
genderace

The use of racial anti-discrimination laws
Gender and citizenship in a multicultural context

WP5

Methodology Report

January 2009

By

Eleonore Kofman, Erica Howard and Helena Wray

In collaboration with Isabelle Carles and Olga Jubany

Grant 217237

Dissemination: Participants

EC Officer: Angela Liberatore

Deliverable: D 05



Contents

Contents.....	2
1. Introduction.....	3
2. Comparative Research.....	5
2.1 Contested concepts.....	5
2.2 Accessing comparable data.....	6
2.3 Contextualisation.....	11
2.4 Regulatory Ethical Frameworks.....	11
3. Methodology in Practice.....	12
3.1 Methodology Workshop Programme 21 May 2008.....	13
Multiple discrimination.....	13
Compound or additive discrimination.....	13
Intersectional discrimination.....	14
3.2 Application of Methodological Approaches.....	16
References.....	20

1. Introduction

There has been a burgeoning literature on multiple discrimination and the interaction between different axes of discrimination or intersectionality as well as the absence or inadequacy of legal measures to deal with these issues. Much of this literature focuses either on theoretical aspects or on a single country situation with some consideration of differences between two countries. An example of the latter is the comparison of different attitudes towards and systems of multiple discrimination in the UK and Canada or UK and Germany (Moon 2007). Often the analysis of these differences is based on a comparison of significant case studies. Though this is important in furthering our understanding of how multiple discrimination is treated in different states, there has been little attention paid to investigating how multiple discrimination, and especially gender and race, is experienced by a large number of individuals in a range of countries with different histories of migration and anti-discrimination policies and strategies. Even less literature is available on the methodological issues of conducting comparative or cross-national research across a large number of states as is the objective of the Genderace project. Thus in WP5 we firstly address some general aspects of cross-national European research as they apply to this project and then outline the issues, problems and procedures to be followed. In the methodology session (Deliverable D05) held at Middlesex University in London on 20-22 May 2008, we presented some of the key considerations relevant to the application of concepts (definitions provided in the WP6 glossary) and methods to be used in the subsequent empirical research (WP4, WP7 and WP8).

The first section focuses on issues of conducting international comparative research. Given the diversity of historical and contemporary differences in tackling discrimination and the groups that are primarily the target of discrimination, we need to consider the impact of the range of countries within the study. Within this particular study, the countries range from those with long histories of recognition of discrimination and legislation in place to tackle discrimination, especially sex and race (Sweden and UK), to those with only very recent experience (Bulgaria, Spain). In others, such as France and Germany, there had previously been resistance to recognising the ethnic and racial

basis of discrimination and hence of putting in place relevant legislation. In this case the development of EU directives has been crucial in stimulating debate and legislation.

Having selected a range of countries, there are a series of differences, which also impact on the conduct of the research. For the purposes of this project, some of the most significant differences are the basic and often contested concepts, such as ethnicity and race; availability and access to personal data, especially that which is defined as sensitive; the sectors covered by discrimination legislation and data collection, primarily employment and housing; and the regulatory ethical framework governing research into human subjects. These differences may come into play to a greater extent and be more significant in some phases of the project than in others. For example, issues of accessing complainant files, as in WP4, may pose considerable problems in some countries due to the operation of regulatory frameworks and interpretations of data protection and transfer to third parties. On the other hand, there may be fewer problems raised in interviewing stakeholders as in WP7 where access and consent may be obtained directly without the need to rely on intermediaries, such as NGOs and public bodies.

All of these dimensions render the research process extremely complex. However there has been relatively little reflection by researchers on the methodological implications of their research and how in particular they have proceeded from one level and phase to another, from objectives to outcomes and how in their comparative analysis they have sought to connect up the different types of data and results. In this report we have referred in particular to the publications on comparative research methodology produced by some recent European Union projects which have addressed topics such as the selection of countries (Hantrais 2006), contextualisation, the relationship between the production of data and its analysis (Brannen and Nilsen 2006), the meaning and interpretation of contested concepts and their transportability across societies (Cameron and Moss 2006). In addition we have drawn from the valuable surveys of access and availability of ethnic statistics and data protection concerning EU and Council of Europe states (Simon 2004, 2007).

The next section focuses on the major issues confronting comparative research. These include differences in the meaning of concepts, contextualisation, the availability and

coverage of comparable statistical data, and the regulatory framework governing the ethics of the research process with human subjects and its application.

2. Comparative Research

2.1 Contested concepts

Contestation of concepts may take place in a comparative project in a number of ways:

Country unique concepts that are not prevalent in other countries

Contested concepts

Concepts with differing salience

Different examples can be given from past EU projects of concepts with different meanings and salience. Some may be poorly understood in one society, whilst at the same time commonly used in another eg. *précarité*. In *Care Work in Europe: how do we compare?* Claire Cameron and Peter Moss outlined the nuances of meaning in five countries of the core concept of ‘care’. Their conclusion is that:

There is always the need to get results, to be pragmatic, to overcome language difficulties as barriers, and not enough time and space to explore the subtleties of meaning through non-comprehension ...This seems to hold up the work, those representing lesser spoken languages come to regard this as their personal problem...*And yet, it would be precisely the non-understanding which could give us the most valuable clues to differences in meaning, to the need for further clarification of familiar terms and concepts, to the transformation of taken-for-granted perspectives into creative, shared knowledge*

Walter Lorenz, 1999

In the Genderace project, the concepts of ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’ are the most contested. In many countries ‘race’ is not used, usually due to historical reasons and concerns that the use of the word implies the reality of the object ie. that races as a biological division

of society actually exist. Recital 6 of the Council Directive 2000/43/EC *Implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin* states clearly that “The European union rejects theories which attempt to determine the existence of separate human races. The use of the term ‘racial origin’ in this Directive does not imply an acceptance of such theories’. However, though commonly defined as imagined communities and an ideological category, there is still resistance to its application in the classification of populations. Critiques of the fixity of ‘race’ have led to other concepts being developed to give the sense of a more dynamic and constructed, rather than being a biologically fixed, category. For example, the term, ‘racialisation’ (Miles 1989) has been taken up by many scholars (Murji and Solomos 2005). It refers to the ways in which racial ideas are constructed to define differentiated social collectivities and applied as the basis of exclusionary practices.

Ethnicity too has widely varying definitions. The principles and recommendations for population and housing censuses, Revision 2, Draft, United Nations, September 2006 (Simon 2007: 28) affirms it as a social construct with fluid boundaries (cited in Simon 2007). The UN defines it in the following way:

Ethnicity is based on a shared understanding of history and territorial origin (regional and national) of an ethnic group or community as well as on particular cultural characteristics such as language and religion...Ethnicity is multidimensional and is more a process than a static concept, and so ethnic classifications should be treated with moveable boundaries”.

However there is a wide variation in whether data on ethnicity is officially collected with the UK being the only Western European country to do so. In many other countries, place of birth and nationality or citizenship are more likely to be available as proxies of social differentiation.

2.2 Accessing comparable data

In the report in 2006 to the Council and European Parliament on the application of Directive 2000/43/EC (cited Simon 2007:68), the Commission noted the crucial role

which could be played by statistics in activating anti-discrimination policies and referred to the misunderstandings in the relationship between data protection and the production of statistics on discrimination. As we have indicated, there are substantial variations in data collection which are influenced by national conventions. The source of data, the purpose for which they were gathered, the criteria used and the method of collection may vary considerably from one country to another. The categories themselves may change over time reflecting policy concerns and the changing population being studied. In turn this raises issues of how discrimination and equality of opportunity may be measured and monitored without statistical evidence (Simon 2004).

In terms of data relating to individuals, legal provisions come from the European Directive of 1995 95/46/EC “on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data” which has been transposed into all EU countries and aims so as to guarantee citizens’ privacy by enforcing respect for anonymity and to restrict the collection of ‘sensitive’ data (the list of these data will correspond to grounds of discrimination) to certain conditions. All EU states have transposed the Directive on the processing and transmission of the such information. Whilst Article 8 prohibits the processing of personal data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, trade-union membership, and the processing of data concerning health or sexual life, there are a number of principles which authorise exceptions on certain conditions to the collection of what is defined as sensitive data. In some countries interpretation is strict and only data explicitly referring to ‘ethnic’ or ‘racial’ origin’ are prohibited; in others it is broader and includes anything that may act as a proxy, for example nationality, country of birth and name.

All countries include a list of exemptions to the collection of sensitive data but the grounds of exemption are not the same in each state. It may exclude employment or health and vital interests and files kept by NGOs. The latter may be permitted to do keep such data on condition that the processing relates solely to the members of the body and that the data are not disclosed to a third party without the consent of the data subjects (Article 8(2d)). On the other hand, there may be highly sensitive areas such as social welfare where proxies are prohibited even though information is collected in the

census, for example on nationality and place of birth in France¹. Finally states may lay down exemptions for reasons of public interest (Article 8(4), as is the situation in the UK.

As Simon (2004) has commented “When ‘racial’ (or equivalent) categories are created their congruence with the personal identity of individuals is always a subject of dispute, while the extent to which equivalences are realistic determines their salience within a policy on equal treatment”. One of the main constraints to collecting data on discrimination comes from the laws and judicial precedents prohibiting intrusion into people’s private lives and governing the conditions under which computerised data can be collected and disseminated. Different balances may have been struck between the need to identify in order to document discrimination and the protection of people’s private lives and which are often reflected in the ethical regulations and the stringency with which they are applied.

Only the UK has an established tradition of collecting and using data on ethnic minorities and identities (see WP2 section 6.1). It is based on laws and regulations governing the production of sensitive statistics which are laid down in the Race Relations Acts (1976 and 2000) where it is argued that there is a need to collect data for the purposes of ethnic monitoring which can be used to highlight potential inequalities, investigate their underlying causes and remove unfairness and disadvantage (Simon 2007: 42). Promoting equal treatment is also mentioned in the list of exemptions from the Data Protection Act 1998. Apart from Belgium and the Netherlands, other Council of Europe countries have not modified their data protection laws to align them with equal opportunities policies.

Most of the old EU states collect information on country of birth and citizenship, whilst the UK, Ireland and the Netherlands collect information on ethnic group and religion and in Denmark parents’ country of birth. In France permission to collect personal data must be requested from the CNIL whose powers were established with one of the first

¹ The Commission Nationale Informatique et Libertés deemed in 1980 that data in this area could only be collected by three headings: French, EU alien and non-EU alien (Simon 2007: 19).

data protection laws in Europe in 1978. In 2005 it acknowledged “ that the aims of combating discrimination in the matter of employment are legitimate in terms of public interest but considered that in the absence of ethno-racial typologies, on which it expressed strong reservations, there was no purpose to analysing names or nationality (Simon 2007: 49-50). There has been a lively public debate on the collection of ethnic statistics but the decision not to collect such data on race and ethnicity has been reaffirmed in France in the decision of the Constitutional Council in November 2007 to prohibit the use of racial and ethnic origin in studies which seek to measure diversity (Decision no. 2007-557 DC 15 November 2007). However since its inception in 2005 the High Authority against Discrimination and for Equality has been analysing the complaints submitted to it as an indicator of the kinds and grounds of discrimination being experienced (WP2 Annexe 1). Furthermore it has been possible in the past few years to study the situation of descendants of immigrants in France drawn from data on tests for job seekers and applicants for housing.

In Germany, the transposition of Directive 95 in 2003 stipulated that a key condition of the collection of statistics was ensuring that personal consent is obtained. Federal agencies and public sector are subject to greater supervision than private sector organisations. However case law on collection of ethnic statistics is very limited. It is only since 2005 that the migrant background of men and women has been collected in micro censuses (WP2 Annexe 4). However data on discrimination are incomplete. Not only is there no official data on discrimination in employment but there is also little non-official data (Baer 2005 cited in Simon 2007). There is also little public debate on discrimination and anti-discrimination (WP2 Annexe 4) and on the collection of statistics except for some NGOs and researchers. However some larger cities, such as Berlin, Wiesbaden, Essen and Stuttgart, are beginning to set up systems to collect data on integration which includes discrimination. For example, Berlin produced an Anti-Discrimination Report 2005-7 (WP2 Annexe 4).

There is less systematic data available in some countries due to the recency of their immigration flows and/or development of anti-discrimination legislation. Collection of such data may be the subject of interest by academics and undertaken in small scale studies or by NGOs, both of which only yield a very partial coverage, as is the case of

Spain (WP2 Annexe 2). We also have to take into account major differences in significant groups. Though present in all countries, the Roma, probably the most disadvantaged group in Europe, only form a numerically significant population in Bulgaria where they constitute the main victim of discrimination (WP2 Annexe 6).

Significant data for collection also changes over time. Thus familiar categories such as ethnic minority in the UK, which are embedded in legislation and have until recently determined who may benefit from protection against discrimination (WP2 Annexe 3), may impede the way we understand more recent changes that have sought to extend the groups covered by legislation. The categories of data collection on ethnicity need to be flexible and incorporate a subjective appreciation to take account of duration of settlement, mixed marriages and diversification of flows. For example, in the UK the original ethnic classification was developed in response to post colonial migration but has in recent years been modified to take account of political representation by groups such as the Irish, who though 'white', were able to demonstrate considerable discrimination in terms of a number of economic and social indicators. Inter-marriages between ethnic groups have generated an increasing number of children in mixed categories. Discrimination against other 'white' groups such as the Eastern Europeans has become more common but it is difficult to assess due to their inclusion in the broad category of 'white'. Many Middle Eastern migrants also classify themselves as 'white'. These developments require a much more sophisticated understanding of processes of racism and racialisation beyond a simplistic 'black' and 'white' dichotomy. Gender statistics too use the broad ethnic categories rather than country of birth or nationality which would capture more accurately recent changes in immigration and groups subject to discrimination.

Another variation is the collection of data on religion which is included in official statistics in a number of countries such as Bulgaria, Germany, and the UK in the 2001 census but not in ethnic monitoring forms. As Muslims have been subjected increasingly to harassment and discrimination in the past decade, religious identity, including dress, and belief have become the object of exclusionary and discriminatory practices. In this regard, discriminatory practices have a gender dimension, especially in relation to education and employment.

Though only providing limited coverage, it is NGOs who are more likely to collect data on the newly recognised forms of discrimination. As we have noted, NGOs have an important role to play in raising awareness of different forms of discrimination and the interaction between them (Simon 2004), particularly where there is constitutional opposition to the collection of data or simply lack of official data.

2.3 Contextualisation

Contextualisation refers to the way in which we make sense of data assembled as part of a cross national enquiry – how we interpret it in relation to something wider than the cases analysed and data gathered ((Brannen and Nielsen 2006). The interpretation of cross-national data typically means:

- taking account of different types of data. Such data sets are often very different and may involve integrating findings based on qualitative research with those based on quantitative enquiry
- reviewing the literature and making sense of our study findings in relation to the literature
- usually referring to national trend data: it is typical of such enquiry to have a trend mapping phase sometimes involving secondary analysis of such data
- involving the study of documents as in studies that locate themselves in relation to public policy and policies at a supra national level (Brannen 2006)

2.4 Regulatory Ethical Frameworks

Ethical regulation may be imposed externally, often from outside the research community itself, as well as those which lie within the remit of the individual researcher or research team (Freed-Thomas 1994). There are four kinds of ethical research controls, but most existing controls will contain elements of all of these:

1. The **externally imposed**, such as legislation, legal, administrative and contractual arrangements, sanctions, or implementation of technical solutions.

2. **Data protection legislation**, which we have previously discussed in 2.2, relates to the protection of the right to privacy of the data subject. As we have seen the procedures contained in the legislation of the various European countries vary greatly, as does the stringency with which they are imposed.
3. **Internal review board**, to review all proposals for human research before the research is conducted to ascertain whether the research plan has adequately included the ethical dimensions of the project. Many university departments, institutions, hospitals and research organisations have such boards, as do many governmental departments and statistical agencies.
4. **Measures operated by archives, data brokers and electronic gatekeepers or monitors** to ensure that some, at least, of the ethical principles and procedures are not abused and assisting in the administration of sanctions against misuse of research data, particularly statistical data. The effectiveness of these has considerably eased the problems faced by those contemplating data-based research and facilitated access to anonymised data provided by third parties.

3. Methodology in Practice

Methodological considerations are very important in successfully undertaking meaningful comparative research and are addressed throughout the project. Issues of comparability of concepts, contextualisation, access and availability of data, ethical procedures and regulatory frameworks, sampling of interviewees are particularly relevant in the empirical work packages, namely WP4 for complainant files, WP7 stakeholder and expert interviews and WP8 interviews with individual women and men concerning their experience of discrimination and the legal and institutional systems in place.

At the first meeting held in London on 20-22 May 2008, sessions were devoted to clarification of the key concepts, issues that these raise for the outcome of the project and achieving comparability in data and sectors for study in obtaining complainant files.

3.1 Methodology Workshop Programme 21 May 2008

A number of general theoretical issues concerning multiple discrimination and intersectionality and its implementation at European and national levels were presented by Eleonore Kofman, Erica Howard and Helena Wray. The discussion drew upon several key texts (asterisked in references)

In the literature three forms of multiple discrimination are often identified (European Commission 2007, Makkonen 2002).

Multiple discrimination

First of all there is the situation in which a person suffers from discrimination on several grounds, but discrimination takes place on one ground at the time. So a disabled woman might be discriminated against in one situation, for example access to a restaurant, because she is disabled, and in another situation she might be discriminated against, for example, passed over for promotion, because she is a woman. Therefore, discrimination takes place on the basis of several grounds operating separately. Sometimes the term multiple discrimination is used for this specific form.

Compound or additive discrimination

The second form is where a person is discriminated against on more than one ground in the same instance and discrimination on the one ground adds to the discrimination on the other ground to create an added burden. In other words, one ground gets compounded by one or more other discrimination grounds. A good example is a situation where the labour market is segregated on a multiple basis: some jobs are considered to be only suitable for men and only some jobs are reserved particularly for immigrants. In such a situation the prospects of an immigrant woman finding a job matching her merits are markedly reduced because of compound discrimination. An example from the British case law is the case of *Perera v Civil Service Commission (no 2)*. In this case, an employer had set out a number of requirements for a job and Mr Perera was turned down because of a variety of factors which were taken into account

by the interviewing committee, including his experience in the UK, his command of English, his nationality and his age. The lack of one factor did not prevent him from getting the job, although it made it less likely. The lack of two factors decreased his chances still further. He did not get the job because of a variety of different grounds.

Intersectional discrimination

The third form takes place where two or more grounds of discrimination interact and discrimination takes place because of this interaction. For example, a disabled woman might experience specific types of discrimination not experienced by disabled men or by women in general. The grounds interact and the discrimination that takes place cannot be captured wholly by looking at discrimination on one ground separately. The grounds are inseparable. Another example, minority ethnic women might be subject to particular types of racial prejudice and stereotypes and may face specific types of racial discrimination not experienced by ethnic minority men. There is also the problem that a combination of factors might have what Makkonen calls the ‘trigger effect’: person might not in general discriminate against women or immigrants, but the combination of these two factors may trigger discriminatory behaviour.

A number of questions concerning the meaning and application of intersectionality were raised.

1. Why the interest in intersectionality and amongst which groups – was it at European or national levels?
2. Different meanings of intersectionality
3. Problems identified with intersectionality eg. each inequality has different logics
4. What are the issues involved in applying intersectional analysis ie. transposition of different theoretical understandings to concrete situations?
5. To what extent is this form of analysis actually being applied or not in our different countries?
6. To what sectors is it or could it be applied eg. Employment, access to goods and services, violence including domestic violence?

7. To what extent is sufficient data available in possible selected areas of application?

Having briefly discussed the different theoretical approaches and how we could put these into practical approaches, we also posed the question of what is the outcome we are aiming at, because this will influence our methodology. Our objectives of policy recommendations and possible proposals for legal changes mean fuller discussion of:

Who are we looking at?

In what arenas?

At what type of discrimination?

Implementation of EU legislation for each state. Does it differ from state to state?

What sort of body/bodies have been established?

Who uses the law?

Who has access to the law?

Is there a difference between men and women in this both in making claims and access to claims?

What are the channels of access available and used?

Is there a difference in awareness between men and women about the available tools?

To what extent does lack of legislation/possibility to make intersectional claims hinder/stop people from making claims?

Does the lack of recognition of intersectionality influence the making of claims?

There followed a discussion of ensuring comparability of data collections and sectors in which discrimination complaints are made (WP4). It was suggested that employment, as the area in which discrimination had been applied for the longest time both in terms of sex and race discrimination, should be covered by all partners. Other areas will be looked at, mainly those mentioned in the Race Equality Directive, if and when available.

The template for collecting data in WP4 will be reviewed before being finalised (see WP4 report).

Methodological approach for each part of the project will also be presented by each work package leader. Methodology is something which will be discussed in further meetings, especially in relation to the interviews with stakeholders and experts in WP7 and with women and men experiencing discrimination and their encounters with legal and institutional systems in WP8.

3.2 Application of Methodological Approaches

Many researchers in EU projects divide their research into levels which may correspond to phases (macro, meso, micro) with distinctive methodological approaches, as Julia Brannen and Ann Nilsen (2006) have done for their FP 5 project *Transitions: Gender, Parenthood and the European Workplace*. In Genderace, empirical research is divided into the following levels:

Macro

1. National reviews (WP2) consisting of statistical data on ethnic minority and migrant populations by gender, documentation on the major groups experiencing discrimination and the development and application of anti-discrimination policy. The general report, based on a comparison of the national surveys, brings out the key similarities and differences in the main groups being discriminated against, whether data on discrimination is systematically collected, and the range of governmental and non-governmental organisations involved in dealing with gender and racial discrimination.

2. European level review (WP3) of concepts and discussions on multiple discrimination and intersectionality based on comparative and European research and policy making.

Meso:

Sampling of case files of complaints made by women and men of racial discrimination

using a variety of sources (WP4).

The initial questionnaire schedule has to take into account variations in the availability of data, for example collection of data on country of birth or ethnicity, the range of data to be collected from organisations likely to provide files of complaints. The potential organisations able to provide files and the data they make available in turn constrict the pool from which complainant files are drawn. The difficulty of getting organisations to participate due to time and financial constraints on their part may limit the range of files and cases. On the whole, and due to the emphasis on employment, most files are likely to be based on this sector.

Some of the main problems in undertaking **WP4** arise from differences in data collection, the different ethical regulatory frameworks for obtaining information from a third party and their strictness of their application by different organisations. These were discussed in section 2.2. Thus apart from lack of official data, a major problem encountered was the transfer of information to a third partner or to the researcher without the permission of the research subject and their awareness that the information is being used for research purposes. Whilst official data on employment tribunal cases is anonymised and deposited in archives in the UK, the strict application of regulations on the transference of information to third parties on public bodies and NGOs means it is not possible to access directly the main sources of complainant files held by Law Centres and Citizens Advice. Only personnel from the organisations in question could access these files but this often involved lengthy negotiations. It is not possible to use the anonymised official files in WP4 for subsequent interviews in WP8 although this link may be possible with NGOs.

This contrasts with conditions of access in Scandinavian countries where researchers are permitted direct access to non-anonymised files held by the Ombudsman Against Ethnic Discrimination, set up in 1999. Though an official organisation, it is possible to interview their individual complainants. However it should be borne in mind that they estimated that only 4% of complaints were actually reported to them in the early years of operation (Englund 2002). An analysis of their cases for 1998-2003 demonstrated that they were failing to reach the most exploited groups (WP2 Annexe 5).

Subsequently they have tried to encompass hard to reach groups.

Micro: Individual semi-structured interviews with complainants and stakeholders.

Ethical regulatory frameworks are less significant since it is possible to make contact directly as in WP7 and obtain consent directly, thus avoiding the transmission of information to a third party, as in WP8.

WP7 will be conducted in the light of the review of national policies (WP2) and the European review (WP3) which will form the background to the interviews with stakeholders and experts. The sample should therefore include a range of legal academic and practitioner experts and governmental and non-governmental bodies working in both gender and race discrimination fields. The semi-structured interviews (10 in each country) are designed to fulfil the objectives of this WP which are to improve the knowledge of the combined effects of racial and gender discrimination, how complaints are treated and how double multiple discriminations are treated, assess the effectiveness of policies and suggest best practices in this field. The following themes serve as guidelines structuring the interviews:

1. The impact of gender on the experience of discrimination. The impact of racialised identities on the experience of discrimination.
2. The use of institutional and non-institutional resources available to complainants in the field of gender discrimination and racial discrimination.
3. The influence of gender and racialised identities on the treatment of discrimination complaints
4. The capacity of the institutional and legal framework to handle multiple-discrimination based on racialised identities and gender.
5. The collection, recording and public availability of data on discrimination complaints.

WP8 consists of semi-structured and biographical interviews with about 30 women and men who have been victims of discrimination. The aim is to reconstitute the events leading to the complaint, the extent to which the lack of recognition of multiple discrimination influence the making of their claims, their representation of the legal and institutional systems, their satisfaction of the proposed solutions for resolving the conflict, and the judgement of the efficiency of the legal framework in fighting against discrimination.

A purposive sample constructing a set of interviews that reflects the range of groups experiencing discrimination needs to be based on the specificity of each country. There may be a bias towards established migrants and minority ethnic groups who are more conversant with the system and more secure in terms of residence and employment.

In countries with a history of discrimination claims, as in the UK, it may mean that the sets of complaints generated in WP4 and WP8 are not the same. Different kinds of organisations are likely to supply different types of interviewees and this should be taken into account. Official public sources and NGOs may differ in the information collected, especially in relation to the sectors and services (employment, housing, entertainment services) in which discrimination is experienced and the groups they cover. Combining these two considerations will yield different samples. For example, in the WP4 for the UK over half the files were generated almost 5 years ago before the arrival of large numbers of Eastern Europeans, who have experienced discrimination. It is believed they make up a significant number of recent clients in an organisation such as Citizen Advice which in many rural areas is the only organisation dealing with advice and complaints on employment, health, housing and welfare.

References

Brannen, J. and Nilsen, (2006) Contextualisation in cross- national comparative qualitative/ biographical research. ESRC NCRM TRAINING Institute of Education, London

Englund, C. (2002) *Migrants, Minorities and employment in Sweden. Exclusion, discrimination and anti-discrimination*, Raxen 3 Report, EUMC

European Commission, Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, *Tackling Multiple Discrimination Practices, Policies and Laws* (2007 Luxembourg: Office of Official Publications of the European Communities).

Freed-Taylor, M. Ethical considerations in European cross-national research, *Most Programme International Social Science Journal*, no. 142, 1994, pages 523-532 <http://www.unesco.org/most/ethissj.htm>

Hantrais, L. (1999) ‘Contextualization in cross-national comparative research’, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology: Theory & Practice*, 2 (2), pp. 93–108.

Hantrais, L. (ed.) (2001) *Researching Family and Welfare from an International Comparative Perspective*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Hantrais, L. (2003) ‘Cross-national comparative approaches to the analysis of family and welfare’, in C. Cameron (ed.), *Cross-National Qualitative Methods*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, pp. 3–14.

Hantrais, L. (2004) ‘Crossing cultural boundaries’, in P. Kennett (ed.), *A Handbook of Comparative Social Policy*, Cheltenham and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, pp. 261–75.

Hantrais, L. (2005) ‘Combining methods: a key to understanding complexity in European societies?’ *European Societies*, 7 (3), 399–421.

Hantrais, L. (2006) “Research design – scientific and pragmatic rationales for choice of countries, case studies and their contextualisation“ EU projects on Family and Welfare Cross-National Research: Challenge, cooperation and compromise, ESRC NCRM TRAINING

Hantrais L. (2008) *International Comparative Research. Theory, methods and practice*, Palgrave Macmillan

Hantrais, L. and Mangen, S. (2007) *Cross-National Research Methodology and Practice*, Routledge

Makkonen, T, “Multiple compound and intersectional discrimination: Bringing the experiences of the most marginalized to the fore” <http://www.abo.fi/instut/imr/norfa/timo.pdf>

Martiniello M. and Simon P. (2005) «Les enjeux de la catégorisation. Rapports de domination et luttes autour de la représentation dans les sociétés post-migratoires», *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales*, 21-2, p.7-17

Miles, R. (1989) *Racism*, Routledge

Moon, G. (2007) “Multiple Discrimination: How Real are the Problems and what are the Solutions?” 30, *Discrimination Law Association Briefings* 433, 3-7

Murji, K. and Solomos, J. (2005) *Racialization. Studies in theory and practice*, Oxford University Press

Simon, P. (2004) “Towards a set of common rules for the measurement of discrimination” *European Conference on Data to Promote Equality*, 9 - 10 December, Helsinki

Simon P. (2005) “The measurement of racial discrimination: the policy use of statistics”, *International Journal of Social Science* 183, p.9-25

Simon, P. (2007) “Ethnic” statistics and data protection in the Council of Europe countries, ECRI, Strasbourg

Verloo, M, “Multiple Inequalities, Intersectionality and the European Union” 13, 3, *European Journal of Women’s Studies* 211-228 (2006).

Vieten, U. (2007) “Intersectionality scope and multidimensional equality within the European Union: traversing national boundaries of inequality?” in D. Schiek and V. Chege (eds.), *European Union Non-Discrimination Law. Comparative perspectives on multidimensional equality law*, London: Routledge Cavendish.

Yuval-Davis, N, “Intersectionality and Feminist Politics” 13, 3, *European Journal of Women’s Studies* 193-209 (2006).