CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-00481-8 - Ethnic Minority Migrants in Britain and France: Integration Trade-Offs
Rahsaan Maxwell
Excerpt
More information

Introduction

Why are some migrants better integrated than others? Some seamlessly adopt host country customs and become socioeconomically successful and civically active in the new society. Others cling to their home country customs, face stigmatization and discrimination, and become marginalized. These differences also persist across generations. Many second- and third-generation descendants of migrants lead lives that resemble those of the native-origin population. Others live in segregated communities and become alienated from mainstream society. Understanding why some migrants are better integrated than others is a crucial question for contemporary societies struggling to maintain stability and unity in the midst of growing migration-related diversity. This book addresses these concerns by analyzing the conditions that shape integration outcomes for different migrant groups.

This book primarily focuses on Western Europe and the large stream of non-European migrants who arrived after World War II. The first wave of these migrants was during the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s when single men came to work in low-wage jobs during the postwar European economic expansion. At first, not many people thought about long-term integration issues, because it was not clear whether these migrants would form permanent communities in Europe or return home after making a bit of money. Yet, by the 1970s and 1980s, many of the single male migrants had been joined by their wives and children from home. In addition, new waves of migrants from around the world were further diversifying Europe. In the 1980s and 1990s, the permanency of non-European, nonwhite, and often non-Christian migrant-origin communities became increasingly evident, which led to intense debates about how to promote their integration (Castles and Miller 2009). Migrants from within Europe traditionally resolved their integration difficulties by the second or third generation. In comparison, the diversity of integration outcomes among non-European-origin migrants has raised fears of long-term conflict and the inability to obtain social cohesion (Caldwell 2009; Dancygier 2010a).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-00481-8 - Ethnic Minority Migrants in Britain and France: Integration Trade-Offs
Rahsaan Maxwell
Excerpt
More information

One of the biggest debates is whether non-European migrants and their descendants will adopt European cultural norms. Optimistic researchers (from Europe and elsewhere) argue that most migrants and their descendants tend to adopt the host country's nationality, language, and general cultural customs over time (Alba and Nee 2003; Brouard and Tiberj 2005). In fact, there is evidence that migrants in Europe have levels of commitment to mainstream political institutions and of government satisfaction that are similar to – if not more positive than – those of natives (Maxwell 2010a; Röder and Mühlau 2010). On the other side are people who worry that migrants may retain elements of their homeland culture incompatible with European society. In recent years, these concerns have focused on Muslim migrants, who, some argue, are too conservative (especially concerning women and homosexuals) for native Europeans (Sniderman and Hagendoorn 2007).[1] In addition, there have been extreme cases of Muslim fundamentalists and their European critics descending into violent confrontation (Buruma 2006).[2] Furthermore, concerns about divergent cultural values have been stoked by terrorist attacks in North America and Western Europe committed by extremists and the fear that even moderate Muslims may provide support for terrorists (Caldwell 2009; Cesari 2009). Debates about how to best promote cultural assimilation are central to most European public agendas.

The wide range of economic outcomes among non-European migrants is another point of concern. Many of the first-generation migrants who arrived after World War II enjoyed stable employment but had limited education and worked in low-wage jobs. Over time, many of their children and grandchildren have received higher educational qualifications and achieved significant socioeconomic mobility. The elite professions and upper echelons of society in most European countries now include increasing numbers of ethnic-minority-migrant-origin individuals (Castles and Miller 2009: 252–55; Maxwell 2009a; Modood and Berthoud 1997). Nonetheless, many second- and third-generation migrant-origin individuals suffer from some of the most extreme socioeconomic disadvantages in their countries (Castles and Miller 2009: 221–76). In addition, second- and third-generation migrant-origin individuals often complain of racial, ethnic, and religious discrimination that leaves them pessimistic about opportunities for future advancement (Bhalla and McCormick 2009; Loury et al. 2005). Observers across Europe worry that ethnic minority migrants' poverty and exclusion will lead to increased conflict between migrant and native-origin communities. Since the 1970s, large-scale urban riots have

[1] One of the central struggles has been over Muslim womens' right to wear religious headscarves, veils, and burquas in public places (Joppke 2009a; Kastoryano 2002; Traynor 2010). In addition, there have been a series of conflicts over whether Muslims have the right to prevent the publication of materials that they feel are blasphemous and disrespectful to Islam (Hansen 2006; Klausen 2009a).

[2] In response, European governments have built "Islamic councils" to encourage moderate Muslim leaders to adapt their practices to European traditions (Laurence 2012).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-00481-8 - Ethnic Minority Migrants in Britain and France: Integration Trade-Offs
Rahsaan Maxwell
Excerpt
More information

occurred sporadically across Western Europe as a violent reminder of migrant-origin individuals' dissatisfaction with their integration (Joly 2007; Roy 2005). Figuring out the best way to promote successful economic integration among ethnic minority migrants remains a crucial task for most European societies.

Politically there is also a mixed bag of results for non-European migrants. In the first years (and in some cases decades) after arrival, non-European migrants generally found it difficult to engage in mainstream European politics as they were not citizens and were ineligible to vote or run for elected office.[3] Even after becoming citizens, socioeconomic disadvantages often weaken migrant political participation, and a lack of elite networks has made it difficult to access political influence (Messina 2007). Furthermore, the rise of xenophobic parties across the Continent has contributed to new restrictions on immigration and access to citizenship. This agenda has also advanced a renewed focus on assimilation that frames non-European migrants as unwelcome outsiders (Givens 2005; Joppke 2007a, 2007b). Nonetheless, there are many counterexamples of non-European migrants becoming politically powerful. As demonstrated in this book, some groups are even overrepresented among elected official relative to their percentage of the local population. That electoral success has not led to widespread political influence, but there are growing examples of influence for non-European migrants in certain countries and local areas (Bird et al. 2010; Garbaye 2005; Givens and Maxwell 2012; Messina 2007). Understanding why some migrants are better at engaging the political system will help promote the broad representation of migrants' interests in Europe. Developing that representation will be vital for ensuring that migrants feel connected to European societies and will work within the established political system.

In this book, I examine the wide range of integration outcomes among non-European-origin migrant communities in Western Europe by analyzing the conditions under which favorable or unfavorable integration outcomes are more likely to occur for different ethnic minority migrant groups. In the rest of this chapter, I sketch out the main argument for the book. (Chapter 1 provides a more in-depth explanation of the argument, along with a discussion of how it relates to existing literature). I then discuss my decision to select migrant-origin groups as the main level of analysis for understanding integration, and provide details on my case selection. I finish by outlining how I develop my argument in subsequent chapters.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE ARGUMENT

The main argument in this book is that integration involves a set of trade-offs. A trade-off occurs either when a positive outcome on one metric promotes a negative outcome on another metric or when a negative outcome promotes a positive outcome. To apply this concept to ethnic minority migrant integration,

[3] The exception to this barrier is that since the 1970s, a growing number of European countries allow noncitizens to vote (or even run for office) in local elections.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-00481-8 - Ethnic Minority Migrants in Britain and France: Integration Trade-Offs
Rahsaan Maxwell
Excerpt
More information

I distinguish three dimensions of integration – social, economic, and political – and examine the trade-offs among them.

Briefly put, social integration measures migrants' social and cultural interactions with mainstream society, economic integration focuses on educational and labor market outcomes, and political integration is the capacity to pursue ones' interests in the political system.[4] This book focuses on the ways in which social integration outcomes have trade-offs with economic and political integration. The mechanism that activates these trade-offs is group mobilization. I claim that groups with better social integration outcomes will have less capacity for group mobilization because they are more likely to interact with mainstream society and less likely to need strong coethnic networks for survival. This creates a trade-off, because their relatively weak capacity for group mobilization reduces their ability to respond to economic difficulties or apply political pressure. In comparison, socially segregated groups will have greater capacity for group mobilization because they are more likely to depend on coethnic networks for survival. This group mobilization then provides valuable resources for furthering economic integration and gaining political influence.

I do not claim that these trade-offs are automatic or that social integration is the only important variable for understanding economic and political integration. To specify the circumstances under which these trade-offs are most likely to operate, I identify several intervening variables. The extent to which social integration leads to trade-offs with economic and political integration depends on vulnerability to discrimination and access to independent financial resources. If socially integrated groups are not vulnerable to discrimination or have access to significant independent financial resources, their lack of group mobilization capacity should not be a problem for political and economic integration. The extent to which social segregation leads to trade-offs with economic and political integration depends on the size of the population in a given constituency and access to independent financial resources. If socially segregated groups are too small a percentage of a given constituency or do not have any independent financial resources, their group mobilization may not yield significant benefits for economic and political integration. Chapter 1 goes into greater detail on these intervening variables.

In short, this book develops an argument about the ways in which different dimensions of integration involve trade-offs with each other. This allows me to account for several empirical puzzles that existing literature is unable to explain. In addition, my argument offers a new conceptualization of the positive and negative implications of different integration outcomes, which encourages us to take more seriously the diverse ways in which migrant-origin individuals become part of the host society.

[4] Chapter 1 goes into more detail on the specific indicators used to measure each integration dimension.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-00481-8 - Ethnic Minority Migrants in Britain and France: Integration Trade-Offs
Rahsaan Maxwell
Excerpt
More information

GROUP-LEVEL ANALYSIS

There are two caveats about my focus on group-level variation. First, I acknowledge that group-level variation is not the only way of analyzing ethnic minority migrant integration. Other possibilities include variation across time, place, individuals, or specific integration indicators. However, while these other levels of analysis are important, group-level variation is particularly well-suited to understanding political integration, which is a key focus of this book.[5] Political integration is the capacity to pursue ones' interests in the political system. Citizenship acquisition and vote turnout are two baseline indicators of political integration that can be measured at the individual (as opposed to the group) level. However, a more thorough examination includes influence over policy decisions and access to government resources. Both of these require some form of group-level analysis to determine which segment of the population is receiving the benefits. At a broad level, one could consider the extent to which migrants as a whole have political influence, but as seen earlier, there is considerable variation among migrant groups. This book explores that variation by examining why migrant groups have different integration outcomes.

The second caveat is that I recognize the diversity in any group-level category. I do not mean to imply that all members of a group have the same interests or the same social and economic status. Nonetheless, to the extent that having specific migrant origins shapes interests or life experiences, then that migrant-origin category will be relevant. This does not mean that the migrant-origin category is the only salient group category or that it is equally salient at all times for all individuals in the group. Everyone belongs to multiple groups (ethnic, national, religious, professional, neighborhood, sex, marital status, etc.) that are more or less relevant depending on the circumstances. This book does not deny the importance of these other identities but attempts to analyze what is particularly relevant about the migrant-group origin category.

CASE SELECTION

The bulk of this book compares ethnic minority migrant groups in Britain and France. There are two main reasons why these are useful cases for examining group-level integration variation. First, they have a broader range of well-established ethnic minority migrant groups than most West European countries. This is primarily because of the two countries' extended history with colonies outside of Europe as well as their early industrialization and demand for foreign labor, which facilitated a longer history of immigration than in many other West European countries. This is especially important for my focus on political integration, because Britain and France have a wider range of migrant

[5] I provide a more precise definition of social, economic, and political integration in Chapter 1, along with a more detailed examination of how previous authors have treated the concepts. For more on how political integration has traditionally received less attention than social or economic integration see Bloemraad (2007; Forthcoming).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-00481-8 - Ethnic Minority Migrants in Britain and France: Integration Trade-Offs
Rahsaan Maxwell
Excerpt
More information

groups with full political rights than in many other European countries (Favell 2001b; Garbaye 2005). In Britain, non-European migrants were active in formal politics in significant numbers as early as the 1970s, and in France as early as the 1980s. In most other European countries, that formal participation has only taken place since the 1990s, or even is yet to come for countries that only switched from being countries of emigration to countries of immigration in the 2000s (e.g., Greece, Ireland, Italy, Spain) (Bird et al. 2010; Castles and Miller 2009). It would be more difficult to draw reliable conclusions about which migrant-origin groups have better or worse political integration outcomes in these countries when all of the political integration outcomes are new and not yet indicative of systematic patterns. These countries will be useful future test cases to extend my argument.

The second main reason for my focus on Britain and France is that the two countries have traditionally been juxtaposed for their different approaches to migrant and ethnic minority integration (which will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 1) (Bleich 2003; Favell 2001b; Garbaye 2005; Koopmans et al. 2005; Soysal 1994). This makes my argument about group-level trade-off dynamics more powerful, because they exist across very different national-level integration environments. Moreover, France is a critical case that tests how far my argument about group mobilization capacity can be applied. One of the key features of France's migrant integration approach is a general hostility (both formally and informally) toward ethnic-specific organization and mobilization. This weakens the impact of group mobilization in comparison to Britain where there are no such barriers to ethnic minority migrant-group mobilization. Nonetheless, the evidence that group mobilization dynamics are important for integration trade-offs in France broadens the scope of my argument.

There are many ethnic minority migrant groups in each country, but I focus on a limited selection. In Britain, I focus on Caribbean, Indian, and Bangladeshi/Pakistani migrants. Caribbean migrants in Britain come from many different islands.[6] Each island may have unique migration dynamics, but I analyze them under the collective "Caribbean" category because of the basic similarities as well as the fact that they were categorized this way on arrival in Britain. I combine Bangladeshis and Pakistanis into one group category because prior to 1974, they were both part of Pakistan. Even though Bangladesh and Pakistan are now two separate countries, their migrants often mobilize together in Britain (especially around Muslim issues). In France, I examine Caribbeans and Maghrebians. Caribbeans in France come from three different places: Guiana, Guadeloupe, and Martinique.[7] Maghrebians come from Algeria,

[6] Migrants in Britain are coded as Caribbean if they come from one of the following countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenades, and Trinidad and Tobago.

[7] An additional source of Caribbean migrants in France is Haiti. However, Haitians are not included in my analysis because of significant differences in their historical relationship with France in comparison to migrants from Guiana, Guadeloupe, and Martinique. Most notably,

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

Cambridge

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-00481-8 - Ethnic Minority Migrants in Britain and France: Integration Trade-Offs
Rahsaan Maxwell
Excerpt
More information

Morocco, and Tunisia. As for Caribbeans in Britain, I combine these migrants into "Caribbean" and "Maghrebian" groups because of the general similarities in their migration experience and the way they have been categorized in the broader metropolitan French society.

I focus on these groups because they were the largest non-European-origin migrant groups to arrive in Britain and France during the decades immediately following World War II.[8] This is important for two reasons. One, it allows me to control for time spent in the host country as a variable for explaining group-level integration variation.[9] In addition, there are at least two generations of each group in Britain and France, which is particularly important for my focus on political integration. Political integration requires migrants to be enfranchised and engaged in the host society's political system. This process generally takes longer than other forms of integration (i.e., learning the language or finding a job), and to track systematic group-level political integration differences, one must compile data across several election cycles. A diverse range of ethnic minority migrants has arrived in Britain and France since the 1970s, most notably East Asians, East Europeans, and Sub-Saharan Africans. It is too early to draw systematic conclusions about integration variation among these groups, but in the future they will provide an important test for extending the argument in this book.

In summary, the majority of this book compares Caribbean, Indian, and Bangladeshi/Pakistani migrants in Britain and Caribbean and Maghrebian migrants in France. To see how far my argument can extend beyond these examples, I include some brief additional comparisons. This is useful because in France, the group mobilization differences between Caribbeans and Maghrebians are not as dramatic as those between Caribbeans and Indians and Bangladeshis/Pakistanis in Britain. One might conclude that this is entirely because of France's hostility to ethnic mobilization. However, in Chapter 7 (which deals with local-level political influence in France), I examine integration outcomes among two additional groups: Sephardic Jews and Assyro-Chaldeans. These groups are not as large as Maghrebians and Caribbeans across metropolitan France (and in the case of Assyro-Chaldeans are much more recently-arrived), so they are not appropriate to include in all of the analyses across the book. Yet on the local level, they provide evidence of integration trade-offs and the importance of group mobilization in ways that are even more dramatic than among Maghrebians and Caribbeans.

Haitians rebelled against French colonial rule in 1791 and became an independent nation in 1804, whereas Guiana, Guadeloupe, and Martinique remain part of the French republic.

[8] Both countries received many European-origin migrants who faced integration challenges. These groups largely fall outside of my analysis because as a result of limited relevance of discrimination, they became indistinguishable from the native-born across generations. More details can be found in Chapter 1.

[9] This is one of the main arguments in the existing literature for explaining migrant integration outcomes. It is discussed in more detail in Chapter 1.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

Cambridge

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-00481-8 - Ethnic Minority Migrants in Britain and France: Integration Trade-Offs
Rahsaan Maxwell
Excerpt
More information

PLAN FOR THE BOOK

Chapter 1 develops my framework about integration trade-offs in greater detail. I start with an overview of the main integration outcomes among Caribbeans, Indians, and Bangladeshis/Pakistanis in Britain and Caribbeans and Maghrebians in France. In Britain, Caribbeans have enjoyed better social integration outcomes than Indians or Bangladeshis/Pakistanis. This means that Caribbeans have been less likely than Indians and Bangladeshis/Pakistanis to live in ethnically segregated neighborhoods and more likely to speak the host country's language, to participate in the host country's religious and cultural practices, and to intermarry with the host country's population. The group-level profile is different for economic integration in Britain, where Indians have enjoyed the best outcomes and Caribbeans and Bangladeshis/Pakistanis currently suffer from some of the worst outcomes in the country. Politically there is yet another division, as Indians and Bangladeshis/Pakistanis are now doing better than Caribbeans. In France, Caribbeans have better social integration outcomes than Maghrebians. Yet the groups currently have similar economic outcomes and Maghrebians have better political outcomes than Caribbeans. These diverse outcomes suggest that integration varies significantly across migrant groups and integration dimensions. In Chapter 1, I review the existing literature on migrant integration and claim that it cannot account for group-level variation among Caribbeans, Indians, and Bangladeshis/Pakistanis in Britain or among Caribbeans and Maghrebians in France. I then elaborate on my argument about integration trade-offs and claim it provides a better account of this group-level variation. The evidence I present in the rest of the book relies on multiple data sources. I use archival materials from local municipalities in Britain and France, quantitative analysis on public opinion and census data, references from secondary literature, as well as data from more than 240 semi-structured interviews that I conducted in Britain and France.[10]

Chapter 2 lays the foundation for my argument by reviewing the history of post–World War II migration to Britain and France. It also presents evidence to support my claim that Caribbeans in Britain have better social integration outcomes than Indians and Bangladeshis/Pakistanis, whereas Caribbeans in France have better social integration outcomes than Maghrebians. In the rest of the book, I explore how social integration creates trade-offs with economic and political integration.

Chapters 3 and 4 examine the trade-off between social integration and economic integration. The basic proposition is that social integration reduces

[10] I conducted 244 interviews in Britain and France between September 2004 and June 2009 with politicians (14%), bureaucrats (14%), activists and community workers (58%), professors, journalists, and other experts (10%), and an assortment of individuals including business people and young people (5%). The subjects were chosen through purposive snowball sampling aimed at finding people involved in ethnic minority politics. Interviews in Britain were conducted in English and interviews in France were conducted in French.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

Cambridge
Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-00481-8 - Ethnic Minority Migrants in Britain and France: Integration Trade-Offs
Rahsaan Maxwell
Excerpt
More information

the capacity for group mobilization whereas social segregation increases the capacity for group mobilization, which can be a valuable resource for economic advancement under certain circumstances. Chapter 3 analyzes outcomes in Britain where social segregation among Indians and Bangladeshis/Pakistanis encouraged the development of self-employment networks. These networks have improved economic outcomes among both groups and in the case of Indians have led to some of the best economic outcomes in the country. In comparison, social integration among Caribbeans limited their capacity to develop self-employment networks, which has reduced their ability to respond to recent economic challenges and weakened their economic outcomes. Chapter 4 analyzes France where the group-level story is more subtle, as Caribbeans and Maghrebians have similar economic integration outcomes. However, given Caribbeans' current social integration advantages as well as their economic advantages in the years after arrival, one might have expected Caribbeans to have better economic integration outcomes now. Instead, I show how social segregation facilitated the development of self-employment networks and independent financial resources among Maghrebians, which helped boost their economic outcomes. In comparison, Caribbeans' social integration limited the development of those resources, which helped depress their economic outcomes.

In Chapter 5, I turn to political integration and examine the trade-off between social integration and representation among elected officials in both countries. I claim that social integration reduces capacity to develop group mobilization that can influence elections. In comparison, social segregation increases the incentives and the capacity to develop group mobilization. To develop this argument, I collected data that provides unprecedented detail on group-level variation in local political representation.

Chapters 6 and 7 extend the analysis of political integration to examine local political influence and the ability to sustain community projects over time. This is an important addition to the analysis in Chapter 5 because merely having coethnic elected representatives does not necessarily lead to substantive influence. Chapter 6 is a case study of the London borough of Brent, a local authority in which both Caribbeans and Indians have significant population density and the basic demographic potential for political influence. Similarly, Chapter 7 is a case study of the Paris suburb Sarcelles, a city in which Caribbeans, Maghrebians, and several other ethnic groups (e.g., Sephardic Jews and Assyro-Chaldeans) have significant population density and the basic demographic potential for political influence.

Chapters 6 and 7 make similar arguments. Both chapters build on the trade-offs examined in Chapter 5 by arguing that group mobilization and access to coethnic councilors help establish political influence that can support community projects. However, they also find that influence is unstable because it can change across elections. In the absence of influence, group mobilization and private financial resources are essential for sustaining vibrant community projects over time. This focus on group mobilization reiterates trade-offs from

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-00481-8 - Ethnic Minority Migrants in Britain and France: Integration Trade-Offs
Rahsaan Maxwell
Excerpt
More information

Chapter 5, whereas the importance of financial resources builds on the trade-offs discussed in Chapters 3 and 4.

Chapter 8 gives a brief overview of ethnic minority migrant integration variation in the Netherlands and the United States. In the Netherlands, I argue that the more positive social integration outcomes among Antillean- and Surinamese-origin minorities have reduced the capacity for group mobilization and hindered economic and political integration in comparison to Moroccan- and Turkish-origin minorities. In the United States, I make a similar argument for political integration outcomes among Chinese, Filippinos, and Mexicans. This chapter is not intended to explore group-level variation in the same detail as the rest of the book. Yet, it provides suggestive evidence that my argument holds in a wider range of country contexts. Moreover, in recent years, the Netherlands has suffered from problems related to extreme migrant segregation. It is an important test of whether the positive trade-offs of social segregation still exist in such an environment. In comparison, the United States is often touted as one of the most successful examples of migrant assimilation into mainstream society. It provides a key test of whether negative trade-offs of social integration exist in such an environment. The conclusion reviews the main findings and explores the implications for research on migrant integration more generally.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org