifications of branch of industry (NACE rev 1) and occupation (ISCO88) are also available.

Statistics Netherlands maintains an employment database that is created through combining registers and information from LFS. Information is available based on the same international classifications.

Statistics Denmark maintains a labour force database (RAS) with classifications based on ILO recommendations. Information is available based on the same international classifications.

Due to long-term cross-national efforts to harmonise and increase comparability in this field, it is possible to use the same classifications in all countries.

Income
Income is a seemingly simple, but simultaneously complex measure. Money is a language everyone understands, while gauging income differences is a difficult exercise. However, even in this field, various countries have harmonised income indicators, and it is therefore possible to rely on existing indicators in our present endeavour. Our interest is in the absolute and relative levels of income and the composition of that income.

Statistics Norway combines many registers that provide information on net income, taxes, social support, social insurance and benefits of various kinds on the individual level. By combining this information with the Central Population Register, nuclear family information is also available. Statistics Denmark also has a register-based system of income levels and source that can be used to give income distributions at both the individual and nuclear family level. Statistics Netherlands maintains the SSD database that contains, among other things, information on income levels and composition at the individual, household and nuclear family levels.

In all three countries absolute and relative levels of income and income composition can be presented at both the individual and nuclear family levels.

Summary
It appears to be possible to create a ‘backbone’ of micro-data of complete populations containing variables distinguishing target populations, their educational background (albeit with less detail from the Netherlands), labour market attachment and income levels and compositions in each of the three countries based on comparable classifications. These registers also contain information about place of residence, age, gender etc., thus enabling descriptions of outcomes, outcome gaps and trends over time. This highly differentiated and reliable data can be used as a framework of reference and comparison. Such sets of outcome data could also potentially allow for extensive analytical triangulation to surveys and case descriptions.

Triangulating Sources of Data for the Measurement of Discrimination
We asserted above that one possible way of approaching discrimination is to establish four elements: a level of outcome, interpreted as a disadvantage or unjustifiable equal outcome; the lack of justification for this; and a connection to a distinction defining a target population (See page 13 of the introduction).
Further work is needed to clarify the difference between data sources and data types, and how they relate to discrimination. This table both exaggerates and hides some of the differences between the data sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1. Relating Sources of Data to Aspects of Discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome difference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case descriptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We need the different sources of data to establish all four aspects. The register data allows us to describe levels and trends in outcomes, and to define membership in the relevant target population. Surveys allow us to look at experiences of disadvantage and discrimination, and can also be used to test many alternative explanations for discrimination. Case descriptions are needed, on the one hand, to suggest where to look for discrimination: they provide examples of discrimination that help to identify the groups subjected to discrimination, and to exemplify disadvantage. On the other hand, case descriptions can qualify a disproportionate outcome as potential discrimination.

In other words, we believe it should be possible to establish that certain outcome differentials (or unjustifiable equal outcomes) are connected to discrimination. For example, if a particular minority group receives lower pay for comparable work, and there are documented cases of this type of discrimination against members of this minority group, it is reasonable to suspect that some of the income gap can be attributed to discrimination. If in addition one can establish with the help of surveys that a certain proportion of this minority group experiences discrimination in their working life, and that there are discriminatory attitudes amongst employers, the suspicion will be further strengthened. However, it will never be possible to establish what the precise level of discrimination is. Discrimination is by its nature a hidden process that can only be approached by a process of approximation.

**Surveys**

Surveys can provide many different kinds of information—outcomes not available in registers, experiences of discrimination, and information needed to evaluate alternative explanations. The triangulation can be carried out in several ways, and the items mentioned below are just examples, not an exhaustive list.

First, findings from survey research may be used as arguments, supplementing other research, and vice versa, and no real linking or mapping is performed. This is a rather superficial triangulation.

Second, if common categories are used, for example for target populations, aggregate-level information can be used in several ways. The survey results can be reported on the aggregate level and inserted as contextual information in the micro-data or calculation models. For example, if a survey
establishes the levels of experienced discrimination for several target groups, this information can be imputed into the micro-data. In other words, if a survey establishes that 20% of the men and 10% of women of Pakistani background experience discrimination in the workplace, this can be added to the micro-data as estimates of probability of experiencing discrimination for this target population.

Third, it is possible to use outcome gaps from register data (aggregate-level information for the population as a whole) to supplement information collected with a survey.

Fourth, it is possible to link information between surveys and registers at the individual level. This can be used to improve survey design. Registers can be used to select people for surveys, in order to sample small groups that, at present, are not included in large enough numbers in surveys. Registers can also be used to improve surveys by better adjusting sampling to expected levels of response. Moreover, registers can be used to analyse selective non-response, as this would provide information on both those who did and those who did not reply.

Fifth, it is possible to extract background information (such as country background, age, and many other types of outcomes) from registers that can be used to enrich and validate the data collected through the survey. The extent to which highly sophisticated analyses can be carried out increases when statistical agencies with access to register data are involved in the execution of the surveys and can link data from surveys to register data.

Complaints and Case Law

We believe that when complaints data is properly categorised and collected, it can provide information about the presence of discrimination in particular arenas for particular groups. Multivariate approaches measuring discrimination are unable to surmount the causality limitation (‘if there is something we cannot explain, it could be discrimination’).

As discrimination is one of the hidden – unmeasurable – variables, it becomes a component of the unexplained error or variance in the analyses. We argue that if they are properly mapped, complaints and case descriptions may provide the information necessary to legitimate claims that some of the unjustifiable differences in outcome are connected to discrimination.

Complaints and legal cases can be used as examples of discrimination, but their usability is reduced as they are not systematised in a manner that allows for mapping to other data sources. In addition the number of court cases is low in the countries in our project. At present the main value of these complaints and court cases is that they can highlight areas where particular groups experience discrimination, which again can be used to target surveys towards these areas. In addition, case descriptions can improve our understanding of the arenas, social agents and processes involved in discrimination, which in turn can aid us in creating means of measuring discrimination, and in the interpretation of the figures later on.

A lack of complaints should not be seen as evidence of a lack of discrimination, as the likelihood of a complaint being made and registered is largely a result of how the system for receiving and
handling complaints is organised. The number of complaints is also a product of individuals’ access to justice and their knowledge of the existence and perception of the benefits of lodging complaints.

In Norway, the Centre for Combating Ethnic Discrimination has collected information on the complaints it receives that makes it possible to establish the presence (but not the prevalence) of discrimination against a target group in different areas of life. It is also possible to distinguish between the total number of complaints, which serve as indicators of the aggregate number of discrimination incidents experienced, and the limited number of complaints where the lawyers believe that discrimination is the most probable explanation, which would serve as indicators of more objective forms of discrimination. The Ombud for Equality and against Discrimination will be established soon in Norway. There are no rulings by the Ombud yet and few of the new laws protecting ethnic minorities have been tried in court.

In the Netherlands, the Equal Treatment Commission collects information on complaints and makes rulings. The number of rulings is low, and it is unclear if sufficient data is available to enable the drawing of conclusions about particular target groups. Simple statistics about grounds of discrimination are published annually. Local Anti-Discrimination Bodies collect statistics on many types of complaints, and their national federation publishes these annually. The relevant institutions are currently working to improve the collection and categorisation of this information.

In Denmark, the Complaints Committee on Ethnic Equal Treatment was established in 2003. The number of complaints that are deemed to be within the mandate of the complaints body is low compared to the total number of incoming complaints. The Danish Human Rights Institute is working on a project to systematise case descriptions.

In general, it would be valuable to find examples of how the complaints that local bodies receive are systematised. A systematisation of such complaints according to common definitions of target groups and social background variables would provide valuable information. In addition, some form of harmonised classification of areas and natures of complaints should be developed and implemented across national borders to allow further comparison. This is an issue that presents many methodological challenges and is dealt with only briefly here, but represents a potentially valuable area for gathering information on measuring discrimination.

### Situation Testing

Results from situational testing can be used to triangulate against other data sources. Situational testing is an experimental technique which attempts to isolate causality and link observed differences to discrimination with more certainty.

Testing is a way of measuring differences in treatment by housing agencies, employers and public service providers who are attributable to the race of the applicant. The testers, who are as similar as possible in all respects except race, act as house seekers or job applicants, etc. and the way they are treated is compared, to see if any differences observed may be a result of racial discrimination (CRE 1990: 7).

Situational testing can provide information concerning the prevalence of objective discrimination in a particular setting. This technique is limited to arenas where the social interaction is of short duration and repetitive, so that it is possible to compare the outcome for a matched pair
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(two applicants with different ethnicities but otherwise sharing similar characteristics), for example in finding housing or getting a job.

Properly designed and executed this method can make generalisations possible, and be a valuable addition to complaints and case descriptions, as situational testing indicates not only the presence but also the prevalence of discrimination. Because situation testing is a labour-intensive method, the number of tests is often low as a result, and only a few target populations can be compared. In order to be used for triangulation the categories used must be harmonised and clearly presented.

What to Look for?

Outcome gaps

The search for statistical evidence for discrimination is closely related to the identification of unjustifiable outcome gaps, which again depends upon having variables available that enable us to distinguish target groups from each other. The quality of the measurement of outcomes is of little interest if we do not have valid and reliable ways of distinguishing the groups that are subject to discrimination from those groups that are not.

Because the datasets that can be created from register- or census-data are large, they enable us to perform analyses that seek out combinations of variables. Too often minorities are lumped together and analysed as part of large units that obscure the internal diversity of the relevant groups. We know for example that there are minority groups with higher than average education and others with education levels much lower than the majority average level of education. Perhaps we should compare smaller groups like the highly educated women between 40–50 who have been in the country for more than 15 years? What kind of influence does country background have? Where do individuals from each different group work, and in what kind of positions? What is the level, distribution and composition of their income?

The effects of discrimination should be visible in a skewed distribution of outcomes. At present it is unclear if discrimination should be approached through averages for target groups, or whether we should perhaps pay more attention to the form of distribution. Discrimination is not yet well understood, and it is not clear what kinds of changes in income distribution are connected to discrimination. One can argue that discrimination reduces social mobility, and can best be seen as a glass ceiling (a metaphor used in the gender equality discussion) that the resourceful members of target groups meet. In this case the resourceful members suffer from discrimination. Discrimination may be seen as a question of thresholds, where discrimination becomes the equivalent of a higher threshold which certain members of society are forced to try to cross. In this case the minority individuals or groups with low resources are affected most, as they do not make it over the threshold. It can also be argued that discrimination affects the whole group in the same way, as a generalised form of distrust or dislike. In this case the form of the distribution does not change, only the level. One could also find all three of the aforementioned changes in distributions present at the same time.

Unjustifiable Similarities

Sometimes discrimination can manifest itself in the form of unjustifiable similarities, as when two persons with quite different educations have similar work or similar pay for quite different work. Thus the search for discrimination should not
be limited only to outcome gaps, but should also include processes of discrimination that lead to unjustifiable similarities.

**Relative Outcomes**

Using absolute levels of income in comparisons between countries is difficult. By transforming the level of income measurement to a relative measure of income within the country, some of the comparative problems are reduced. There are several well-established measures of disadvantage that could be applied, such as the *relative poverty threshold*, which is defined as 60% of the median disposable income of a country. Another alternative is some version of *equivalence income*, which takes family size among other things into account.

**What about Alternative Explanations?**

During the process of writing the country chapters several alternative theories on the origins of outcome gaps were presented, for which some explanation should be provided. Lack of justification is one of the elements that need to be established before a differential outcome can be related to discrimination.

Perhaps the most important step in interpreting data is to give serious consideration to plausible variables, not present in the analysis or even in the data set [...] (Davis 1985: 66).

In Norway, *duration of stay* has shown itself to be one of the strongest predictors of labour market participation. There are differences between groups in how fast they find employment, and the level where the positive development stops. The lesson seems to be that how long a group or individual has been in the country must somehow be taken into account.

In the Netherlands, some research indicates that *parents’ education and social class* can explain a large portion of the differences in outcomes. This is closely related to the social mobility argument, and can be seen as social mobility across generations. When government policies do not remove the effects of parents’ low education in the majority population, how can we expect this in the minority populations? However, the issue is complicated, as discrimination also occurs within the field of education. More conceptual work is needed to clarify whether and if so how parents’ education should be taken into account.

This question can be transformed to ask what kind of social mobility (range and rate) can we expect? However, it is possible that social mobility is more an issue of integration than of discrimination. In Norway the presence of social mobility among migrant groups has been used as an indicator of integration: as long as there is social mobility, things are getting better. This is a conceptual issue that also needs to be solved.

The Danish country report uses *health* as one explanatory variable, and some research points towards that health problems can explain some of the differences in outcomes. There are several reasons as to why a target group’s health can be worse than the majority’s. First, they may arrive in poor health, something that is not unlikely for refugees. Second, their health may weaken in the receiving country, due to an unfavourable working environment or other related issues. The first cause would not constitute a case of discrimination in the receiving country, whereas the second could be a form of discrimination. More conceptual work is needed to clarify whether and if so how health should be
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accounted for. Information about health is not available through registers, and needs to be collected via surveys. However, it is possible that information about the composition of received benefits could be used to uncover some of the effects of poor health.

It will also be important to establish some form of consensus on which variables it is sufficient to control for in order to claim the presence of discrimination. It is impossible to make an exhaustive list of relevant variables, but the list should include enough variables such that the measure of discrimination will have legitimacy.

There are very few “whopper” effects in social science. The variables you left out might make things stronger or weaker but if something had a massive correlation with your Xi and Xj, you would probably have heard about it (Davis 1985: 66).

The choice of included and excluded variables should be informed and influenced by practical, political, legal, and methodological considerations.

It is possible that the measurement of discrimination with such a certainty that it cannot be disputed is an impossible task. There will always be components of discrimination that are not included, and there are will always be alternative explanations that are left out. Perhaps the most realistic alternative is to have the measurement of differential outcomes be controlled for a few of the most important factors.

Ideas for Future Work
Expanding to Countries with Weaker Registers
Not all countries have a tradition of collecting demographic and socioeconomic data on their population in registers. From 2006, the second year of the project, new participants will join us from Portugal and the Czech Republic. Their input will enable us to evaluate, how this approach might or might not be applied in their countries, and what other alternative routes might be available.

Poverty and Social Exclusion Indicators (EU)
The Netherlands country report points out how Eurostat has developed indicators for social exclusion and poverty which in the future will be available as individual-level information. This includes information about lack of social participation, normative integration, material deprivation and access to services to which every citizen is entitled. An evaluation of how this information can be utilised to measure discrimination should be performed. It seems obvious that by using this information much can be gained with regard to cross-country comparisons. However, some conceptual clarifications are necessary, including the issue of what the relationship is between social exclusion and the different forms of discrimination.

Social Cohesion Indicators
Eurostat also provides European Structural Indicators measuring social cohesion.

These include: inequality of income distribution, at-risk-of-poverty-rate, at-persistent-risk-of-poverty rate, dispersion of regional employment rates, early school-leavers, long-term unemployment rate, and population in jobless households. A proper evaluation should be performed concerning whether and if so, how, some of the existing indicators for social cohesion could be utilised to measure discrimination. In addition, The European Council has recently published Concerted development of social cohesion indicators – methodological guide, which presents a comprehensive reference framework for

4) http://epp.eurostat.ec.eu.int
how one can proceed in the development of measurement. This guide does provide many general guidelines that will also apply for the development of measurements of discrimination. The aim of the report is to provide examples of which indicators can be chosen (2005: 109). They provide a large number of possible indicators, some also related to evaluation of employment and income for the minority population. We should evaluate which portions of the general approach presented in the methodological guide also apply to the field of measuring discrimination.

**Contextualisation**

The interpretation of quantitative data can be facilitated by the inclusion some contextual information in the data. The need for contextual information depends on the analytical purpose, and while it is reasonable that some contextual information be included, it should be limited to a few items. However, comparison across nations (or over time) requires more contextualisation than a simple analysis of discrimination. For example, the employment figures for a target population are likely to be more affected by the national and regional-level economic situation than by discrimination. Aggregate-level background data such as unemployment levels in the state, region and municipality can be added to a micro-data set as contextual information. A substantial amount of this type information is available through the national statistical institutions and through Eurostat. Another type of contextual information is the inclusion of information concerning national migration and integration policies. It could be also be useful to have more information about target groups that would help to select the right groups for comparisons across countries. One should also evaluate whether, and if so what kind of, contextual information should be included.

**Collecting Data in Order to Find Agreement**

Some other social phenomena are well understood, and it has been possible to reach agreement upon one indicator that is considered to ‘be’ or represent the phenomena by the stakeholders. An example of this is unemployment. The official unemployment figures are the result of a set of definitions which include some aspects and exclude others. There is no such understanding or consensus across national boundaries or in supranational agencies concerning discrimination.

We believe that the first priority should be to try to understand the different aspects of discrimination better, so that in the future it may be possible to reach an agreement as to what aspects of discrimination can be measured with sufficient precision to enable them to be used as a indicator of discrimination as whole.

It is possible that no such measure can be found, and that one will have to settle for measuring one or several separate aspects of discrimination, like disparate outcomes or experienced discrimination. But even in this case, knowledge of how the different aspects of discrimination relate to each other is required. Defining indicators or an index for discrimination is a task that must be left for future.

**Developing Recommendations**

One of the main goals for this project is to develop recommendations measuring discrimination. We are now arriving at the end of the first year of this two-year project. The following chapter discusses a number of factors which may be included in recommendations. These are presented here as an item for discussion. Recommendations endorsed by the group will be presented in the final report in the end of year two.
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The ultimate goal of the project is comparability, as we are attempting to develop a methodology that can produce comparable data across Europe for describing and analysing discrimination. We must bear in mind that comparability in this context is never perfect, but always useful nonetheless. Even with exactly the same definitions of variables, the same survey design, identical questions in surveys etc., differences related to national settings (contextual differences) will always remain. Our approach aims to reduce the effects of these differences in settings, but they will never be negligible.

When doing comparative research based on national datasets, and with only a very limited ability to produce tailor-made surveys or other data collections, we can at best hope for the use of harmonised definitions in these sets; we will seldom have harmonised sources. Every country will have at least some existing sources that can be used, and as long as the vital definitions are the same, this will be the best we can hope for in this context. In this sense, we have the same level of ambition as Eurostat has for most of their European databases. This approach is normally known as output harmonisation, i.e. using the same definitions in different sources. Harmonisation of input, or using exactly the same sources in every country, is often considered to be the ideal solution, but this involves considerable expense, and can only be achieved in a few statistical areas. The European Labour Force Survey is one example of that, but as we have seen, even this source will be of limited usefulness.

In the conventions and directives aimed at fighting discrimination, a principal distinction is made between direct and indirect discrimination. Register data provides information on differences in outcome. With the help of statistical techniques we can measure the combined effect of many small events, but we cannot distinguish between these two forms of discrimination using register data alone.

Complaints registered with anti-discrimination bodies offer examples of both direct and indirect discrimination, and may be a particularly useful way to learn more about direct discrimination. However, even in the complaints category, there is a certain need to adhere to standard definitions, and some of the recommendations in this note will also be relevant for comparing the results from these sources. The most important definition may be that of target populations, namely those who are defined to be the target group in our comparisons. The target group should be immigrants and their descendants, and not foreign citizens, foreign born or other. Other minority groups, national minorities, age, disability, sexual orientation, etc. are not included in this work, but our analyses may also prove valuable for these groups. In using the term immigrants we refer to individuals born abroad of foreign-born parents, who have migrated to the host country. On the basis of this definition, descendants are those born of two immigrant parents. For a number of countries it will be relevant to increase the number of generations included in the target population.

For comparative purposes, it is necessary to have common sub-groups, but it must also be possible to use specific sub-groups for each country. Indonesian immigrants to the Netherlands represent a group of particular interest for the Netherlands, but there are few Indonesians in Norway or Denmark (or in most other European countries). Thus, in spite of the interest in discrimination against
Indonesians in the Netherlands, comparability can be achieved only on an aggregate level. Thus, the aggregations must be harmonised, or it should at least be possible to aggregate according to the different uses to which the sources are put. The target population also needs to be broken down by other relevant variables, like sex and age, as we know that there may be interaction between different grounds for discrimination. For age, it will be useful to apply the same broad categories in each country, even though there is also a need to apply country-specific aggregations for national purposes.

We need standard aggregations for descriptive purposes, not only for classifications related to grounds for discrimination. Age and sex are of course also important for descriptions. In addition, we need a set of the ‘normal’ background variables, such as education, labour force participation, types of household, social status, principal source of livelihood, housing, etc., and perhaps also immigrant density in the relevant neighbourhood.

For our comparative purposes, there will also be a basic difference in sources measuring objective and subjective discrimination.

For the measurement of objective discrimination, we will be able to rely on the following principal sources, which help us in examining outcome differences, and the degree to which they can be justified:

- Registers
  - Standard meta data information to be included

- Censuses
  - Standard information such as questionnaire, census date, availability of data and publications

- Surveys
  - Target populations
  - Questions used
  - Languages available for the respondents
  - Design and size of the sample
  - Response rates by sub-group
  - Other relevant information

- Situational testing
  - Standard information such as target populations, design, sample size, generalisability

- Arenas of discrimination
  - Labour market
  - Education
  - Other arenas are conceivable

For subjective discrimination, we will be able to rely on the following principal sources in working towards our goals:

- Surveys
  - Target populations
  - Questions used
  - Anders Lange’s questions
  - EUMC-coordinated
  - Language available for the respondents
  - Design and size of the sample
  - Response rates by sub-group
  - Other relevant information

- Cases/Complaints

- Area of discrimination

- Target populations
  - Severity of discrimination

- Arenas of discrimination
  - Labour market
  - Education
  - Other arenas are conceivable
One aim is to recommend methods for making links between objective and subjective discrimination. The list below presents the potential levels of linking in descending order of strength:

- **Matching on the level of the individual:** that is having information about the same individuals concerning both indirect discrimination (primarily from registers) and experiences of discrimination (from surveys). It is unlikely that matching between surveys/registers and complaints will be possible anywhere.

- **Statistical matching:** this is in many senses a way of imputation, and means that for very detailed groups (by national background, age, education, work experience etc.) we are able to relate subjective experiences of discrimination with register information.

- **Aggregate level:** this involves performing measurements on the same groups, defined in the same way to the extent possible in different sources for objective and subjective information.

In all our measurement attempts, there will be different levels of comparability. It will always be necessary to accept lower levels of comparability, but at all stages one should be able to describe all of the details needed to understand the level of comparability. This includes very precise information about meta data. It will not always be possible to have the same definitions, for instance of social class, household typology or labour market position, but the definitions used must be described in such detail that it is possible for external users to evaluate the level of comparability.

Due to the lack of common definitions and classifications, and due to the fact that in many respects there will be contextual differences, we will have to apply and rely upon measures that are coarser than we would normally accept for our national-level analyses. Sometimes the differences will be greater than it is possible to accept for our comparisons, and sometimes the meta data will inform us that our comparisons can be performed. We need to maintain focus on the effects of the inevitable differences that will be present almost everywhere, in order to judge when they are detrimental and when we can live with them.

Our recommendation for triangulation means that in certain circumstances, experiences in one country of linking subjective and objective discrimination, for instance at the individual level of information, can be used for understanding the same relation in other countries.

To be able to profit from this triangulation of methods, it is necessary that the same coding standards be applied to the extent possible. In addition, to make use of harmonised definitions, we will need to apply common coding standards. This is a problem and a scope common to all comparative statistics, and we should recommend that the common coding standards developed for European statistics by Eurostat, and other bodies, are applied everywhere. In particular this applies to the standards for coding of occupation (ISCO), industry (NACE), education (ISCED), country and country aggregations, as well as for households and families, income, social class and other areas.
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### Three tables summarising the country chapters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Netherlands</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other sources</strong></td>
<td>Linking Keys etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target population</strong></td>
<td>Country of origin</td>
<td>GBA, registering system run by municipalities. Mix of national minorities and birthplace.</td>
<td>Self-reported or sample selection based on SSD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| Experienced Discrimination | | SPVA 2002 ERCOMER 1999 Islam EUMC 2002 |

| Education | CBS is working on linking this to SSD | Cohorts by Statistics Netherlands, SPVA, PRIMA survey + CITA, VOCL cohort survey. Foreign education: yes |

| Level | SO12003 matches ISCED primary, secondary and tertiary education. |

| Labour Force | Employment database | SPVA, LFS. Structure of Earnings Survey |

| Participation | Eurostat and ILO definitions available |

| Placement | Branch: SBI 1993, NACE rev.1, ISIC–rev.3.1 | Occupation: SBC =>ISCO |

| Experienced discrimination | Hoogsteder et al., 2001– personal experience & perceived on group level. |

| Income Level | Available on individual and household level. | In future RIO will become part of SDD. | Income panel survey (IPO). Regional income survey (RIO). Both linked to GBA |

| Composition | SSD (employed & self-employed, social benefits) | Survey on Employment and Earnings + LFS => Structural Earnings Survey. |

| Poverty | Eurostat’s Structural indicators database. | SILC will be linkable to SDD. | European Community Household Panel (ECHP). Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (SILC). |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Other Sources Target population</th>
<th>Register</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Complaints (all below by SMED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td>Central Population Register</td>
<td>Same as in registers</td>
<td>country background &amp; self-identified ethnicity, Duration of stay, Identifies national minorities and Sami &amp; Norwegian citizens, Norwegian citizenship, age, gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No national minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No indigenous groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Experienced Discrimination</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living Conditions Survey among non-western immigrants (1996); housing, hate-crime, labour market and healthcare.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short descriptions of the discrimination situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>ISCED is used.</th>
<th>BHU (Populations highest level of education), GSI (primary and lower secondary levels), VIGO (upper secondary education), NUDB (tertiary education), NUDB (tertiary education).</th>
<th>Surveys of Education Completed Abroad. Significant non-response, and no data for newly arrived persons without any education taken in Norway. Linked through BHU.</th>
<th>Level of education: none, primary, secondary and tertiary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Experienced</th>
<th>ISCED is used.</th>
<th>BHU (Populations highest level of education), GSI (primary and lower secondary levels), VIGO (upper secondary education), NUDB (tertiary education).</th>
<th>Surveys of Education Completed Abroad. Significant non-response, and no data for newly arrived persons without any education taken in Norway. Linked through BHU.</th>
<th>Level of education: none, primary, secondary and tertiary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISCED is used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|--------|--------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|                                |

| Norway | Participation | ILO definitions | Register of unemployed | Yes/seeking employment/ student/not-on labour market. |                                |
|--------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|                                |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Experienced discrimination</th>
<th>Available for individuals and nuclear families</th>
<th>Combination of many registers</th>
<th>Annual Income and Property</th>
<th>Not registered.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Available for individuals and nuclear families</th>
<th>Combination of many registers</th>
<th>Annual Income and Property</th>
<th>Not registered.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|--------|---------|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|                                |

|--------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|                                |
Towards Common Measures for Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>Register</th>
<th>Surveys and other sources</th>
<th>Complaints data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td>Country of Origin, No national minorities No indigenous groups No ethnicity groups No religion</td>
<td>Register on Immigrants and Descendants (IEPERS)</td>
<td>Central Personal Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tænketanken om udfordringer for integrationsindsatsen i Danmark, Udlændingenes integration i det danske samfund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual statistics from the National Police 2004 Decisions by the Complaints Committee for Ethnic Equal Treatment at: <a href="http://www.klagekomite.dk/?id=287">www.klagekomite.dk/?id=287</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Report by the Complaints Committee for Ethnic Equal Treatment at: <a href="http://www.klagekomite.dk/n">www.klagekomite.dk/n</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Discrimination</td>
<td>A Survey on integration performed twice a year, Integrationsstatus, Catinét Research September 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>ISCED compatible</td>
<td>Register on Education and Employment (BUE), Education completed abroad available in BUE</td>
<td>The Danish Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs, The Think Tank on Integration in Denmark, Educational choices of immigrants and children of immigrants by Bjørg Colding, Hans Hummelgaard and Leif Husted. Education abroad through surveys included in BUE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>Industry: NACE RAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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