EXPERIENCES OF DISCRIMINATION
OF MINORITIES IN SPAIN

- Against Immigrants and Roma -

European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, Ref Nº 2002/02/01

By Colectivo Ioé
(Walter Actis, Carlos Pereda y Miguel Ángel de Prada)

With the collaboration of the Fundación Secretariado General Gitano
(Fernando Villarreal y Daniel Wagman)

Translator: Daniel Wagman

C/ Luna, 11-1º dcha.
28004 Madrid. -
Tf: (34)- 91.531.01.23
Fax: (34)-91.532.96.62
Email: ioe@nodo50.org
http://www.nodo50.org/ioe/

Madrid, enero de 2003
Table of Contents

I. Antecedents And Application of the Study 3
   1. Motivation of the application 3
   2. Principal ethnic / foreign minorities in Spain. Design of the sample 4
   3. Design and Testing of the Questionnaires 7
   4. Preparation of the survey teams and application of the questionnaire 9

II Results 12
   1. Introduction 12
   2. Some characteristics of the collectives under study 13
   3. “Reported” discrimination 18
   4. Other factors related to discrimination 31
      4.1. Age, education and leng of time of residency in Spain 31
      4.2. Difficulties to making friends with Spaniards / Payos 33
      4.3. Difficulties in practicing one’s own religion in Spain 37
      4.4. Confidence in Spanish Institutions 39
      4.5. Points of view regarding the “climate of opinion” in Spain in regards to ethnic minorities and immigrants 42
      4.6. Social Relations 44
      4.7. Sentiments of Belonging in Spain or in One’s Country of Origin 45
      4.8. Immigrants “Where do you feel most at home?” 48
      4.9. Immigrants: Remain in Spain or Return Home? 52
      4.10. Attitudes towards immigration 55

II Summary 57
   1. Areas of discrimination 57
   2. Variables related to discrimination 61
   3. Comparative analysis of the results obtained in Sweden and Spain 74

ANNEX I. Questionnaire with percentages of answers obtained
ANNEX II. Questionnaire form. 1. Immigrants 2. Gitanos
ANNEX III. Rejection form

List of Table 81
List of Figures 81
I. Antecedents And Application Of The Study

1. Motivation of the application

The application in Spain of the questionnaire of experiences of racism and discrimination seems particularly relevant if we consider the strategic location of the country as the southern frontier of the European Union, and also if we keep in mind that Spain is one of the countries which has seen the greatest growth in immigrant population in the last few years. In the last decade the number of foreigners has tripled, going from 400,000 in 1992 to the current figure of 1,200,000, according to data of the Ministry of the Interior. This study centers on the three largest non-European community immigrant collectives (Moroccan, Ecuadorian and Colombian), which together represent over half of all non-European Union foreigners in Spain.

We have also chosen to include in the study a cultural minority; the Roma (Gitano), due to its significant presence in Spain (over a half a million persons) and moreover because specialized studies indicate that they are the principle object of discrimination and racism in Spanish society.

The content and methodology of the study follows the criteria established by the EUMC, applying representative samples of the chosen collectives in the three regions of Spain where they have the largest presence: Catalonia, the Madrid Regional Community and Andalusia.

2. Principal ethnic / foreign minorities in Spain. Design of the sample.

According to the last OCDE report, Spain is the second country of the European Union after Greece, that has most increased the proportion of foreigners between 1994 and 1999, with an annual growth rate of 11.67% SOPEMI, Tendances des migrations internationales, OCDE, Paris, 2001, page 40.
In order to carry out the project, whose design is based on a reality of another country, in Spain we have identified the principal immigrant groups using the data of legal residents (Ministry of the Interior) and of foreigner workers registered with the Social Security system (Ministry of Labor). The three most numerous nationalities are Moroccan, Ecuadorian and Colombian. Along with these three groups we add the Roma, identified in all studies as the most discriminated ethnic minority in Spain.

The three immigrant groups chosen represent 33.2% of all regular residents and 37.7% of all foreign workers registered with Social Security system. These proportions exceed 50% if we only look at non- EU foreigners. The total numbers, including a gender breakdown, are shown in Table 1.1.

**Table 1.1**

Most numerous foreign collectives in Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moroccans</th>
<th>Ecuadorians</th>
<th>Colombians</th>
<th>Total Foreigners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal residents 12.31.2001</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>159,271</td>
<td>42,602</td>
<td>18,717</td>
<td>610,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>75,666</td>
<td>42,097</td>
<td>29,993</td>
<td>498,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234,937</td>
<td>84,699</td>
<td>48,710</td>
<td>1,109,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% / Foreigners</td>
<td>21,2</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workers registered with Social Security 4.10.2002</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>121,030</td>
<td>50,032</td>
<td>18,636</td>
<td>467,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>21,147</td>
<td>36,414</td>
<td>20,168</td>
<td>244,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>142,178</td>
<td>86,449</td>
<td>38,807</td>
<td>711,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% / Foreigners</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>12,2</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moroccans are the largest immigrant group in Spain, and furthermore from a historical, geographical and cultural point of view, they are the principal reference of “foreignness.” Furthermore, all public opinion polls identify them as the immigrant group to whom the Spaniards express the most profound discriminatory attitudes.

The most important characteristic of the Ecuadorians and the Colombians is that their populations have shown extraordinary growth in recent years. They have become the principal immigrant groups in many regions of Spain, outnumbering even Moroccans in many areas. In the case of Ecuadorians the number of registered workers in April of 2002 is greater than all Ecuadorian legal residents in December 2001 due to the large increase in their numbers in just 4 months. This increase was a result of exceptional regularizations approved by the government in 2000 and 2001. These two Latin American collectives were chosen not just because of their numbers but also because of their very recent incorporation in Spanish society. This fact means that they are in the most critical phase of the migratory trajectory (legal insecurity, returning the travel debts incurred, black economy, crowded housing, separation from spouses and children, etc.)

Gender distribution shows different patterns among the three collectives: more men among Moroccans, more women among Colombians and equal numbers among the Ecuadorians.

In regard to geographical distribution, three regions stand out among the 17 Autonomous Regions of Spain: Madrid, Catalonia and Andalusia. Over half of all non-EU foreigners are to be found there, including 70% of all Moroccans and Ecuadorians, and 54% of all Colombians. (See Table 1.2)
Geographical Distribution of Moroccan, Ecuadorian and Colombian Immigrants in Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of residence</th>
<th>Moroccans</th>
<th>Ecuadorians</th>
<th>Colombians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal residents 12.31.2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>88.642</td>
<td>37,7</td>
<td>15.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>36.020</td>
<td>15,3</td>
<td>34.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andalusia</td>
<td>39.279</td>
<td>16,7</td>
<td>7.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Spain</td>
<td>70.996</td>
<td>30,2</td>
<td>27.175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workers registered with Social Security 4.10.2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of residence</th>
<th>Moroccans</th>
<th>Ecuadorians</th>
<th>Colombians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>39.326</td>
<td>27,7</td>
<td>11.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>18.808</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>30.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andalusia</td>
<td>23.951</td>
<td>16,8</td>
<td>5.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest Spain</td>
<td>60.093</td>
<td>42,3</td>
<td>38.611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


All studies on discrimination in Spain identify the Roma as the most stigmatized collective, even more so than Moroccans and Sub Saharan Africans. “In all studies carried annually since 1991 the social group which is least positively viewed is the Roma, and therefore the most susceptible to be object of discriminatory attitudes”². According to the Foundation Secretariado General Gitano, the number of Roma can be estimated at 450.000 persons, representing 1.1% of the total population of Spain, with an important presence in the Regions of Andalusia, Madrid and Catalonia.

Keeping in mind the budget limits established for this project, a stratified sample of 1.200 cases was designed (400 Moroccans, 400 Roma and 400 Colombians and Ecuadorians), which, according to the probability tables of Harvard and Tagliacarne, gives a margin of error of 2,9% for the entire sample, and 5% for each of the specific groups (with a confidence interval of 95,5%). Due to the

fact that in Spain registers do not exist that could permit selecting a random sample (such as census data that identify people’s ethnic background or nationality) it was decided to carry out the sample by a system of quotas. These quotas reflect the reality of proportions of men and women, and geographical distribution for the different collectives. For each of the four collectives to be studied there was a team of around 10 persons who located the subjects and interviewed them, thus insuring a sample sufficiently representative. The theoretical sample is shown in Table 1.3.

Table 1.3
Planned theoretical sample to be applied in the Regions of Madrid, Andalusia, and Catalonia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Catalonia</th>
<th>Madrid</th>
<th>Andalusia</th>
<th>Total by sex</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moroccans</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuadorians</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombians</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Sample</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>434</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Design and Testing of the Questionnaires.

The content of the questionnaire was based on that designed and used by A. Lange in the study “Immigrants on Discrimination” (CEIFO 1997) so that international comparisons could be made. A detailed look at the questionnaire used by A. Lange led us to conclude that it was possible to apply it, almost in its entirety, to the three immigrants groups selected in Spain (Moroccan, Colombian, Ecuadorian), but that a number of questions needed to be adapted when directed at Roma. For this reason it was decided to use two different questionnaires, one for immigrants and one for Roma. In
the latter, all references to migratory process were eliminated and some specific questions regarding social, economic and cultural traditions of the Roma people were included. The language was modified in some questions and in some of the possible answers in both questionnaires, in order to better adapt to the Spanish reality. The questionnaire was only in Spanish, the interviewers verbally assisting those Moroccans who were not fluent in Spanish.

The Colectivo IOE and the partners from the Foundation Secretariado General Gitano carried out the adaptation of the questionnaire used by A. LANGE, (Immigrants on discrimination, CEIFO, 1997, pages. 81-96) during the months of July and August of 2002. For this adaptation the observations gathered at the work meeting held at the EUMC office in Vienna on July 29 were taken into account.

A first version of the questionnaire was tested on members of the 4 groups to be studied (Roma, Moroccans, Colombians, Ecuadorians) and this permitted improving the formulation of some of the questions and possible answers. At the same time the provisional draft of the questionnaire was sent to the EUMC Vienna office, and to the national teams that had participated in the Vienna meeting of July 29, (Sweden, Germany, Italy, Holland, Great Britain, And Austria), in order to solicit possible comments or proposals for modification.

Although we have tried to maintain as much as possible the same formulations as in the original questionnaire in some instances it has been necessary to differentiate between questions for Roma (Spanish citizens with full rights) and those for immigrants (foreigners from other countries whose situation is regulated by immigration policy and regulations). It is for this reason that two different questionnaires were used. In the first week of September 2002, the definitive questionnaire texts were completed.
4. Preparation of the survey teams and application of the questionnaire.

Due to the fact that there is no census data available regarding the collectives to be studied (immigrants and Roma) which could have been used to locate perspective persons to be interviewed, it was decided to administer the questionnaires by selecting surveyors who are members of the same collectives to be studied, and thus would have more access to locating subjects to be interviewed. Quotas were established for each surveyor and included numerical objectives based on sex, age diversity, diversity in time of residence in Spain, economic status and place of residency.

The survey teams were trained by Colectivo IOE and the Foundation Secretariado General Gitano. In the majority of cases the surveyors had experience in carrying out similar interviews. The training sessions took place during the second week of September in Madrid, Barcelona, and Malaga.

The survey teams were directed by experienced co-ordinators who were responsible for supervising the first questionnaires in order to discover and correct possible misunderstandings or errors in the application.

Each surveyor had to administer the number of questionnaires that they were assigned, and according to the criteria established in the quotas. Once a subject was located they could fill out the questionnaire themselves, or with the help of the surveyor, (some subjects had some limitations in their reading skills). It was permissible to interview a few people simultaneously, as long as the
quotas were respected. When the subject filled out the questionnaire himself or herself, they had the option of mailing the finished form directly to the Colectivo IOE office.

When a person who had been approached and invited to fill out the questionnaire could not, or choose not to answer, the surveyor had to fill out a rejection form which included the persons basic data: place of residence, nationality, sex, estimated age and the motive cited for not answering the questionnaire. (See rejection form model in Annex)

The time established for completing the questionnaires was three weeks. October 10th was the cut off date for receiving completed questionnaires. Table 4 records the number of questionnaires and rejections forms received by that date. As shown 1,019 questionnaires were answered, which represents 84.9% of the theoretical sample initially decided on in the project definition. It is concluded that the relatively low number of non-respondents, in comparison with the non-respondents in the study done by Lange is due to different information gathering methodologies. In Sweden the questionnaire was sent by mail, while in Spain the surveyors personally sought out and interviewed the subjects.

Table 1.4

---

3 For ethnic /national groups the highest response rate corresponded to Roma (87.8%) and the lowest to Ecuadorians (82%). By region, the highest response rate was in Madrid (89.4%) and the lowest was in Catalonia (82.3%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Catalonia</th>
<th>Madrid</th>
<th>Andalusia</th>
<th>Total sex</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccans</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuadorians</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombians</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Carried Out</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>1.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theoretical Sample: 434 | 441 | 325 | 1.200
Rejected: 78 | 50 | 53 | 181

% Rejects: 17.7 | 11.6 | 16.3 | 15.1

Once completed, the questionnaires were checked by the respective survey team co-ordinators and classified in the Colectivo IOE Office and prepared for computer processing.
II. RESULTS

1. Introduction

What this study attempts to measure are the experiences of discrimination suffered by members of social groups as differentiated from the native majority population in Spain (in this case foreign immigrants and Roma). The research team responsible for carrying out the study in Spain followed the criteria defined in the original investigation (Lange 1997: 19-22). Here discrimination in the first place is defined as a deliberate differential treatment with negative, unjust or illegal characteristics. From this perspective, which emphasizes the negative characteristics of discrimination, there is no discussion of the concept of positive discrimination. Secondly, Lange considers that acts of discrimination are principally registered in the public sphere of social life. In the private sphere acts and conducts of negative differential treatment must be categorized using other concepts. Thirdly, Lange defines that negative differential treatment must be directed against persons due to there being members of certain categories or social groups, not simply as an individual. Fourth, the author does not consider it useful to make a distinction between direct discrimination (intentional) and indirect discrimination (unintentional), in that his definition states that intention is a necessary condition for an act to be discriminatory. Finally, the expression “institutional discrimination” is not considered appropriate as the concept of discrimination applies to deliberate acts produced between individuals in specific situations.

It is important to note that it is possible to distinguish between objective acts of discrimination, and discrimination subjectively experienced, although the determination of objective discrimination is not always simple. The subjective experience of having been discriminated against is not necessarily proof of the objective existence of discrimination. Furthermore, an observer can
identify the latter although there is no perception on the part of the victim of being discriminated against. In this study the questions used refer to concrete situations in which persons can be treated in different ways. What is measured is not the existence of objective discrimination, but the experience of discrimination. Or, more specifically, the reports of experiences of discrimination as perceived by individuals. Therefore we are not in a position to determine:

a) Whether or not the subjects report all the experiences of discrimination that they feel they have lived.

b) If these experiences correspond to objective acts of discrimination, motivated by the individual belonging to a certain social group, or in other words, to what degree their subjective perceptions are adequate.

In order to limit as much as possible the problems of interpretation by the subjects, the expressions “due to foreign background” or "due to being Roma" are systematically used in the questionnaires. However in the final analysis the answers obtained are product of the personal interpretation that the subject makes regarding the reasons that motivated the negative treatment they feel they have received. The methodology used does not permit evaluating the “quality” of these interpretations.

2. Some characteristics of the collectives under study.

As has been indicated above, the populations object of our investigation are composed of 4 collectives: Spanish Roma and three immigrant groups: Moroccans, Colombians, and Ecuadorians. Before analyzing their responses regarding discriminatory treatment we will indicate some of their principal social demographic characteristics and links with Spanish society.
We first look at the situation of the immigrant groups. There is an evident difference among them in relation to the length their residence in Spain. The Moroccans have a longer average length of residence in comparison with the Colombians and Ecuadorians: 40% of the Moroccans arrived before 1990, in comparison with only 2% of the Colombians and Ecuadorians. In contrast, almost half the Colombians and Ecuadorians arrived in the years 2000 and 2001, in comparison with only 8% of the Moroccans. It is important to keep in mind this difference when evaluating the experience of discrimination expressed by the members of each group.

The legal status, which is a factor contributing to a more or less stable position in Spanish society, is also diverse. The Moroccans are better off in this sense in that only 4% do not have residency permits, and another 3% are awaiting response to their residency permit application. In contrast, these figures rise to 10% and 12% in the case of Ecuadorians, and 18% and 20% for Colombians. Furthermore 17% of the Moroccans have obtained Spanish nationality, compared to 8% of the Colombians and only 2% of the Ecuadorians.

The “migratory project”, with plans to stay permanently in Spain or return to their country of origin, influences the strategies and expectations of the immigrants in regards to Spanish society. Although there are a significant number of persons who do not know what they will do in the future (45% of the Moroccans, and a third of the Colombians and Ecuadorians), those who are most inclined to remain in Spain are the Moroccans: 28% in comparison to 7% who expect to return to Morocco within the next 5 years. Among the Colombians there is a balance between those who want to remain- 30%, and those whose desire is to return- 27%. Among the Ecuadorians 36% hope to return and 16% to stay. This same scale, Moroccan > Colombian > Ecuadorian, reproduces the

---

4 The results of all the questions from both questionnaires, presented by ethnic/national categories are shown in Annex I.
scale of length of residency, which suggests that the expectations to return to one’s country of origin diminish as the length of residency increases.

These projects are also related to the identification that exists with the country of origin: this identification is very high among the Ecuadorians (88% express a scale of identification of 6 or 7, on a scale of 7), and is weaker among Colombians (60%) and Moroccans (52%).

A similar relation is found in regards to networks of intergroup relations. Although among the three groups the most common relations are with people of their own country, the Ecuadorians have the least contact with Spaniards (25% have no contact) whereas the Moroccans and Colombians have frequent contact with Spaniards, (48% and 52% respectively).

And finally, among those that are married, the nationality of their spouse is an indicator of contact and “integration” in Spanish society. Here we again find a clear differentiation: only 1% of the Ecuadorians are married to a Spaniard, while the percentage is rather significant among Colombians (25%) and Moroccans (21%)

In the case of the Roma, who are persons born in Spain and descendents of families who have lived almost 600 hundred years in Spain, the links with the majority society (Payos⁵) are of another nature, in that they are relations among peoples who are all Spanish citizens. The majority of Roma (60%) affirm that Payos almost always “identify” them as Roma, while 30% affirm the contrary (they never or almost never are identified as Roma). At the same time 63% believe that the majority of Payos consider Roma as Spanish, while 37% believe the opposite.

⁵ “Payo” is the Spanish word for non Gitanos, and does not have derogatory implications in Spain. It is used in this report to differentiate Spanish Roma from the rest of the Spanish people.
In terms of social networks, the majority have frequent relations with other Roma, (85%), while they have relations frequently with Payos a bit less (72%). Their contact with immigrants is less (only 13 % have frequent contacts with immigrants).

The gender composition of the different collectives shows an equal balance in the case of Roma and Ecuadorians, but more women in the case of the Colombians and more men in the case of the Moroccans. Looking at ages, two thirds of the immigrants are between 30 and 49 years old, whereas among the Roma only 50% are in this age group, and the rest are younger or more elderly.

Examining marital status we find more bachelors among Colombians and Moroccans (around 40%) than among Ecuadorians and Roma (around 25%). Widows/Widowers and separated persons are greater among Colombians and Ecuadorians (13%), than among Moroccans and Roma (5%). In the case of married immigrants we find that a third of those interviewed have their spouse in their country of origin.

The family situation of the different groups is completed with the analyses of the existence of offspring and their place of residence. Those with the greatest tendency to have children are the Ecuadorians and the Roma, of whom 70% are parents, in contrast with only 50% of the Moroccans and Colombians. Some immigrants have children residing in their country of origin (47% in the case of Ecuadorians, 24% of the Colombians and 12% of the Moroccans). There is a correlation here once again with this data and the length of time of residency in Spain (longer time equals fewer children in country of origin)

The educational level of the four groups is also different. The lowest educational levels are found with Roma and Moroccans. 36% and 20% respectively have not completed any education cycle,
with 52% and 31% not having completed elementary school. Among the Latin Americans the majority have a high school education and there are a large number of persons who have attended the university (50% of the Colombians and 37% of the Ecuadorians). Among the Moroccans 18% have attended the university, while this figure is only 2% among Roma. The Moroccan immigration is characterized by a coexistence of two important contrasting groups: illiterates and university graduates.

In regards to place of residence we distinguish two different spaces: cities of more than 500,000 inhabitants, and other. The majority of people interviewed lived in the large cities, although the highest proportion of city dwellers is found among the Colombians (74%) followed by Roma and Ecuadorians (66%). On the other hand the distribution of Moroccans is more balanced (56% in larger cities, and 44% in smaller cities and towns).

In regards to economic activity we find that the vast majority of Ecuadorians are working or looking for work (92%). The same is true for 75% of the Moroccans, and Colombians, and 61% of the Roma. Among those that are economically active the principal occupations, with breakdown by gender and nationality/ethnic group are:

**WOMEN:***

*Moroccans:* domestic workers (35%), store employee (14%).

*Ecuadorians:* domestic workers (45%), street vendors (16%), hotel/ restaurant (13%).

*Colombians:* domestic workers (24%), store employee (16%).

*Roma:* Street vendors (42%), Cleaning woman (8%).
MEN:

*Moroccan*: construction (28%), hotel/restaurant (15%), store employee (12%).

*Ecuadorians*: construction (57%).

*Colombians*: construction (25%), hotel/restaurant (15%), store employee (13%).

*Roma*: Street vendor (36%), construction (16%).

One of the indicators of employment stability is the amount of time that a person has been at their current job or economic activity. The data shows that the majority of the Colombians and Ecuadorians (recent immigrants to Spain) have been at their present jobs less than a year. On the other hand, more than half the Roma have been performing the same economic activity for over 5 years. The Moroccans are in an intermediate situation. The situation of the Roma is influenced by the fact that a large percentage (46%) are autonomous workers, depending on their clients, not on an employer. Autonomous workers are much less frequent among immigrant groups; 5% of the Ecuadorians, and 15% of the Moroccans and Colombians.

3. “Reported” discrimination

We will now look at the experience of discrimination as reported by the interviewed persons, and that they attribute to being members of a specific collective (Roma or immigrants). There are 18 questions referring to possible discriminatory treatments, which are found in both of the questionnaires. However not all subjects had to answer all questions. For example, there is a question regarding whether someone has been refused employment in the last 5 years. Those that had not looked for employment in this period were excluded from answering.
Table 2.1 indicates the proportion of men and women in each of the four groups for whom the questions were relevant in the 12 items which contain the option “I have not...”

For example the results indicate that 66% of the Roma men interviewed had attempted to obtain employment in the last 5 years, thus the number cases of possible experiences of discrimination in this area refers only to this 66%, not to the entire number of interviewed persons. As indicated in the table, the number of people responding to a question can vary quite a bit, depending on the specific question and to which of the 4 collectives the subject belongs.

**TABLE 2.1 Proportions in percentage (rounded off) of men and women in each of the 4 groups that have had experience in the areas referred to in the following questions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Moroccans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ecuadorians</th>
<th></th>
<th>Colombians</th>
<th></th>
<th>Roma</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V11 access to employment</td>
<td>79  88</td>
<td>92  98</td>
<td>91  91</td>
<td>41  66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12 promotion in employment</td>
<td>53  71</td>
<td>46  53</td>
<td>54  68</td>
<td>41  66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12b firing</td>
<td>79  87</td>
<td>92  98</td>
<td>91  91</td>
<td>41  66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13 harassment at work</td>
<td>80  91</td>
<td>95  98</td>
<td>93  93</td>
<td>48  73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14 access to housing</td>
<td>87  88</td>
<td>86  87</td>
<td>91  89</td>
<td>66  77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15 treatment in educational system</td>
<td>63  53</td>
<td>29  13</td>
<td>60  44</td>
<td>52  47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V19 entrance to restaurants</td>
<td>87  93</td>
<td>82  90</td>
<td>86  91</td>
<td>92  95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V21 loans, credit cards</td>
<td>54  63</td>
<td>43  39</td>
<td>58  59</td>
<td>69  63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V24 contact with employment offices</td>
<td>57  59</td>
<td>65  48</td>
<td>49  61</td>
<td>38  56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V26 contact with police</td>
<td>70  74</td>
<td>62  68</td>
<td>58  74</td>
<td>64  71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V27 contact with health services</td>
<td>89  81</td>
<td>92  91</td>
<td>93  91</td>
<td>99  98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V28 contact with social services</td>
<td>55  48</td>
<td>68  70</td>
<td>60  68</td>
<td>52  55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The answers to the questions regarding discriminatory treatment for each of the 4 groups appear in Annex I. In Table 2.2 we have broken down the data in function of gender and place of residency (large cities and other). We have chosen this form of presentation in order to help the comparison with data obtained by Lange in the research carried out in Sweden. The results are given in rounded off percentages. In the last row the figure is given for the total number of cases (n=) of the
subcategory that is analyzed. It is important to keep in mind these magnitudes, for when the numbers are small, the margin for error is greatly increased.

The different questions are grouped in 4 sections, product of the results obtained after a factorial analysis. The 4 sections refer to 1) questions regarding employment 2) questions related to social life in public places 3) questions related to institutional treatment in public or private services and 4) questions related to difficulties in accessing housing or experiences of violence or robbery which we have titled generically “housing and violence”

Values higher than 40% are indicated in boldface. That is to say that in those questions where at least 40% of the possible affected persons affirmed that they had received discriminatory treatment due to being Roma or immigrants. The selection of this figure is arbitrary and does not imply that we consider, for example, that percentages of “only” 30% are acceptable; it is simply a way of highlighting the most noticeable cases. Referring to the entire sample it can be observed (see last column of Table 2.2) that there are only two questions which surpass this figure; difficulties in accessing housing, where 55% of the respondents affirmed that they had received discriminatory treatment, and in questions related to access to employment (40%). Almost a third of the persons affirm that they have had problems in three other areas: discriminatory treatment at work, insults or harassment by neighbors, and difficulties entering restaurants, bars, and similar. Somewhat less is

---

6 The analysis was made on the basis of a previous dichotomization of the 18 variables, giving a value of “0” when there was no experience of discrimination, and “1” when at least there was one experience. We only considered the cases that were pertinent. The result of the factorial analysis was not conclusive in that the four chosen factors barely reached 46% of the variance analyzed. Therefore, although there is an important correlation between variables in each one of the groups, this does no exclude correlations that can be established between variables belonging to the different factors.
the number of persons detained in the street by the police (including only to ask for ID) and those who have suffered aggressions or harassment by other persons in public.

If, instead of analyzing the total sample, we look at different subcategories (nationality, gender and place of residence) we get a more varied view. In general men report more experiences of discrimination than do women, with the exception of experiences in the educational system and health services. The predominance of men experiencing discrimination in relation to the police (both in treatment and in arrests of retentions) is very clear.

In relation to place of residence the experience of discrimination is generally greater in large cities, with the exception of difficulties in accessing bars, restaurants and similar places, and in the treatment received in these places and in health services. In these three areas the experience of discrimination is less in large cities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Moroccans</th>
<th>Ecuadorians</th>
<th>Colombians</th>
<th>Roma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>M.</td>
<td>O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to employment</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job promotion</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment at work</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment employment office</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment by neighbors</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment in public</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance to restaurants</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance to stores</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment in stores-restaurants</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detentions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to housing</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence-robbery</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table represents proportions in percentages (rounded off) of women and men, residents of metropolitan areas (M), or other areas (O), whom have affirmed to have been the object of unequal treatment 1 or 2 times in the last 5 years (V11 to V17) or during the last year (V18 to V24).
The percentages refer only to those persons for whom the question was relevant. The last line “n” indicates the number of individuals who responded in each sub category. The column “All” shows the percentages in relation to all the interviewed persons, without dividing them into the 4 immigrant/ethnic categories. The variables are grouped according to the four factors identified through statistical analysis.

The percentages in Table 2.2 show the following relevant situations:

- Discrimination in access to employment is particularly pronounced for Moroccan and Ecuadorian men living in large cities, Roma women in cities and Moroccans women in non-metropolitan areas and for Roma men in all places of residence.

- Difficulties in job promotion are greater for Ecuadorian men and women in metropolitan areas, and for Colombian men in non-metropolitan areas.

- Harassment or bad treatment in the work place has been particularly reported by Moroccan men and women outside of the large cities.

- Problems or obstacles entering restaurants, bars, clubs, etc., and police detentions affecting notably Moroccan men, in all places of residence. Retentions by police affect other immigrant men in large cities. Access to bars
and similar places is the most frequently reported problem of Roma men in non-metropolitan areas.

- Ecuadorian immigrants most inform of being objects of harassment or bad treatment in the streets or by neighbors, especially Ecuadorian men who live in large cities

- Bad treatment in bars or stores is especially mentioned by Roma and Moroccans, especially by men who live in non-metropolitan areas.

- Discrimination in institutional domains, (schools, health or social services, banks...), present lower values. What stands out is bad treatment by police of Ecuadorian men in metropolitan areas, and to a lesser extent, of Moroccan men. Also detected are problems in accessing bank loans or in using credit cards by immigrant men in large cities.

- The most problematical situation is found in discriminatory treatment in accessing housing. Only the Latin Americans who live in non-metropolitan areas and Roma in all areas present values less than 40% in this area. The most affected are Moroccans, particularly those outside of large cities, and Latin Americans who reside in large cities.
Indexes and Domains of Discrimination

The reading of this data with all of the possible subcategories, is difficult if we do not use some simplifying criteria. As we have indicated, the factorial analysis does not permit satisfactory reduction of the existing variance, but we think that grouping of variables in four factors simplifies analysis once we have analyzed (Table 2.2) in which the most notable situations of discrimination are found.

With the objective of further facilitating the analysis we use mean values that permit situating the experiences of discrimination on a scale of 4 categories: value “1” indicates that there was no experience of discrimination and value “4” that such experiences have been frequent (five or more times in the selected timeframe). Thus values under 1,5 (near “1”) indicate practically the nonexistence of discrimination and those values superior to “2” show the distinct levels of discrimination. As we analyze the results it is important to note that the bulk of the responses to these questions are situated between the options “No” and “yes, 1 or 2 Experiences”, and thus the index tends to situate values between “1” and “2”.

SCALE OF DISCRIMINATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No experience</td>
<td>One or two times</td>
<td>Three or four times</td>
<td>Five or more times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this way we obtain values on the scale for each one of the variables of discrimination that we are investigating. This step is not sufficient to adequately simplify the presentation of the data. For this reason, instead of analyzing 18 values, (one for each variable) we use only four, those that correspond to the factors or “domains of discrimination“ that we have identified: employment, public places, institutional services and “housing and violence.” In the construction of these indexes we have only used the cases in which the question was pertinent for all the variables implicated in each factor, a procedure that reduces, in part, the available sample base, but improves the index validity.  

In the following tables we present said mean values for each of the four discrimination domains in relation to the ethnic/nationality category, gender and place of residence. Values equal or superior to 1.5 are highlighted in bold type.

**TABLE 2.3**

*Mean values in the informed discrimination scale in the employment domain, according to ethnic/nationality group, gender, and place of residence. The Index has a minimum value of 1 and maximum of 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moroccans</th>
<th>Ecuadorians</th>
<th>Colombians</th>
<th>Roma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.</td>
<td>O.</td>
<td>M.</td>
<td>O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of valid cases for each ethnic/nationality group and discrimination domain are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group / Domain</th>
<th>Employment domain</th>
<th>Public places domain</th>
<th>Institutional services domain</th>
<th>“Housing &amp; violence domain”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuadorian</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombian</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2.4
Mean values in the informed discrimination scale in the public place domain, according to ethnic/nationality group, gender, and place of residence. The Index has a minimum value of 1 and maximum of 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Moroccans</th>
<th>Ecuadorians</th>
<th>Colombians</th>
<th>Roma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. O.</td>
<td>M. O.</td>
<td>M. O.</td>
<td>M. O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1.3 1.3</td>
<td>1.3 1.1</td>
<td>1.2 1.1</td>
<td>1.3 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1.4 1.5</td>
<td>1.5 1.3</td>
<td>1.3 1.2</td>
<td>1.4 1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2.5
Mean values in the informed discrimination scale in the institutional services domain, according to ethnic/nationality group, gender, and place of residence. The Index has a minimum value of 1 and maximum of 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Moroccans</th>
<th>Ecuadorians</th>
<th>Colombians</th>
<th>Roma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. O.</td>
<td>M. O.</td>
<td>M. O.</td>
<td>M. O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1.3 1.2</td>
<td>1.2 1.0</td>
<td>1.3 1.1</td>
<td>1.2 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1.3 1.2</td>
<td>1.5 1.3</td>
<td>1.0 1.3</td>
<td>1.3 1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2.6
Mean values in the informed discrimination scale in situations of “housing and violence,” according to ethnic/nationality group, gender, place of residence. The Index has a minimum value of 1 and maximum of 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Moroccans</th>
<th>Ecuadorians</th>
<th>Colombians</th>
<th>Roma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. O.</td>
<td>M. O.</td>
<td>M. O.</td>
<td>M. O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1.6 2.1</td>
<td>1.5 1.4</td>
<td>1.5 1.1</td>
<td>1.3 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1.8 1.9</td>
<td>1.7 1.4</td>
<td>1.6 1.3</td>
<td>1.3 1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the employment discrimination domain the two most affected groups are (without separating by gender or place of residence) Moroccans and Roma. In Table 2.3, if broken down to the sub categories, we see that the highest value corresponds to Moroccan women who live in non-metropolitan areas. Next come Moroccan and Ecuadorian men who live in large cities. The lowest values correspond to Colombians. The place of residence and gender does not introduce variations in the case of the Roma. On the other hand in the case of immigrants there is tendency to report higher
discrimination men and residents in large cities, with the above cited exception of Moroccan women in non-metropolitan areas.

In the discrimination sphere that refers to the public places domain the most affected groups are the Moroccans and Roma. The data in Table 2.4 indicates that men are most affected (Ecuadorians in large cities, and Moroccans in non-metropolitan areas). The values are higher for residents in large cities, with the exception of Moroccan men.

In discrimination in the institutional services domain the Roma are affected more than the immigrant groups. But in table 2.5 we can see that if we separate by gender and habitat the most outstanding situation is that of Ecuadorian men in large cities. In this domain there is no clear majority by gender or place of residence.

Finally, the factor that refers to situations of discrimination in “housing & violence” affects immigrants to a greater degree than Roma. In this case we find the highest values on the scale, and for the first time we have figures close to “2.” In table 2.6 a progression is seen from less to more, beginning with Roma, followed by Colombians and Ecuadorians and Moroccans finishing with the highest values. In the subcategories, the highest values correspond to Moroccans of both sexes who live in non-metropolitan areas. The next highest values are immigrants of both sexes residing in large cities, although men are more affected than women.

In summary, the data in Tables 2.3 to 2.6 confirm what we have observed in Table 2.2: the most important elements of discrimination are related to access to housing and to questions related to employment (principally in accessing a job). Furthermore, although
the reported discrimination tends to be greater for men and for residents in metropolitan areas, this is not a clear tendency in that various exceptions are found. The greatest exception corresponds to Moroccans who reside in non-metropolitan areas, as generally they show higher values than their compatriots in metropolitan areas. In the case of Roma there is little difference in the reports of discrimination in function of gender or place of residence.

In regards to the numerical values of the indicators it is worth mentioning the different situation of Ecuadorians and Colombians, and that of Roma and Moroccans. As a large majority of the first group have been living in Spain only a short time it is less probable that they affirm that they have been treated in a discriminatory manner “3 or 4 times,” or “more than 5 times,” simply due to lack of opportunity. Consequently, it is logical to think that their responses will be found between the values of “1” (“no discrimination”) and “2” (“1 or 2 times”). This argument does not apply to the Roma, all who have lived all their life in Spain, or Moroccans, with a relatively long period of residency. Thus, if the indicators are not higher than “2” we must deduce that the cases where discriminatory treatment was repeated three or more times are infrequent.

Once these questions have been analyzed we can look at the degree to which people denounced or reported discriminatory actions to the appropriate authorities. In the survey there were two questions directed towards those who felt that they had been discriminated in accessing housing, bank loans or credit card use, in accessing stores or places of entertainment and leisure activities. The responses indicate that denouncements are rarely made:
• Of the 461 persons who affirm having been discriminated in accessing housing 12 (2.6%) reported the incident to the authorities.

• Of the 174 persons who were discriminated against upon attempting to enter a restaurant, dance hall etc, only 8 (4.6%) reported the incident to the authorities.

• 73 persons reported problems entering a store, but only 3 (4.1%) notified authorities of the incident

• Obstacles to receiving a bank loan or use of a credit card were reported by 110 persons, but only 4 (3.6%) made a complaint to authorities.

Looking at these results it seems clear that those affected by discriminatory treatment do not have the consciousness that such actions can be denounced. This might be due to a lack of information regarding their rights, an acceptance of certain level of discrimination as “normal,” a lack of confidence in the institutions or authorities responsible for combating and punishing discrimination, simply a lack of knowledge of where and how to denounce, or abandonment of denouncements due to the bureaucratic difficulty that it can represent.
4. Other factors related to discrimination

Until now we have analyzed the results of the questionnaire that refer directly to experiences of discriminatory treatment related to only three variables: membership in an ethnic/nationality group, gender and place of residence. What follows is an analysis of the relationship with other characteristics and opinions of the participating subjects.

4.1. Age, education and length of time of residency in Spain.

We start with the question of age. In the employment domain and in the domain of institutional services there is a negative correlation (that is to say more elderly persons report less discrimination) for Ecuadorians and Colombians and positive (more elderly / more discrimination) for the Roma. In the domain of public places there is a significant negative correlation for Moroccans, (younger people sense more discrimination). In the situation of “housing and violence” younger immigrants (particularly Colombians) have a greater sense of discrimination, and the contrary occurs with the Roma.

Examining the question of education, in the employment domain those with more education sense less discrimination in all groups except the Moroccans where the contrary occurs: those with more education sense greater discrimination. In the domain of public places there is a negative relationship (more education / less discrimination) in the case of the Roma. In the situation of institutional services there is a positive
correlation in the case of Roma (More education/more discrimination)\textsuperscript{8}. In the domain of “housing and violence” there is a weak positive correlation for all groups.

The question of length of residency in Spain only affects the three immigrant groups, not the Roma. In the employment domain there is a positive correlation (longer residency/ more discrimination) for Moroccans and Colombians, and negative correlation for Ecuadorians (particularly for the most recent arrivals). In the domain of public places there is no clear correlation with length of residency except in the case of the Colombians where there is a positive correlation. In the domain of institutional services there are significant, although contrary, correlations in regards to Ecuadorians (more recent arrival / more discrimination) and Colombians (Longer the residency/more discrimination). In the domain of “housing and violence” there is slightly positive correlation in the case of the Moroccans.

Summarizing what has been discussed up to this point:

* In general it could be assumed that if discrimination is greater for more elderly people (as occurs with Roma) then the situation of the younger generations is more positive. In the case for populations that have been residing for a long time we would be witnessing an indictor of improvements over time. But this hypotheses does work if youth and elderly are recent arrivals, as occurs with the two Latin American groups. The greater

\textsuperscript{8} It could be thought that Roma with less education tend to move in less tolerant social –public environments. On the other hand the more educated Roma, not being accustomed to receive discriminatory treatment in public spaces, are mores resentful when receive such treatment in the institutional services sphere
sense of discrimination of older Roma could indicate that the new generations are less affected by these situations.

* The relation between education and discrimination does not show a clear pattern: in some situations greater education seems to reduce the experience of discrimination (employment) but in others the contrary is true, as in the case of Roma in their relation with institutional services.

* In relation to the variable of time of residency, longer residency exposes people to more experiences of discrimination, but at the same time permits them to develop strategies of social integration that are less conflictive. The results are not conclusive. Although there are positive correlations (longer time of residency / more discrimination), there are also cases where the contrary is true (Ecuadorians in employment), and others that show no clear tendency.

4.2. Difficulties to making friends with Spaniards / Payos

The difficulties that exist in terms of establishing ties with persons of the “Majority” society⁹ are influenced by diverse factors. Initially we can suppose that the favorable experiences in this terrain favor “integration” of minorities and consequently reduce the risk of discrimination. The results (see Annex I) show that in all the groups the majority considers it easy or very easy to make friends with Spaniards (in the case of immigrants) or with Payos (in the case of Roma). Those that have greatest difficulties (“difficult” or “very difficult”) are Ecuadorians (49%) followed by Moroccans and Payos in the case of Roma, and Spaniards if we refer to the immigrants.
Colombians (36%). Roma are represented significantly less in this category of response (14%). Thus relations are easiest for Roma and most difficult for Ecuadorians, the group with the least amount of time of residency in Spain.

Other factors apart from nationality can influence this question. An analysis by gender indicates that Moroccan women, and men of the other three groups, have greater ease in establishing relations with Spaniards / Payos. Regarding age, the least difficulties are expressed by people younger than 25 years, with those over 50 years having greater difficulties, and with no clear tendency among those between 25 to 50 years of age. Nor is there a clear correlation in relation to the time of residency in Spain (for the immigrants) except for the Moroccans, the group with the longest average time of residency. In this case the longer the time of residency, the easier it is to establish relations with Spaniards. Education levels show a clear positive correlation: more education means less difficulty establishing relations with Spaniards / Payos. This is true in all the groups except for the Colombians, where no significant correlation is found.

In any case, what interests us is determining if there is a relation between the difficulty in making Spanish / Payo friends, and the experience of discrimination. The study of Lange in Sweden indicates that “the answer to the question [difficulty in making Swedish friends] can be taken as a report of a further type of discrimination” (LANGE, 1997:42), indicating that that a positive correlation can be established between these two variables. Table 2.7 shows the partial correlations between each of the domains of discrimination and the difficulty in making Spanish / Payo friends. These correlations have been statistically controlled for gender, age, length of residency and place of
residency. This means that the correlations found are independent of the effects of these variables, and thus are not explained by their influence.

**TABLE 2.7**  
*Partial correlations between difficulties in making Spanish / Payo friends, for the four identified discrimination domains.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrimination Domain / Nationality</th>
<th>Moroccans</th>
<th>Ecuadorians</th>
<th>Colombians</th>
<th>Roma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0,27</td>
<td>0,38</td>
<td>-0,23</td>
<td>0,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Places</td>
<td>0,15</td>
<td>0,13</td>
<td>0,28</td>
<td>0,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Services</td>
<td>0,29</td>
<td>0,47</td>
<td>0,26</td>
<td>0,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Housing and violence”</td>
<td>0,18</td>
<td>0,12</td>
<td>0,08</td>
<td>0,34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the analysis of data it is recommended to exclude values inferior to 0,15 in that they are not statistically significant. Once done, we see that there exists a positive correlation between difficulty in making Spanish / Payo friends and greater experience of discrimination. There is one notable exception, that of Colombians in the employment domain, where the lack of “friendship” does not mean greater discrimination, and conversely the existence of more “friendships” does not imply less discrimination in the employment domain. Looking at the four groups studied this hypotheses is most true for the Roma, where it is seen that discrimination particularly affects those who are most “closed,” with greater difficulties in relating with Payos. On the other hand, discrimination towards immigrants is less influenced by the ease or the difficulties in making friends with Spaniards. In regard to the different domains of discrimination the influence of immigrants lack of friendship shows a greater correlation with discrimination in the domain if institutional services, and in the case of Roma it is greater in the employment domain and in “housing and violence”
The difficulties in establishing friendships with Spaniards / Payos can be related to other patterns of sociability of the persons interviewed. It is seen, as was expected, that there is a positive correlation between difficulties in establishing friendships and the scarce contact that exists with Spaniards / Payos, except in the case of Colombians. This group shows an anomaly that is not easy to explain, in that those that affirm that it is not easy to maintain friendships with Spaniards are those that have frequent contacts, as well as vice versa. It would be assumed that those that have more contact with those of their own group would also demonstrate greater difficulties in making Spanish / Payo friends. However the results of the investigation do not confirm this hypothesis. There is no significant correlation between these two questions. In other words, in the Spanish situation greater ties to ones own group does not imply greater difficulties in establishing friendship with members of the “majority society.”

It is also interesting to look at the correlation between the difficulties in making friends with Spaniards / Payos and the sensation of “belonging” in Spain. In this question there is a large difference between immigrants and Roma. In the case of the first group there is a clear negative correlation (less feeling of belonging / greater difficulty in establishing friendships with Spaniards). On the other hand with the Roma there is no significant correlation, a high identification with being Spanish does not eliminate the difficulties in relating to Payos.

Finally we look at the link that exits between difficulties in establishing friendships and perceptions regarding the climate of opinion in Spain regarding minorities. Regarding the perception of decrease or increase of xenophobic attitudes in recent years there is a weak relationship in the case of the Colombians and a stronger one in case of the Roma.
In this case these two groups that have greater difficulties in establishing relations with Spaniards / Payos are those who believe that xenophobic attitudes have increased. This correlation does not hold true for Ecuadorians or Moroccans.

Another question in the survey asked to what degree is Spain a racist society, and in this case there is a significant correlation only with the Ecuadorians, where those who think that Spain is racist have greater difficulties in making friends with Spaniards. On the contrary, when we analyze the opinions in regards to whether or not xenophobia predominates in Spain, the positive correlation is evident in the case of the three immigrant groups, (Spain is xenophobic / greater difficulties in making friends), but not for the Roma. However if we control for the correlation, eliminating the influence of experiences of discrimination, the correlation disappears in the case of the Moroccans. In this case it can be concluded that difficulties towards establishing friendships with Spaniards only exists when the characterization of Spain as a xenophobic society is at the same time shared by having suffered experiences of discrimination.

4.3. Difficulties in practicing one’s own religion in Spain

In Annex I we can see the distribution of different religions for each of the four groups studied. The majority of Moroccans are Muslims (93% and 6% profess no religion). The majority of Ecuadorians and Colombians are Catholics, with a minority of Protestants (8% and 6% respectively) and a large group of non-believers (12% and 29%). In the case of the Roma there are two significant groups: Evangelists (44%) and Catholics (36%), and 18% non-believers. Although the Spanish state defines itself as non-confessional, the institutional and social presence of the Catholic Church is clearly
dominant. In this sense it could be assumed that the hypothetical difficulties in practicing one’s religion will only affect Muslims, (93% of the Moroccans) and the Protestants (44% of the Roma, 8% of the Ecuadorians, and 6% of the Colombians).

The answers to the questionnaire indicate that few Catholics affirm that they have difficulties in practicing their religion (only 8% of the Ecuadorian Catholics) whereas half the Muslims make this affirmation, and as well as significant numbers of Protestants (33% of Ecuadorian Protestants, 17% of Colombian Protestants and 11% of the Roma Evangelists). An initial reading of this data suggests that Muslims are in the worst situation regarding this question, while the difficulties of the Protestants are more linked to the problems of being immigrants rather than specifically to their situation as Protestant, since the Roma have less difficulties than the foreigners.

What other variables can explain the difficulties in practicing religions? Neither the age nor the educational level demonstrates any significant correlation in this question. In regards to gender or place of residence it appears that the difficulties have more affect on the Latin American women in large cities and Moroccan men in non-metropolitan areas. In the case of Roma the only clear pattern is that which affects those that live in non-metropolitan areas. Controlling for the influence of experiences of discrimination it is observed that the correlation disappears for Moroccan residents in non-metropolitan areas. This means that, in this case, the residents in these areas affirm that they have problems in practicing their religion only if they have also experienced discrimination. In the other cases the difficulties are independent of having had such experiences.
4.4. Confidence in Spanish Institutions.

An important section of the questionnaire refers to the level of confidence towards different institutions of Spanish social and political life. The results are shown in Annex I. Here we present the percentages of each of the groups studied that affirm to have much or full confidence in each of the institutions cited (see Table 2.8). It is seen that for all of the groups the most positively evaluated institutions are the public health system, places of worship and the educational system, while the least positively evaluated are the politicians, the parliament and the public tax office. Probably there is not much difference with the majority Spanish population in regards to confidence in these latter institutions.

**TABLE 2.8**
Percentages of persons in each group who affirm to have "much" or "full" confidence in each of the following institutions.
The last column indicates the mean value obtained for each institution in a scale of 1 (no confidence) to 4 (full confidence) by all the persons surveyed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Moroccans</th>
<th>Ecuadorians</th>
<th>Colombians</th>
<th>Roma</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Office</td>
<td>26,0</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>14,7</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>2,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish parliament</td>
<td>7,7</td>
<td>9,3</td>
<td>10,7</td>
<td>12,9</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>10,2</td>
<td>12,2</td>
<td>6,9</td>
<td>1,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Unions</td>
<td>21,0</td>
<td>19,9</td>
<td>28,2</td>
<td>18,4</td>
<td>2,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>25,6</td>
<td>16,3</td>
<td>23,3</td>
<td>29,4</td>
<td>2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>28,9</td>
<td>22,7</td>
<td>36,9</td>
<td>26,6</td>
<td>2,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health system</td>
<td>66,4</td>
<td>44,7</td>
<td>68,9</td>
<td>68,8</td>
<td>2,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Office</td>
<td>19,7</td>
<td>13,7</td>
<td>29,2</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>1,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational system</td>
<td>51,0</td>
<td>51,1</td>
<td>49,5</td>
<td>63,5</td>
<td>2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>30,9</td>
<td>46,7</td>
<td>55,3</td>
<td>37,1</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant / Roma Associations</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>56,9</td>
<td>40,2</td>
<td>41,4</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches, Mosques</td>
<td>61,9</td>
<td>51,5</td>
<td>39,8</td>
<td>54,6</td>
<td>2,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regards to difference among the groups surveyed it is observed that the Roma have greater confidence than the immigrants in the employment offices, parliament, judges, health and educational system, and, on the contrary, the immigrants have greater
confidence than Roma in social services, politicians, trade unions, police and the tax office. The Ecuadorians are those that have most confidence in immigrant associations, and together with Colombians have the greatest confidence in social services and politicians, and have the least confidence in health services. The Moroccans and Roma place their confidence in places of worship and employment offices. The Colombians are those that have the most confidence in the police, the tax office and the trade unions.

What relationship exists between confidence in different institutions and the experiences of discrimination? It is observed that discriminatory treatment correlates with the lack of confidence in certain institutions, depending on which sphere or domain of discrimination we look at. Looking at the total of those interviewed it is seen that the experience of discrimination correlates, in general, with less confidence in the institutions in the four domains, with one exception: that of the employment domain in the case of Roma. Here, those that have experienced more discrimination (3 or more times) demonstrate a greater confidence than those that have suffered less discrimination (1 or 2 times). This anomaly can not be explained by the data from the survey, but we can formulate a possible hypothesis: when discriminatory treatment becomes habitual, a sector of the Roma population takes it for granted as a part of reality, difficult to modify and not attributable to the responsibility of any of the institutions evaluated in the survey. Another possible explanation is that those who have suffered many experiences of discrimination are those who maintain a more patient, optimistic attitude towards life, and thus will continue to try to find employment, and this optimistic attitude also is reflected in greater confidence in the institutions.
Discrimination in the *employment* domain correlates with low confidence in employment offices, trade unions, police and health and educational systems. The discrimination experience in the *public places* domain correlates with low confidence in police, politicians, employment offices, health and social services. Discrimination in the domain of *institutional services* affects the confidence in all the areas analyzed with the exception of the schools and the immigrant/Roma associations. And finally the discrimination in “*housing/violence*” domain correlates with negative evaluations of employment offices, the parliament, politicians, trade unions, social services and the educational system. And, on the contrary, confidence in immigrant and Roma associations does not decrease with greater experiences of discrimination, but rather tends to increase.

In the questionnaire directed at immigrants a specific question was introduced with the object of measuring the confidence that is given to the Government Delegation for Immigrants and Foreigner (la Delegation del Gobierno para la Inmigración y la Extranjería). The mean evaluation is 1.9 and thus is situated in the third to the last place, after the parliament and politicians, and on the same level as the tax Office. This evaluation varies according to immigrant group: the Colombians tend to evaluate this institution more positively (46% in contrast to 30% that have a negative evaluation and 24% without a clear opinion). Lack of confidence is much higher among Moroccans (65%) and Ecuadorians (64%), and in both cases only 11% have no clear opinion.
4.5. Points of view regarding the “climate of opinion” in Spain in regards to ethnic minorities and immigrants.

Some of the questions included in the survey are indicators of the perception that minorities have in regards to the “climate of opinion” towards immigrants and minorities in Spain. One of the questions asks about the evolution of attitudes of rejection towards immigrants (xenophobia) in the last few years. The answers can be expressed on a scale of 1 to 5, in which 3 is a neutral value (“there has been no change”). 1 and 2 indicate reduction, while 4 and 5 indicate an increase in xenophobia. The mean values do not show much variation among the different groups, and in general are rather negative: 4.2 for Moroccans, 4.1 for Colombians, 4 for Ecuadorians, and 3.9 for Roma. The Roma are not directly implicated in the question in that it specifically asked about xenophobia against immigrants. The Roma did consider that this xenophobia had increased more than racism against Roma has increased (a value of 3.3), or in other words, their situation has worsened less than that of immigrants.

Another two questions directed towards all the persons interviewed are whether they consider Spanish society to be first, xenophobic, and second, racist. In both cases on a scale from 1 to 3 the mean response is 2.3. That is to say that the answer is strongly affirmative to both questions. Analyzing the answers of each group we find that it is the Roma who are most critical of racism and xenophobia en Spain. For the question regarding racism the values were 2.4 for Roma, 2.3 for Colombians, 2.2 for Ecuadorians, and Moroccans. The difference in the answers regarding the existence of xenophobia was even greater: 2.5 for Roma, 2.2 for Moroccans and Colombians, y 2.1 Ecuadorians. Looking at what we have seen in the previous paragraph we see that
although Roma think that the situation has gotten worse for immigrants then for themselves, they perceive a greater climate of racism and xenophobia.

To what extent is there an important correlation between these last two questions? Do those who consider the Spanish society racist also consider it to be xenophobic? The answer is clearly affirmative in the case of Moroccans (with a correlation coefficient of 0.72) and Ecuadorians (0.69) and much less for Colombians (0.52) and Roma (0.41). Thus, as noted by Lange, these last two groups distinguish more clearly between racism and xenophobia and do not necessarily consider the two questions to be related.

These values do not present any significant correlation in regards to age, gender, educational level or length of residence in Spain, (in the case of immigrants). Only in the variable of place of residence is there a weak correlation for Ecuadorians, as those who live in large cities tend to be a bit more critical in their evaluation.

To what extent is there a relation between “experiences of discrimination” and critical evaluations regarding the “climate of opinion” in Spain? The analysis of the evaluation of xenophobia shows that the relations are not significant except in the case of Ecuadorians. For this group there are positive correlations in the four domains of discrimination analyzed, particularly in that of institutional services and the employment domain. Thus, in this case, we can consider that a critical vision of Spanish xenophobia is related to experiences of discrimination. On the other hand, in the case of the other three groups, Moroccans, Colombians, and Roma, critical perceptions are not linked to experiences of discrimination.
4.6. Social Relations

Other questions in the questionnaire refer to networks of social relations not including those at the workplace and family relations. The object is to learn about the frequency of relations between members of the four groups with Spaniards / Payos and with other members of their own group.

The three immigrant groups have relations more frequently with members of their own country of origin: more than 65% related “frequently.” In regards to the Spaniards, the Ecuadorians are those who least frequently establish relations with them (25% have no contact); whereas Moroccans and Colombians have frequent contact (48% and 52% respectively). On the other hand, relations with immigrants from other countries are less frequent: less than 25% have frequent relations with other foreigners. The situation of Roma is different- their relations with Spanish Payos are more frequent than the immigrants (72%) but at the same time their links within their own group are stronger (85%) and they have very little relation with foreign immigrants (53% have no contact).

In general, both for Roma and for immigrants, relations within their own group and relations outside their group are not contradictory in that the correlation between both variables (relations immigrant/Spaniard or Roma/Payos) is negative, but not significant.

There is a correlation between relationships with Spaniards and place of residence in the case of Ecuadorians, with more relations in non-metropolitans places. The length of time residing in Spain is important for Moroccans and Colombians (longer time of residency / more frequent relations). Age is a factor only among Ecuadorians, with
younger people having more relations. Gender influences social relations among Moroccans, with men having more relations with Spaniards than do Moroccan women. Educational level is a factor in all groups, although the most significantly among Moroccans, where greater educational level correlates with more frequent contacts with Spaniards. On the other hand, among Roma there is no significant correlation with any of these variables.

Is there a correlation between frequency of relations with Spaniards / Payos and the experiences of discrimination? In the employment domain there is a significant relation for Ecuadorians: those more discriminated against have less contact with Spaniards. In experiences of discriminatory treatment in public places there is a correlation between more discrimination / less relationships in the case of Moroccans and Colombians. Experience of discrimination in the domain of “housing and violence” negatively affects relationships between Moroccans and Spaniards. In the domain of experience of discrimination in institutional services no correlations are found.

4.7. Sentiments of Belonging in Spain or in One’s Country of Origin.

The sensation of “Belonging” in Spain, measured on a scale of 1 to 7, is highest among Roma (6.3) in-between for Colombians (4.2) and weak for Ecuadorians (3.8) and Moroccans (3.7). The situation of Roma concurs with their situation as Spanish citizens, while on the other hand the low identification of Moroccans, in spite of their long length of residency, could seem to suggest the existence of difficulties in the integration of this group in Spanish society. In regards to identification with country of origin the highest
value corresponds to the Ecuadorians, (6,5), followed by Colombians (5,6) while the lowest value corresponds to Moroccans, (4,8)

If we compared both results we find that in all case of immigrants they identify, on the average, more with their country of origin than with Spain. The difference is most noticeable in the case of Ecuadorians and least so with Moroccans. In this later case their low identification with Spain is co-exists with an also low identification with their country of origin. In the three immigrant groups their sense of belonging in Spain is greater among those that have resided more time in Spain.

Is there any correlation between the sentiments of belonging in Spain and to country of origin? In the case of the Moroccans there is a positive correlation. Those that feel identified with Spain also feel identified with Morocco and vice versa, low identification with Spain coincides with low feelings of identification with Morocco. On the other hand among Ecuadorians and Colombians there is no significant correlation between these two questions.

The relation found between sense of belonging in Spain and experiences of discrimination are the following. In all cases there is negative correlation: more discrimination / less sense of belonging. In the employment domain the most affected are the Roma. In the domain of public places the Moroccans and Colombians are most affected. In regards to experiences of discrimination in institutional services the most affected are Roma and Colombians, and in the domain of “housing and violence” all four groups show an equal correlation between greater discrimination / less sense of belonging.
The sentiment of belonging is less in all the immigrant groups when relationships with Spaniards are less frequent. However the existence of strong ties with persons of the same nationality does not significantly affect this sentiment, except for a slight negative correlation among Moroccans (greater ties with other Moroccans/ less sense of belonging in Spain). In the case of Roma there is no relation between sentiment of belonging and with whom they maintain relationships.

The perception regarding increases in xenophobia (towards immigrants) or racism (against Roma is also not an important factor. A very weak and hardly significant negative correlation is detected in this case (more xenophobia or racism / less sense of belonging).

Initially it could be supposed that the sense of belonging would be linked to the confidence that is felt towards different institutions. This is verified in the case of the immigrant groups but not for the Roma. For these, the sentiment of belonging is not conditioned by their confidence in the institutions. The Ecuadorians are those that most strongly demonstrate this correlation, and in relation to all the institutions that are evaluated, with the exception of the parliament (that is to say that lack of confidence in the parliament is the only item that does not provoke a weaker sentiment of belonging). In the case of the Colombians there is a correlation between less sense of belonging in Spain and lack of confidence in the health and educational systems. In the case of Moroccans there is a correlation between less sense of belonging in Spain and a lack of confidence in social services and the tax office. And to a lesser extent among
Colombians, Moroccans and Roma a lack of confidence in police, parliament and politicians correlates with a lesser sense of belonging

4.8. Immigrants “Where do you feel most at home?”

Another important question included in the questionnaire directed to immigrants is “where do you feel most at home.” The possible options are “Spain,” “in their own country,” “both equally,” and “nowhere.” The answers show a tendency towards “country of origin,” with the majority stating this preference, and even more strongly in the case of Ecuadorians. The answer “both, equally” is a bit less than a third for each group. Preference for Spain is greater among Moroccans than among the two Latin American groups. Those that do not feel at home anywhere are a minority, although a bit more numerous among Colombians.

What characteristics are found among those that feel more “at home” in Spain? The length of residency is a factor among Moroccans and Colombians- the more time in Spain, the more they “feel at home” in Spain. Also it is seen that Moroccan women and Ecuadorian men have a greater tendency to cite this preference, as do Moroccans and Colombians that live in non-metropolitan areas. Educational level and age do not seem to be factors in this question.

Among those that feel more at home in their country of origin the most notable profiles are Moroccan men, with little education and living in non-metropolitan areas, and Ecuadorian women living in big cities who have arrived recently in Spain.
Initially it would seem logical to assume that “feeling more at home” in one country or the other would be influenced by the treatment received by immigrants during their stay in Spain. However, in the majority of cases no significant correlation is found, and when it exists it is negative. That is to say those that have not suffered discrimination “feel more at home” in the country of origin, and vice versa. This correlation is seen in the employment and institutional services domains for Ecuadorians, and in the “housing and violence” domain for Moroccans. Discrimination related to the public place domain does not influence sentiments of where does one “feel more at home” for any of the three groups.

The preference of “feeling more at home” in one’s country of origin shows a weak, but positive, correlation in experiences of discrimination in the employment domain and in institutional services domain for Ecuadorians. Discrimination in the public places domain and the “housing and violence” domain are a factor in the case of Moroccans. In the case of all three immigrant groups there is a stronger correlation with the variable of the type of relationships with Spaniards. In this case those with the weakest ties with Spaniards are those who “feel more at home” in their country of origin. And, as would be supposed, those who feel most at home in Spain are those who have more frequent relations with Spaniards, especially the Moroccans.

Another factor that influences this question is the perception of the “climate of opinion” in Spain regarding foreigners. Those immigrants who “feel more at home” in Spain think that the Spanish society is not xenophobic and that rejection of immigrants has not increased. This correlation is clear in Moroccans and Ecuadorians and less clear in the
case of Colombians. The inverse can also be statistically seen. Those that perceive the Spanish as increasingly xenophobic feel more at home in their country of origin.

The sentiment of “feeling more at home” in one of the two countries is related to the sense of identification with the respective countries. As it is logical to suppose those that feel most identified with their country of origin, also feel more at home there and vice versa, (more identification with Spain, more one feels at home in Spain). This correlation is seen in the case of Moroccans and Ecuadorians but not in the case of Colombians. In this case a not “feeling at home” in Colombia does not mean that they feel identification with Spain.

Comparative results with the proposed typology in Sweden:

In his analysis of the situation in Sweden, Lange constructs a typology based on the information provided by three variables: 1. Sentiment of belonging to Sweden (weak/strong), 2. Identification with country of origin (weak / strong), and 3. Sentiment of “feeling at home” (country of origin / Sweden / both / none). This typology consists of five types that represent 59% of the sample. In our case we have repeated the procedure and we find that these categories only represent 30% of the sample in Spain. For this reason, and with the objective that the typology have a broader representation, we have introduced four new categories in addition to those proposed by Lange. With this typology we have 63% of the sample represented. The types obtained are: (the denominations are purely descriptive and attempt to respect Lange’s proposal)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belonging To Spain</th>
<th>Belonging to Country of Origin</th>
<th>Feels “more at home...”</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Both-Neither</td>
<td>Alienated Cosmopolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td>Nostalgic Cosmopolitan (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Assimilated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Integrated bicultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td>Nostalgic Integrated (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Adapted ‘Ethnic’ (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
<td>Unintegrated ‘Ethnic’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>‘Ethnic’ in transition (*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Types that do not exist in Lange’s proposal.

In Spain the most numerous type is the “unintegrated ethnic”, followed at a certain distance by the “integrated bicultural,” the “nostalgic integrated,” the “nostalgic cosmopolitan,” and the “ethnic in transition.” The dominance of the “unintegrated ethnic” is greater among Ecuadorians. The different types of “integrated” are more important among Colombians than in the other two groups. On the other hand, “cosmopolitans” and “assimilated” are important types among the Moroccans.

**TABLE 2.9**
Proportion of immigrants assigned to each type by nationality and by total of immigrants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Total Foreigners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moroccans</td>
<td>Ecuadorians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienated Cosmopolitan</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nostalgic Cosmopolitan</td>
<td>11,0</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilated</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>2,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated bicultural</td>
<td>9,5</td>
<td>12,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated nostalgic</td>
<td>8,0</td>
<td>7,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted Ethnic</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>6,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic in transition</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintegrated Ethnic</td>
<td>16,9</td>
<td>29,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total typology</strong></td>
<td><strong>64,7</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No type</td>
<td>35,3</td>
<td>39,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The correlation of the principal types with other variables (nationality, gender, place of residence, length of residency, opinion regarding xenophobia in Spain) permits elaborating the following typical profiles:

“Cosmopolitans”: Moroccan and Colombian men who think that Spain is a xenophobic society; Moroccan men who live in non-metropolitan areas.

“Integrated”: Metropolitan Moroccan women; non-metropolitan Colombians. They believe that Spaniards are not xenophobic.

“Non-integrated ethnic”: Colombian women; metropolitan Ecuadorians and Colombians; non-metropolitan Moroccans; Moroccans and Ecuadorians. They believe that Spain is xenophobic and they are recent arrivals to Spain.

“Adaptad Ethnics” non-metropolitan Ecuadorians y Colombians.

4.9. Immigrants: Remain in Spain or Return Home?

As we have seen in Part 2, immigrant's plans to remain permanently in Spain or to return to the country of origin condition their expectations towards Spanish society. We know that those that are most inclined to remain in Spain are Moroccans and that among Ecuadorians a majority plan to return home. However almost half of the Moroccans and a third of the Latin Americans have no precise plans and are insecure in regards to this question.
The correlation with the “migratory project” and the variables of gender, age, place of residency or length of residency are not always very clear. We begin with those who have plans to return to their country of origin. The place of residence influences these plans in the case of Moroccans and Colombians. The most inclined to return are those that live in non-metropolitan areas. Gender is a factor only in the case of Colombians, with men being more inclined to return. In regards to age, the only significant correlation is in the case of young Ecuadorians. And as for length of residency, Ecuadorians who are recent arrivals are more inclined to return home, as are Moroccans who have been in Spain for around 5 years.

On the other extreme are those that have decided to permanently stay in Spain. In terms of place of residency those that stand out are Moroccans and Colombians living in large cities. In terms of length of residency are recently arrived Moroccans, and Ecuadorians and Colombians with the longest periods of residency. The only correlation regarding gender is with Moroccan women with age, there is a correlation with Ecuadorians who are over 40 years old.

It seems reasonable to assume that discrimination experienced by immigrants will affect their migratory project. However, in our analysis we have found that this hypothesis is true only in a few cases, with significant correlation in only two situations. The discrimination experienced in the domain of public places has a negative influence (greater discrimination / less inclination to remaining in Spain) for Moroccans. And discrimination registered in the “housing and violence” domain affects Ecuadorians. On the other hand, discrimination in the employment and institutional services demonstrates no correlation. It could be concluded that the immigrants accept as inevitable, or
normal, a certain level of discrimination in these domains, at least when it comes to
deciding to remain or return home, while, at the same time, they are more sensitive to
discriminatory treatment that is experienced in more informal spheres of public places
and spaces of daily life.

There is a very strong relation between the migratory project and the sentiment of
“feeling at home” in a determined place. The great majority of those that feel at home in
Spain have decided to remain in this country. And those that feel more at home in their
country of origin maintain a plan of returning there within a defined period of time.
Those that feel equally at home in both countries, or in neither, are divided among the
distinct projects, although the majority is inclined to stay in Spain. Thus, in these latter
cases, there exist other motivators, apart from the identification with one country or the
other, that influence their migratory project.

A relationship can be established between the migratory project and the typologies
elaborated in the previous section. Those who usually opt for remaining in Spain are the
different “integrated” types, especially the bicultural, and this is true for the three
nationalities. Furthermore, among the Ecuadorians the “adapted ethnics” stand out, that
is those with greater identification with their country of origin but who feel equally at
home in both countries. And, as would be expected, those that have plans for retuning to
their country of origin are included in the type “ethnic non-integrated”. With those who
do not have a clear idea about returning or remaining there is a correlation with the
following types: “ethnic non-integrated” of all three nationalities, Ecuadorian and
Colombian “integrated bicultural”, and Moroccan “nostalgic cosmopolitans”.
4.10. Attitudes towards immigration

The questionnaire also investigates the attitudes of those interviewed regarding their opinions around new immigration to Spain. The objective is to determine if they are in favor of an increasing, reducing or maintaining the current levels of immigration. In the questionnaire for Roma there is a specific question regarding their opinions towards the immigration of Roma from other European countries.

The answers (see Annex I) reveal a clear difference between Spanish Roma and the foreign immigrants. While the former are reticent regarding new immigration (57% support reduction, or not accepting any further immigrants), the immigrants tend to support maintaining current numbers, or increasing the flow (70% of the immigrants from the three nationalities). The percentage of persons who did not have a defined opinion (“do not know”) is higher among Roma, Moroccans and Colombians (a bit less than 20%), than among Ecuadorians (9%). In the case of Roma the reticent attitude is the same when asked specifically about immigration of foreign Roma; 54% want to reduce it, or stop it completely and 27% are in favor of maintaining, or increasing current levels. Thus it would seem that this group’s position reflects more their feelings as Spanish citizens, worried about the possible negative consequences of immigration, than any hypothetical transnational ethnic solidarity.

On a scale of 1 to 4, where the higher values reflect rejection to new immigrants, the mean values obtained for each group are the following: Roma 2.8; Ecuadorians 2.0; Colombians 1.9; Moroccans 1.8.
We will now look at what relation exists between these attitudes towards immigration and other variables. In all four groups women are less receptive than men towards the arrival of new immigrants. As for age, persons between 35 and 39 years old are systematically more favorable towards new immigrants. In regards to educational levels it can be seen that favorable attitudes are greater among those that have completed secondary education, except among the Colombians where it is seen that higher educational level implies less acceptance of new immigrants. The experience of discrimination has a weak correlation with the attitudes being analyzed, with only two cases being identified. There is a positive correlation among Moroccans discriminated in the employment domain (more discrimination / greater rejection of new immigrants) and negative for Ecuadorians in the public places domain (more discrimination / greater acceptance of new immigrants). The variable of length of time of residency in Spain shows no correlation with attitudes of acceptance or rejection of new immigrants.
III. SUMMARY

The study carried out in Spain refers to four minorities that we can group in three situations clearly differentiated; Roma, who are Spanish citizens; Moroccan immigrants with long periods of residency and with different language and religion then the native population, and two Latin American nationalities, Ecuadorians and Colombians, more recently arrived but who share language and religion with the majority population. From this description it could appear that the Moroccans constitute the most “distant” group in comparison with the majority population, and that the Roma would be the “closest.” However throughout the research it is seen that the reality is much more complex.

1. Areas of discrimination

We have investigated the frequency with which the interviewed persons have felt discriminated against in 18 types of situations. The areas where the highest levels of reported discrimination were found are in housing and in access to employment. The three next highest reported situations are difficulties in access to bars, restaurants, clubs, harassment in the workplace and harassment by neighbors. Thus, in general, questions related to employment, housing, and relations with neighbors seem to be the areas where more discrimination is generated. Figure 1 illustrates the importance of reported discrimination in each of the 18 situations that are analyzed.

- The most problematic situation is in discriminatory treatment in access to housing. The most affected are the Moroccans, particularly those who live in
non-metropolitan areas, and Latin Americans who live in the large cities. Only Latin Americans who live outside large cities and Roma show values lower than 40%.

- Discrimination in access to employment is most often reported by Moroccan and Ecuadorian men and Roma women who live in large cities, Moroccan women in non-metropolitan areas and Roma men regardless of place of residency.

- Problems in accessing bars, restaurants, clubs etc, and detentions by police most often affect Moroccan men, regardless of the area of residence. Police retentions also affect Ecuadorian and Colombian men in large cities. Discrimination in accessing bars, etc. is the most reported problem by Roma men in non-metropolitan areas.

- Harassment or bad treatment in the workplace is reported primarily by Moroccans, both men and women, who live outside large cities.

- Ecuadorians, especially men who live in large cities, are those who most often report harassment or bad treatment in the street or by neighbors.
• Difficulties in job promotion are greatest for Ecuadorians, both men and women, residing in large cities, and by Colombian men who live outside of large cities.

• Inadequate or bad treatment by police most often affected Ecuadorian men in large cities, and to a lesser extent Moroccans.

• Inadequate or bad treatment in bars and stores is mentioned by Roma and Moroccans, and especially immigrant men who live in non-metropolitan areas.

• Problems using credit cards, or access to bank loans most often affects immigrant men residing in large cities.

• Discrimination exhibited in institutional environments (schools, health care facilities, social services, banks)... show lower values for all of the groups.

Domains of Discrimination

In order to simplify the reading of the data regarding discrimination we have grouped together the 18 situations analyzed into four “domains” or “spheres” of discrimination: employment domain, those that refer to discrimination experienced in public places, that
which is related to diverse institutional services and the more heterogeneous category called “housing and violence”.

In the employment domain discrimination most often affects Moroccans and Roma. The highest value corresponds to Moroccan women who live in non-metropolitan areas, followed by Moroccan and Ecuadorian men living in large cities. The lowest values correspond to Colombian men. Variables of place of residence and gender do not introduce any variations among Roma, however, in the case of immigrants there is a tendency to report more discrimination among men and residents of both sexes in large cities, with the exception of Moroccan women in non–metropolitan areas cited above.

In the domain of discrimination referred to as public places Moroccans and Roma are, once again, affected to a greater extent. The most affected are men (Ecuadorians in large cities and Moroccans in non-metropolitan areas). Indicators are higher for residents in large cities (except for Moroccan men).

Discrimination in institutional services affects Roma more than immigrants. With a breakdown by gender and place of residence the most outstanding case is that of Ecuadorian men living in metropolitan areas. In this area of discrimination there is no clear pattern of gender or place of residency being a differentiating factor.

And finally, in the domain of discrimination called “housing and violence,” immigrants are more affected than Roma. There is a scale of greater to lesser effects, beginning with Moroccans, followed by Ecuadorians and Colombians and then Roma. Looking at sub-
categories the highest values correspond to Moroccans of both sexes living in non-metropolitan areas. The next category is members of both sexes of the three immigrant groups living in large cities, although men show higher values the women.

In summary, the most important elements of discrimination are related to access to housing and to discrimination in the area of employment, principally in access to jobs. Furthermore, although reported discrimination tends to be greater for men and for residents in large cities this is not a constant pattern and various exceptions are found. In general the greatest deviations to the dominant pattern correspond to Moroccans who live in non-metropolitan areas and who usually show higher values than their compatriots in large cities. And, in contrast, in the case of Roma differences in sex and place of residence has little or no effect on the indicators of discrimination. In three of the domains analyzed -- employment, public places and institutional service--discrimination affects the Roma more than the immigrants. Only in the case of “housing and violence” are immigrants more affected.

2. Variables related to discrimination

Factors such as age, educational level, or length of residency in Spain (in the case of immigrants) have little correlation with the experience of discrimination.

* Discrimination is greater for older Roma in three domains: employment, institutional services and “housing-violence.” Because we are dealing here with a native Spanish population the improved situation of youth could indicate that there is an improvement over time in the situation of the Roma. Among immigrants the correlation of age with
discrimination is weaker and is the opposite, with younger people reporting more discrimination than elder immigrants.

* The relation between educational level and discrimination shows no clear pattern, in some situations greater education seems to limit discrimination (such as in employment) but in others it acts as an especially sensitive factor, as in the case of Roma in the institutional services domain.

* In regards to length of residency in Spain, longer residency exposes people to more experiences of discrimination, but also permits them to develop less conflictive strategies for social integration. In the opposite way, short residency reduces the exposure time to experiences of discrimination, but is a time of greater social precariousness for immigrants. The results are not conclusive. There are positive correlations (more discrimination with longer period of residency) but also negative correlation in the case of Ecuadorians, or not clearly defined situations in the case of Moroccans.

Difficulties in making friends with Spaniards / Payos.

Relations of friendship are easier for Roma than for immigrants, and among the later the best situations correspond to Moroccans and Colombians, and the worst to Ecuadorians. (See Figure 2.) The length of residency in Spain is important. The Moroccans with the longest time of residency have the easiest time relating to Spaniards, and the Ecuadorians have the greatest difficulties, probably related to their short time of residency in Spain. More important is the educational level, as greater educational level
makes it easier for Moroccans, Ecuadorians and Roma to establish relations of friendship with Spaniards / Payos.

There is a positive correlation between greater difficulties in make friends with Spaniards / Payos and experiences of discrimination. The positive correlation is especially significant for Roma, with a high correlation between discrimination, particularly in the domains of employment and “housing-violence,” with those who have difficulties in establishing relationships with Payos. On the contrary, discrimination is less of a factor among immigrants regarding difficulties or abilities in establishing friendships with Spaniards. There is even a negative correlation in the case of Colombians in the employment domain, where lack of ties to Spaniards does not imply more discrimination, nor does the existence of friendships correlates with less discrimination in employment. In terms of domains of discrimination, lack of ties with Spaniards affect immigrants most in discrimination in the institutional services sphere.

The existence of strong ties with persons of their own group does not imply greater difficulties in relationships with Spaniards / Payos. This means that strengthening inter-group ties does not require weakening of intra-group ties.

Among immigrants, when the sentiment of “belonging” in Spain is less, the difficulties in establishing friendships with Spaniards are greater. For the Roma, high levels of identification with Spain does not eliminate difficulties in establishing relationships with Payos.
The difficulties in establishing relationships with Spaniards are greater among Latin Americans who think that xenophobia has increased in Spain, and among Moroccans who have suffered experiences of discrimination.

Religious Practices

Although the Spanish state is defined as non-confessional, the institutional and social presence of the Catholic Church is clearly dominant and for this reason it is more probable that Muslims and Protestants will find difficulties in practicing their religions, as Catholic immigrants practice the same religion as the majority.

There are few Catholics that acknowledge difficulties in practicing their religion in Spain (only 8% of the Ecuadorians are of this faith), while such difficulties are cited by about half of the Moroccan Muslims and significant minorities of Ecuadorians (33%), Colombians (17%) and Roma (11%) Protestants. It seems clear that Muslims are in the worst situation, while the Protestant's difficulties seem more related to problems of immigration than being specifically religious since the Roma have fewer difficulties than the foreigners.

Latin American women in large cities and Moroccan men in non-metropolitan areas (only if they have, at the same time, encountered experiences of discrimination) suffered the greatest problems in this area. In the case of the Roma the only clear pattern is that which affects those who reside in non-metropolitan areas.
Thus, Moroccans and Roma, the groups that more frequently practice a religion different from the Catholics, have greater difficulties in non-metropolitan areas, which would thus appear to be less open to religious diversity.

Confidence in Institutions

For the whole of the collectives under study the most highly valued institutions are the public health system, places of worship and the school system, and the least highly valued are the politicians, the Government Delegation for Immigration and Foreigners (Delegación del Gobierno para la Inmigración y la Extranjería), the parliament and the public tax office. (See Figure 3).

There is a correlation between experiences of discrimination and lower confidence in general towards the institutions, which is registered in the four domains of discrimination that we have been analyzing, with one exception. In the employment domain, and in the case of Roma, those that have experimented more discrimination (“3 or more times”) demonstrate a greater confidence than those who have suffered less discrimination (“1 to 2 times”). This anomaly can not be explained by the data gathered from the survey, although the following hypotheses can be proposed: when discriminatory treatment in access to employment becomes habitual, a sector of the Roma population assumes this to be a “fact” of reality, hard to modify and not attributable to the responsibility of any of the institutions evaluated in the survey.

Confidence in immigrant or Roma associations is not weakened when there are more experiences of discrimination, but rather the opposite, the confidence tends to increase.
In this sense it would seem that the experience of discrimination strengthens sense of group belonging.

The climate of opinion regarding minorities.

In regards to the evolution of rejection of foreigners (xenophobia) in recent years, there is in general a negative evaluation, without important differences among the four groups studied. In the opinion of the Roma their particular situation has not worsened as much as that of immigrants, although at the same time they perceive more racism and xenophobia in Spanish society than immigrants do. Thus, in spite of being Spanish citizens and their greater ease in establishing relations with the majority society, they denounce more discrimination than immigrants do and are more critical of the Payo society.

Social relations

What relation exists between experiences of discrimination and relationships with Spaniards / Payos? The social relations of the Roma do not seem to be influenced by personal experiences of discrimination. As for immigrants, in the employment domain there is a significant correlation for Ecuadorians, where the most discriminated against have the least contact with Spaniards. Discriminatory treatment in the domain of public places has a correlation with lack of contact in the case of Moroccans and Colombians. Problems in the domain of “housing and violence” negatively affect the relations that Moroccans have with Spaniards. And finally, discrimination in the domain of institutional services has no direct relation with the relationships with Spaniards.
Sentiments of Belonging

Immigrants identify to a greater degree with their country of origin than they do with Spain. The difference is greatest in the case of Ecuadorians, and least with Moroccans. Regarding the latter group the level of identification with one country is not in contradiction with identification with the other. Those that identify with Morocco also identify with Spain, and vice versa. Those that have little sense of identification with Spain also have little sense of identification with Morocco. In the cases of the three immigrant groups those that have a stronger sense of identification with Spain are those that have resided the longest time in Spain.

The greater the discrimination suffered, the less the sense of belonging in Spain. In the employment domain the most affected are the Roma, and in the domain of public places the Moroccans and the Colombians are most affected. Discrimination in the institutional services domain correlates with less sense of belonging among Colombians and Roma and in the domain of “housing and violence” the sense of belonging of all four groups is lessened.

Sense of belonging in Spain is linked to the confidence that the immigrant (particularly Ecuadorians) places in different institutions (less confidence / less sense of belonging). However, in the case of Roma this correlation does not exist. For them, the sense of belonging is not conditioned by the evaluation that they make of institutions.
The typology we have elaborated, combining the results of three variables, demonstrates that the least “integrated” immigrants are the Ecuadorian, the most “integrated” are the Colombians, while among Moroccans we find the highest proportion of “assimilated” and “cosmopolitans” (those with no identification with any country). Once again we find results that question the image of the Moroccan immigrant as especially distant from the Spanish society.
Plans to remain permanently in Spain or to return to the country of origin condition the expectations of the immigrants towards Spanish society. The most inclined to remain in Spain are the Moroccans and the Ecuadorians are most inclined to plan to return to their country. At the same time almost half of the Moroccans and a third of the Ecuadorians and Colombians have no precise plans and feel insecure around this question. The correlation of the migratory project with variables of gender, age, place of residency or length of time in Spain is not always clear and the experience of discrimination also does not have a very clear influence. The discrimination experienced in public places has a negative effect on Moroccans, (more discrimination / less inclined to remain permanently in Spain) and that which is registered in “housing and violence” negatively affects Ecuadorians, On the other hand discrimination in the employment domain and the domain of institutional services show no correlation in this regard. It could be supposed that immigrants consider “normal” and inevitable certain levels of discrimination in these areas, and thus it does not affect decisions to stay or to leave. However, they are more sensitive to discrimination in more informal areas, and incidents experienced in public places and daily life do lead to a greater inclination to return to the country of origin.

Attitudes regarding immigration

In this question there is a clear difference between the Spanish Roma and foreign immigrants. While the former show a clear reticence towards the arrival of new immigrants, the foreigners tend to be in favor of maintaining or increasing the number of new immigrants. The reticent attitude of the Roma is even seen in regards to the specific question of Roma immigrants from other European countries, where once again
the opinion that few or none should be allowed in is strongly supported. This attitude of the Roma is a reflection of their condition as Spaniards, and is probably similar to the rest of the population, worried about supposed negative consequences of immigration, a position in contradiction with a possible attitude of hypothetical transnational ethnic solidarity.

In the four groups studied the most receptive towards the arrival of new immigrants are men, those between 35 and 39 years of age, and those with high school or university education. The experience of discrimination has a weak correlation with the attitudes towards new immigrants, as does the length of time of residency in Spain.
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ABILITY FOR MAKING FRIENDS WITH SPANIARDS / PAYOS

[Diagram showing the ability for making friends with Spaniards/Payos among different groups (Moroccan, Ecuadorian, Colombian, Roma) across different difficulty levels: Very Difficult, Rather Difficult, Rather Easy, Very Easy.]
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3. Comparative analysis of the results obtained in Sweden and Spain.

Given that the orientation and methodology of this study was defined by the research carried out in Sweden, we think it useful to compare some of the conclusions that have been found in the two countries.

First, it is important to note that different populations were studied: in Sweden foreign immigrants from ten nationalities were included, grouped in 4 large blocks: Arabs, Africans, Asians, and Yugoslavs. In Spain we studied three immigrant groups; Moroccans, Ecuadorians, and Colombians, and one Spanish ethnic minority, the Roma. This diverse composition, added to the fact that in each country there are different migratory histories and institutional organization, obliges us to be prudent in making comparative analyses.

The situations where greater discrimination was detected in Sweden were in access to employment (40% of those surveyed), bad treatment in public places or in the street (36%) and discrimination at work (27%). In Spain it was access to housing (55%), access to employment (40%) and three other situation of equal importance: discrimination at work, harassment by neighbours, and access to public places (30%). Apart from showing higher percentages in general, the very high value for discrimination in access to housing that was detected in Spain is notable.

In the Swedish case the author established three domains of discrimination (employment, authorities, and public places). In Spain we conformed three domains of a similar nature (work, institutional services and public places), and a fourth domain that
includes discrimination in access to housing and situations of violence or robbery in the street. This last domain has a residual character in that the two variables do not correlate very closely with the first three domains; its importance is in the very strong incidence of problems in accessing housing.

In Sweden clear patterns of discrimination were detected, both in terms of national origin (the most discrimination for Africans, the least for Yugoslavians) and in terms of gender (men, more than women). In Spain the situation presents a less clear picture. For example the Roma are most discriminated in 3 domains and the least discriminated in a fourth. As regarding gender there is no clear pattern, in regards to place of residence the most affected are those in metropolitan areas, except in the case of the Moroccans who are most discriminated in non-metropolitan areas.

In Spain, as in Sweden, very low levels of denouncement of situations of discrimination were detected. But even so in Sweden the percentages (11%) are much greater than those detected in Spain (between 2.6% and 4.6%, depending on the domain of discrimination).

In both countries a low correlation was found between experiences of discrimination and the variables of age, educational level or length of time of residency. The correlations (almost always weak) that were found were as follows. For age: in Sweden the most discriminated against were the young, in Spain, young immigrants and older Roma. In educational level: in Sweden there was a correlation only in the employment domain (more education / more discrimination), while in Spain this correlation was found in the domains of public places and “housing-violence,” and an inverse
correlation with education in the employment domain. In length of residency in Sweden there is a negative correlation in the authorities and public places domains (less time / more discrimination) and positive correlation in the employment domain (more time / more discrimination). In Spain no clear pattern was detected.

Regarding the question of the ease or difficulty in establishing relations with persons of the native majority in neither of the two countries significant relationships were found in relation to the variables of age, gender or educational level. However, the link with experiences of discrimination was clearly, although weakly, established in both countries (greater discrimination / more difficulties in establishing relations). Difficulties in establishing relationships correlated with a weak sentiment of “belonging” to the country of residence, except in the case of Spanish Roma. For this group neither the discrimination nor the lack of relations with Payos weakened their sense of “belonging.” And finally, the correlation between ties of friendship and perceptions regarding attitude to minorities was measured. In Sweden a weak relationship was found: those that have more difficulties in establishing friendships with Swedes believe that xenophobia exists. In Spain this correlation is also weak and only exists when the subjects have also suffered experiences of discrimination.

Difficulties in practising one’s religion especially affected Muslims of Arab origin in both countries. In Sweden a correlation was verified between these difficulties and the experience of discrimination, while in Spain this relation was not generalized. It was only detected for Moroccans living in non-metropolitan areas.
The evaluations regarding confidence in the institutions of the country of residence are similar in the two countries; the most highly valued are the schools system, the public health system (in both countries), the social security office (in Sweden) and places of worship (Spain). The least respected institutions are the politicians, immigration authorities (in both countries) employment agencies (in Sweden), parliament and the tax office (in Spain). Confidence in institutions decreases in general when there are more experiences of discrimination. This link is seen in general in the different domains of discrimination, with the exception of Spanish Roma in the employment domain. In this case the experience of discrimination does not weaken confidence in institutions.

In both countries the subjects interviewed believe that xenophobia has increased in recent years. There are also collectives that consider the respective societies racist and xenophobic. However these opinions have a weak correlation with experiences of discrimination.

The analysis of social ties shows that the experience of discrimination makes the establishment of relations with persons of the native majority more difficult. This correlation is moderate in Sweden but it is found in the three domains of discrimination, while in Spain it is not seen in the domain of institutional services. That is to say that discrimination in this area does not have an effect on establishing friendships with Spaniards / Payos.

The sensation of belonging in the country of residence is greatest for Yugoslavians and Arabs in Sweden, and for Roma in Spain. Those that feel most identified with their country of origin are Chinese and Vietnamese in Sweden, and Ecuadorians in Spain.
The author of the Swedish report proposes that there exists a “conflict of identification” when persons feel strongly identified with one of the two countries (origin/residency) and a weak relation with the other. In the Spanish situation it is seen that this conflict does not exist for Moroccans (they can identify a lot with both countries simultaneously or little with both countries simultaneously). And no correlation is found with the Latin Americans in Spain. In Sweden, as in Spain, it is seen that this question has a weak correlation with experiences of discrimination, and that this is negative (more discrimination/less identification with country of residence). However the correlation with confidence in institutions (greater confidence, greater identification with the county of residence) is more important. The Roma are an exception here; there is no correlation between their sense of identification with Spain and their level of confidence in the institutions.

Regarding the sentiment of where does one “feel more at home” it has been seen in both countries that the variables of age, gender, and education have little importance while the length of time of residency does have some influence. The experience of discrimination does not show any correlation with this question in Sweden and in Spain there is a weak, negative correlation (those that have not suffered discrimination feel more at home in their country of origin). Finally, the perception of climate of opinion towards minorities has a slight influence in Sweden, while in Spain the correlation is clear in regard to Moroccans and Ecuadorian immigrants (Those that perceive more xenophobia or racism in Spain feel more at home in there country of origin, and vice versa).
Plans to remain in the country of residency or to return to the country of origin have a relationship in Sweden with experiences of discrimination and with perceptions of the climate of opinion towards foreigners. In Spain the correlation is weaker, and the sentiments of where does one “feel at home” is found to be more important in regards to people’s migratory project.

* * * *

This research report, in accordance with the mandate of the EUMC reproduces the analytical definitions (regarding discrimination) and the methodology applied in the Swedish investigation directed by A. Lange. The objective is to offer material that permits a comparative analysis with the situations existing in different European countries. The only modification that we have introduced in the Spanish case is that instead of mailing out the questionnaires as in Sweden, they were carried out through personal interviews with the subjects, a modification that was proposed due to the peculiarities of the situation of immigrants in Spain. We think that although there is a detailed census of the groups to be studied, personal interviews greatly reduced the number of “no replies” and provided a better quality of information, although it does imply greater economic expense for the fieldwork.

Finally we would like to express our belief that the breadth of this investigation is limited, both in regards to its analytical focus and to its methodology. In terms of the
first limitation, Lange warned that we are not analysing “objective” discrimination, but rather the subjective perception of discrimination by those that are its victims. In this sense we would remark that the perceptions of discrimination probably acquire a multidimensionality within the populations studied that transcends the indicators used in this investigation. And, as regards the second limitation, we believe that questionnaires are not the best method for analysing questions, which have to do with beliefs, attitudes and opinions, particularly when there has not previously been an analysis of the range of existing subjectivities using qualitative type methodologies. The further development of these questions transcends the limits of this report, but we include this note with the goal of motivating a future discussion with the interested persons.
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