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Abstract

Although Austria has a long history of immigration, migration is largely associated with “guest worker migration” that started in the early 1960s and the “new immigration” of Eastern European, African and Asian migrants that began in the late 1980s. At the time of the 2001 census, Austria had a foreign population of about 711,000 or 8.9% of the total population, and a foreign born population of just over 1,000,000 or 12.5%.

Immigrants from Turkey and the former Yugoslavia, which were the major sources for labour recruitment, still form the majority of immigrants, making up more than two thirds of the total foreign population at the time of the census. However, as a result of the “new immigration” from other European, mostly Eastern European countries as well as from Africa and South Eastern and Central Asia, and, to some extent, Latin America and the Caribbean, the immigrant population is increasingly diversifying. Since the mid-1990s, the number of naturalizations, in particular of Turkish migrants, who have one of the highest naturalization rates among individual immigrant groups, is rapidly rising, thus also rapidly increasing the number of Austrian citizens with a migrant back-ground. The growing share of Austrian citizens with an immigrant background also led to a visible increase of the interest shown by political parties vis-à-vis Austrians of immigrant origin as potential voters, most evident in the most recent election for the Vienna city council.

Until the early 1990s, Austria designed its migration policy exclusively on the basis of economic considerations, while the government left the determination of migration levels largely to the “social-partners”, comprising organized labour and institutionalized business interests. The changing patterns of migration and the large inflows that resulted from the break-up of Yugoslavia and the fall of the Iron Curtain, as well as rising numbers of asylum applications from third world countries, the transformation of the Austrian political system as a result of the erosion of the dominance of the traditional ruling parties and the increasing politicisation of immigration policy, however, led the government to adopt a major reform of immigration legislation in the early 1990s whose major objective it was to restrict immigration and to drastically reduce immigration levels. Among others, the reform introduced annual immigration quotas, which have been applied ever since. The reform also led to massive deterioration of the situation of long-term migrants. The 1997 reform of the Aliens Act addressed these deficiencies to some degree, by introducing the principle of “consolidation of residence”, that is, increasing residential security (protection from expulsion) for long-term third country nationals. Access to the labour market, however, remained decoupled from immigration legislation until the reform of immigration legislation in 2002. The latter introduced the so-called residence certificate which gives unrestricted access to employment for long-term third country nationals. The 2002 reform, however, also massively expanded the scope for temporary labour migration. In contrast to “guest-workers” who were equally regarded as temporary migrants, however, new temporary migrants are permanently excluded from “denizenship”, the secure status long-term migrants enjoy, as well as citizenship. In addition, mandatory integration courses were introduced and labour immigration limited to highly skilled migrants.

Apart from basic political rights as freedom of association and freedom of assembly, third country nationals have no formal political rights. An attempt to introduce the local vote for third country nationals in Vienna was ruled unconstitutional by the Constitutional court, a decision that is unlikely to be reversed by Parliament. Hitherto, third country nationals were also excluded from standing for elections in works councils at the shop floor level and in the elections for the statutory interest representative bodies, the Chamber of Labour and the
Chamber of Commerce. The European Commission has repeatedly criticized Austria for its practice. In response to a recent judgement of the European Court of Justice, the passive vote in works councils and chamber elections will finally be introduced. Similarly, third country nationals are excluded from standing for elections in the statutory student representative bodies, but also the vote for citizens of the European Economic Area has only belatedly been introduced.

The denial of the right to stand for election has arguably had a tremendous effect on patterns of political socialization of immigrants. While works council are formally independent from trade unions, holding office as a works councillor has traditionally been a major entry gate into the trade union hierarchy. In addition, both trade union activists and delegates of the statutory chambers have been a traditional source of recruitment for political parties. Surveys, on the other hand, have shown that migrants are keen for political representation, in particular in regard to the work place and wider forms of industry representation in the form of the statutory Chamber of Labour and the Chamber of Commerce.

As a result of the exclusion from formal channels of political participation, studies of immigrant participation have been rare, while mainstream empirical political research continues to focus on patterns of political participation, voting behaviour and political preferences of Austrian nationals. The continuously rising numbers of naturalizations, however, has markedly expanded the pool of voters with an immigrant background. As a result, interest into migrant political participation has recently been growing.

Similarly, however, wider patterns of civic participation of migrants have been largely neglected by mainstream social science research. There is, however, a growing body of specialized research focusing on immigrant civic participation. The bulk of the work focuses on associational patterns of immigrants, with several comprehensive mapping studies having been published recently. Although existing research indicates generally lower rates of civic participation of immigrants than is the case for Austrians, with participation rates of foreign nationals being lowest, the existing studies also suggest that immigrants tend to engage more in informal networks than in formal associations and generally show a high willingness to engage in civic or indeed, political participation.

In general, however, research on immigrant civic participation is still in its infancy. The majority of studies published so far are case studies and limit themselves to describing patterns of participation, whereas they only partially provide causal explanations for the patterns of civic participation found among immigrants. Thus, the existing research on civic participation has several limitations, including the lack of comparative and theory guided research, and the descriptive nature of much of the literature. The application of network analysis, social capital approaches and research on transnational dimensions of immigrant participation rank among the most promising avenues for future research.
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1 Part I: Understanding the conditions for immigrant participation

1.1 Key events and demographic developments in the migration history of Austria

1.1.1 Labour Recruitment and “Guestworker” Policy, 1961-1989

The post war boom and the growing demand for labour led to an important shift in migration policy in most northern European states. By the mid-1950s, a growing number of European governments had begun to forge bilateral agreements with southern and South-eastern European states (Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain and Yugoslavia) and other countries in the Mediterranean (Turkey, Morocco). Such agreements were to provide for the recruitment of workers from these countries and designed temporarily to satisfy the needs of unskilled labour in the recruiting countries. In comparison to other European countries, Austria started recruitment relatively late. Partly, this is due to the fact that despite massive economic growth in the post-War years, Austria’s economy was weaker than other major recruiting countries and experienced high unemployment well into the 1950s. In addition, some 530,000 ethnic German refugees from Eastern Germany had settled in Austria who provided a ready pool for labour and acted as a major disincentive to recruitment (Faßmann/ Münz 1995: 34). Because Austria started recruitment later and wage levels were below those of other recruiting countries, labour migrants had to be drawn from more remote regions of Yugoslavia and Turkey.

When Austrian employers first demanded to be allowed to employ foreign workers in the late 1950s in order to address the severe shortages of labour in certain sectors of the economy, the trade unions had strong reservations and opposed any legal changes. A draft proposal for a new law that should replace the German Decree on Foreign Workers, in force since 1941 and taken over by the reinstated republic in 1945 was opposed by employers who wanted an outright liberalisation of foreign employment. With no prospect of reaching a compromise on a law, a compromise was nevertheless reached in 1961 in the form of an agreement between employers and trade unions that allowed for a maximum contingent of 48,000 aliens to be temporarily employed in Austria in 1962. Initially meant as a temporary measure, the practice of setting contingents each year continued in slightly modified form up to 1975. Even when a law on the employment of foreign nationals was finally passed in 1975 and the state (the Ministry of Social Administration which was in charge of labour market policy) henceforth played a much more important role, the social partners remained in overall control of migration policy (Gächter 2000, Matuschek 1985).

Recruitment – a first agreement was signed with Spain in 1962 – was only one channel through which migrants entered Austria. Many, especially later waves of migrants, frequently came on their own accord, following family members, relatives and friends, often traveling as tourists and obtaining work permits from within the country. By 1969, the number of foreign workers from Turkey and Yugoslavia had grown to 76,500. By 1973, numbers had almost tripled to 227,000, 178,000 of whom came from Yugoslavia and 27,000 from Turkey (Faßmann/ Münz 1996).

The first oil crisis in 1973 radically reversed the trend of steadily growing numbers of foreign workers. As a result, the number of foreign employees continuously decreased between 1974 and 1984. The recruitment stop and the concomitant “export” of foreign labour to countries of origin, however, also greatly encouraged the permanent settlement of those that chose (or were able to choose) to remain in Austria.
### Table 1: Population of Foreign Citizenship, 1934-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union (EU 15)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(59,215)</td>
<td>(64,594)</td>
<td>(57,823)</td>
<td>(79,437)</td>
<td>(106,173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>2,178</td>
<td>4,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (FRG and GDR)</td>
<td>43,751</td>
<td>23,667</td>
<td>43,944</td>
<td>47,087</td>
<td>40,987</td>
<td>57,310</td>
<td>72,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>9,847</td>
<td>8,662</td>
<td>7,778</td>
<td>6,681</td>
<td>8,636</td>
<td>10,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>3,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>2,341</td>
<td>2,666</td>
<td>3,427</td>
<td>5,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non EU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(42,951)</td>
<td>(147,302)</td>
<td>(233,625)</td>
<td>(428,253)</td>
<td>(600,753)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>1,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (excl. Taiwan)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3,537</td>
<td>4,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Former) Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>115,780</td>
<td>4,754</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>2,991</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>11,318</td>
<td>(15,052)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which Czech Republic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>10,574</td>
<td>4,509</td>
<td>4,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>20,573</td>
<td>5,985</td>
<td>4,956</td>
<td>2,691</td>
<td>2,526</td>
<td>10,556</td>
<td>12,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>3,043</td>
<td>4,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>1,779</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>5,687</td>
<td>5,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>2,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>24,727</td>
<td>3,705</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>5,911</td>
<td>18,321</td>
<td>23,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>4,924</td>
<td>2,798</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>18,536</td>
<td>17,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>4,747</td>
<td>2,474</td>
<td>3,307</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>3,569</td>
<td>4,901</td>
<td>5,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>16,423</td>
<td>59,900</td>
<td>118,579</td>
<td>127,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>4,171</td>
<td>5,770</td>
<td>6,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Former) Yugoslavia</td>
<td>30,940</td>
<td>14,948</td>
<td>4,565</td>
<td>93,337</td>
<td>125,890</td>
<td>197,886</td>
<td>(214,214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which BiH</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>108,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>132,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYROM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Foreign Population</td>
<td>292,219</td>
<td>322,598</td>
<td>102,159</td>
<td>211,896</td>
<td>291,448</td>
<td>517,690</td>
<td>710,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In % of total population</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian Nationals</td>
<td>646,800</td>
<td>6,611,307</td>
<td>6,972,000</td>
<td>7,279,630</td>
<td>7,263,890</td>
<td>7,278,096</td>
<td>7,322,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Resident Population</td>
<td>6,760,000</td>
<td>6,933,905</td>
<td>7,074,158</td>
<td>7,491,526</td>
<td>7,755,338</td>
<td>7,795,786</td>
<td>8,032,926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations used: FRG – Federal Republic of Germany; GDR – German Democratic Republic; BiH – Bosnia-Herzegovina; FRY – Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (now: Serbia and Montenegro)


Thus, despite the declining participation of non-nationals in the labour market (the number of foreign workers declined by approximately 40%), the total foreign resident population remained almost constant, declining only slightly between 1974 and 1976, but increasing constantly thereafter, mainly due to family reunification (Münz/Zuser/Kytir 2003; Waldrauch 2003).
The migration initiated in the 1960s stimulated further migration and keeps shaping the current composition of the foreign resident population. Thus, in 2001, 62.8% of the total foreign resident population, and three quarters of third country nationals, came from Former Yugoslavia and Turkey (see Table 1).

1.1.2 The 1990s: From “Guestworkers” to Immigrants

The 1990s brought a major shift in migration policy, not only in terms of substance, but also in terms of competences and, most importantly perhaps, in terms of political discourse. In public discourse, the term “guest worker” was still very much in use throughout the 1980s, while the legal framework governing the immigration and employment of foreign nationals similarly rested on the assumption of the temporary nature of the presence of “guestworkers”. Unemployment, minor criminal offences and even offences against administrative rules could all lead to the termination of a permit, and eventually, to expulsion, thus leaving non-nationals with little rights and a high degree of general insecurity. By the late 1980s, however, it had become clear that the existing legal framework governing the entry, residence and employment of foreign nationals was inadequate to deal with the long term presence of foreign nationals.

The political context had also changed dramatically as the dominance of the two main parties – the conservative Austrian People’s Party and the Socialist Party – successively eroded during the 1980s and 1990s. Both the Green Party, which had gained several seats in parliament in the 1986 elections, and the populist Freedom Party (FPÖ) used migration to sharpen their profiles, albeit in diametrically opposed directions. Mobilisation against immigration by the FPÖ, and as a reaction, for tolerance and against xenophobia and the FPÖ campaign against immigration, reached its height in 1992/1993, when the FPÖ organized a mass campaign under the slogan “Austria first”, calling for a restriction of immigration and tighter border and internal controls. In response, a wide range of NGO’s, public figures, church organisations and others, organized a mass-demonstration for tolerance and against xenophobia, the so-called “Sea of Candles” (Lichtermeer), in which some 300,000 people participated, making it one of the largest demonstrations of the post-war period. The mass demonstration against xenophobia also was the trigger for the emergence of a lively and active anti-racist movement, including several immigrant advocacy groups.

The mass influx of Romanian asylum seekers in 1990 also made asylum a contentious issue and created the impression that the asylum system was in crisis. An increasing number of actors called for a review of asylum legislation and for restricting immigration, including the Trade Unions and the Austrian Freedom Party (FPÖ). The rising number of immigrants from Eastern Europe since 1989 and the mass influx of Bosnian war refugees in 1992 (between 1987 and 1997, the immigrant population more than doubled from 326,000 to 713,000) additionally created a pressure for reform of immigration policy.

At the same time, there was a shift of competences on the level of government, with the Ministry of Interior taking over the lead in regard to the formulation of overall goals in

---

1 The campaign used the constitutional mechanism of a Volksbegehren (literally: “popular initiative”). If passing the threshold of 100,000 signatures, a Volksbegehren has the character of a proposal for a law and has to be voted in Parliament.

2 Most of the 95,000 Bosnians who fled to Austria were accepted on an ad-hoc basis. In contrast to Bosnians in Germany and the approximately 11,000 Kosovars who fled to Austria a few years later, the overwhelming majority (70,000) stayed in Austria and were readily integrated (Jandl/Kraler 2003).
migration policy from the Ministry of Social Affairs. Between 1989 and 1992, the Ministry of the Interior together with the Office of the Federal Chancellor held several dialogue groups, comprising civil servants as well as migration researchers and intellectuals, resulting in a draft proposal for an “immigration law” (the title was subsequently dropped). The proposal suggested the introduction of a quota system and the abolishment of labour market controls for immigrants. Proponents of the law argued that the existing control mechanisms (essentially: the control of the labour market) were ineffective. In addition, immigration was also suggested as a means to address the problems posed by aging societies (König/Perchinig 2003: 2).

Thus, since the latter half of the 1980s, migration gradually moved to the centre of political discourse, and on a political level, it stopped being an issue dealt with in a technocratic manner behind closed doors (Bauböck 1999).

Initially informed by a progressive agenda, the legislation eventually adopted in 1992 (Aliens Act and Residence Act) only added additional levels of controls, while long-term migrants still found themselves in the same precarious legal situation as before the reform, and in many instances, were arguably even worse off. However, the new legislation, in particular the 1992 Residence Act which introduced annual quotas for immigrants, also had major shortcomings in practical administrative terms, especially in regard to administering the annual quotas, but also more generally because of the imprecision of its provisions and the resulting scope for administrative discretion which in turn led to frequent annulations of administrative decisions by the country’s higher courts (Jahwari 2000). Closely tied to the reform of immigration legislation, a new Asylum Act was adopted in 1991, whose main objective was to reduce the numbers of asylum seekers, among others, by introducing fast track procedures. In fact, numbers of asylum applications dropped starkly, but by the late 1990s, rose to previous levels again (See Table 3).

Within five years of the initial immigration legislation reform, a new immigration act – that merged the 1992 Aliens Act with the Residence Act in one single piece of legislation – was adopted in 1997, partly to address the obvious shortcomings of the 1992 Residence Act. A central aim of the legislative reform was to promote the integration of aliens instead of new immigration (“integration before new immigration”). The most important novelty introduced by the 1997 Aliens Act was the principle of (successive) consolidation of residence after five, eight and ten years (Sohler 1999: 84f). At the same time, new restrictions were imposed. Particularly severe are the high employment barriers for migrants who had come as family members (8 years of continuous residence, later reduced to 4 years).

Finally, Nationality was reformed in 1998. While changing little in the general design of the law (different waiting periods for different categories of migrants wishing to naturalize, absolute entitlement to naturalization after 30 years, regular discretionary naturalization after 10 years, ius sanguinis acquisition of citizenship at birth), it introduced “integration” as a guiding principle in respect to naturalization. Thus, naturalizing migrants generally need to prove integration, mainly by proving a certain level of German language proficiency. But they may also acquire an entitlement to naturalization, if they can show to be particularly well integrated in economic, social, and professional terms (see also below). One of the objectives of the reform was to give citizenship a symbolical value, wishing to interpret it as an expression of membership and as a reward rather than “only” as a legal status. As a corollary, other provisions were tightened as well. Most importantly, already a sentence of 3 months makes naturalization impossible (See Waldrauch/Çinar 2003).
Table 2: Naturalizations by former Nationality, 1990-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ex-Yugoslavia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>Other Europe</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>America</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Australia, Oceania</th>
<th>Stateless, unclear</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2.639</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>2.112</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.708</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>8.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3.217</td>
<td>1.801</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>2.401</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>2.212</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>11.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>4.329</td>
<td>1.987</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>1.930</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.051</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>11.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>5.780</td>
<td>2.686</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>15.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>5.621</td>
<td>3.377</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>2.575</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2.042</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>14.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>4.529</td>
<td>3.201</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>2.072</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>2.369</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>15.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3.118</td>
<td>7.492</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.879</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>1.665</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>15.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3.659</td>
<td>5.064</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>3.857</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>2.425</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>17.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>4.142</td>
<td>5.664</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3.572</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>24.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>6.728</td>
<td>10.324</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.904</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>2.419</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>24.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>21.574</td>
<td>12.623</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>3.205</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>44.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>25.574</td>
<td>13.665</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.696</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Austria, Statistical Yearbook, Various Years

1.1.3 A Turning point? The formation of the centre-right coalition government in 2000 and migration policy

The formation of a coalition government between the conservative People’s Party and the populist Freedom Party (“Schwarz-Blau”) in early February 2000 brought a major change to Austria’s political system. In particular, it meant an end to the post-War political system and an established political consensus that found its institutional expression in long periods of grand coalitions between the two major parties (Social Democrats and the conservative Austrian People’s Party) and the importance of the (largely informal) mechanisms of social partnership in a wide range of policy areas.

By 2002, the coalition began to undertake a major reform of the Aliens Act. In July 2002, the parliament adopted the amendment of the Aliens Act (FrG Novelle 2002) and the Asylum Law (AsylG Novelle 2002). In general, the reform followed the line of earlier legislation, but it introduced new regulations in three important respects. First, labour immigration of unskilled and semi-skilled workers was formally ended by the abolishment of the quota for employees (only a quota for key personnel/ highly skilled migrants will henceforth exist) and the introduction of a minimum wage requirement for prospective migrants set at € 2016 per month. Second, as compensation, the employment of seasonal workers was greatly facilitated by allowing seasonal workers in other than those industries that traditionally employed seasonal migrants (agriculture and tourism) and by extending the employment period to up to one year. Third, under the conditions of the so-called “integration contract”, all third country nationals newly immigrating or those who have been living on Austrian territory since 1998, are obliged to sign the so-called “integration agreement” stipulating the attendance of language courses. However, there are a series of exceptions; for example, immigration officers can exempt immigrants from the integration contract if their prima facie command of German is deemed sufficient; furthermore, foreigners are exempted if admitted as key personnel, if he or she is under-age or otherwise in education, is a close relative of an Austrian citizen or is sick or elderly. In the first half of 2004, most of the 34,000 foreigners, (new immigrants and migrants that came to Austria after 1998) in principle falling under the regulation, were exempted from attending language courses, while only 825 immigrants actually attended a course.3

3 Der Standard, 09/02/2005
As a migration control instrument, both the 1997 and the 2002 Aliens Acts failed to reach their tacit objectives – to reduce immigration flows. In Austria, for example, family members of Austrians/EEA citizens who do not fall under quota restrictions and are entitled to enter Austria now make up the overwhelming majority of long term immigrants admitted to the country (88% in 2003). Thus, while the policy of restricting long term labour migration, was enormously effective, immigration numbers continue to rise, mainly because of the increasing number of naturalizations (see Table 2) and the related rise of family reunion cases involving family members of Austrians citizens (See on quantitative developments Biffl/Bock-Schapelwein 2004). In addition, many migrants on short term permits stay in the country for prolonged periods, thus effectively being long term migrants without the rights that “regular” long term migrants enjoy. Nevertheless, despite high levels of net-immigration and a constant birth surplus of foreigners, the total number of foreigner residents seems to be rather stable, mostly because of rapidly rising numbers of naturalizations.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>2,098</td>
<td>4,209</td>
<td>12,995</td>
<td>6,651</td>
<td>2,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>3,366</td>
<td>2,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>2,118</td>
<td>4,466</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>3,343</td>
<td>2,559</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYR Macedonia</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>1,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>6,713</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and Montenegro</td>
<td>5,915</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>6,647</td>
<td>6,840</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>4,723</td>
<td>2,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>1,968</td>
<td>3,561</td>
<td>2,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5,515</td>
<td>2,514</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>2,314</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>2,651</td>
<td>3,126</td>
<td>4,481</td>
<td>4,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,238</td>
<td>4,744</td>
<td>5,082</td>
<td>5,920</td>
<td>6,991</td>
<td>6,719</td>
<td>13,805</td>
<td>20,129</td>
<td>18,284</td>
<td>30,127</td>
<td>39,354</td>
<td>32,364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FYR Macedonia refers to the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Source: Compiled from annual Ministry of the Interior statistical reports, available in electronic format since 2002 at http://www.bmi.gv.at/publikationen/

Throughout the 1990s, the debate on immigration reform was closely tied to the debate on asylum, mirroring the intermingling of both issues in public discourse (See below, Chapter 1.2). Similarly, most immigration reforms were coupled to reforms of asylum legislation.

Since the late 1990s, Austria has become one of the main receiving countries of asylum seekers in Europe, the majority of whom enter the country illegally. Many asylum seekers, however, are thought to move on to other European destinations, but hard evidence on this issue is scarce. Apart from the concern over “bogus asylum seekers” and criminal asylum seekers, the reception system for asylum applicants has been one of the most contentious issues throughout the 1990s, not least since it strongly rests on the cooperation of the Länder (provinces) in charge of implementing the reception system. Traditionally, only an estimated 30% of asylum seekers were accepted in federal care. However, a ruling of the Constitutional
Court in April 2003 that all asylum seekers were entitled to federal care, as well as the recent EU Directive on the Reception of Asylum Seekers⁴, have triggered a series of amendments of asylum legislation proper, aimed at sharply reducing the numbers of asylum seekers and at accelerating the procedure (See Jandl/Kraler 2003, Waldrauch 2003).

Reflecting the reduced levels of new immigration subject to quota requirements (family members of EU nationals and Austrian citizens are not subject to immigration quotas), the number of third country nationals with short term permits or permits with a short duration of validity is relatively low. Just above 57% of third country nationals possess unlimited permits and thus a relatively secure status (See Table 4).

Table 4: Third Country Nationals by Type of Permit and Duration of Validity of the Permit, (1 December 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>of which</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>long term residence permits (Niederlassungsbewilligungen)</td>
<td>short term permits (Aufenthaltsverlaubnisse)</td>
<td>Short term permits (Aufenthaltsbe-willigungen, 1992 Residence Act)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>554,208</td>
<td>504,755</td>
<td>25,271</td>
<td>24,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>285,399</td>
<td>25,825</td>
<td>13,803</td>
<td>13,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>268,809</td>
<td>24,650</td>
<td>11,468</td>
<td>10,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>138,262</td>
<td>130,994</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td>5,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-30</td>
<td>120,584</td>
<td>102,990</td>
<td>14,618</td>
<td>2,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>117,239</td>
<td>10,729</td>
<td>4,689</td>
<td>5,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>85,094</td>
<td>77,493</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>4,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>61,720</td>
<td>56,873</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>3,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td>31,309</td>
<td>29,126</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2,028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of the Interior, Asyl- und Fremdenstatistik November 2004, available at http://www.bmi.gv.at/downloadarea/asyl_fremdenwesen_statistik/112004.pdf. It should be noted that not all categories of third country nationals need residence permits, most importantly, recognized refugees are not included in the statistics.

Despite the restrictions on labour migration, however, immigration levels continue to be pronounced. In fact, net migration to Austria has risen sharply during the last five years (see Table 5).

The overall immigrant population (by country of birth) now stands at just over one million or 12.5% of the total population (See Table 6) Immigrants from traditional countries of labour recruitment still make up the majority of the immigrant population. However, there is a sizable population from Eastern European countries, notably from Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, who predominantly came either as refugees in the Hungarian crisis (1956), in the aftermath of the Prague Spring (1968) and after the declaration of a state of emergency in Poland (1981), or in the late 1980s and early 1990s, after the fall of the Iron Curtain and before the restrictions on immigrations that entered into force in 1993. In addition, there is a

---

growing population of immigrants from non-traditional source countries, notably Iran, India, the Philippines and Egypt.

Table 5: Net migration by citizenship categories, 1996-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Nationals</th>
<th>Non-Nationals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Former-Yugoslavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1.537</td>
<td>-5.603</td>
<td>7.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>32.964</td>
<td>-12408</td>
<td>45.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2003</td>
<td>153.695</td>
<td>-72.943</td>
<td>226.638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Austria

While Austria was an important transit country for Jews from the Soviet Union throughout much of the 1970s and 1980s, only few of the 250,000 Jews channelled through Austria to overseas resettlement countries and Israel stayed on in Austria (Bauböck 1999: 108). In contrast to Germany, Austria never felt to have a special obligation towards ethnic German minorities in Eastern and Central Europe, for example those that were historically part of the Austrian-Hungarian monarchy, nor to Jews or other minorities persecuted during World War II who don’t reside in Austria or were residents prior to the Nazi period. However, there is a special relationship with the autonomous region of South Tyrol (Alto Adige), immigrants from which probably make up the majority of immigrants from Italy.

The history of initially predominantly male labour migration still shapes the demographic structure of the immigrant population. However, the gender imbalance has significantly decreased over the past 10 to 20 years, especially with regard to the more settled immigrant communities. By contrast, a stark gender imbalance still characterizes some more recent immigrant communities with very specific immigration histories, notably Egyptians and Nigerians – where males dominate – and Filipinos, of whom the majority are females.

---

5 This changed somewhat in the early 1990s, but only in regard to victims of Nazism who were residents of the territory of Austria during the Nazi period. Also, former forced labourers are now eligible for financial compensation, but never did Austria apply preferential rules for either immigration or acquisition of citizenship for particular groups, like Eastern European Jews.

6 Most Nigerians came as students or as asylum seekers (asylum seekers, however, are normally not counted in the census). As in other European countries, Filipinos were recruited as nurses for the health and care sector.
1.2 Major issues discussed with relation to immigration

In stark contrast to the 1970s and 1980s when immigration hardly featured in public debates, immigration became a high profile issue during the 1990s and continues to be so in the new millennium. In general, the debate is characterized by negative attitudes towards immigration and outright xenophobia and consequently largely focuses on the negative aspects allegedly associated with migration.

During much of the past one and half decades, one of the main protagonists of the debate on immigration was Jörg Haider’s populist Freedom Party, perhaps not so much by framing the terms of the debate (various actors including government officials and officials of the Socialist and the conservatives Austrian People’s party were equally, if not more important in doing this, See Zuser 1996), but by successfully mobilizing anti-immigrant sentiments for political purposes, and in particular, for election campaigns. One of the underlying reasons for the ability of the FPÖ to do so, can be identified in a general unease of broad sections of the population in view of major geopolitical changes, brought about by the end of the cold war and equally important, by the major economic transformations that had led to massive...
restructuring including massive lay-offs, particularly in the more traditional industries, all over Europe since the 1970s, although only belatedly so in Austria (See Kraler 2003).

While these global transformation had created widespread, unspecific fears, a more specific fear of being overwhelmed by mass migration flows “from the east” was closely tied to the fall of the iron curtain. The first wave of emigrants, – the 45,000 or so citizens of the German Democratic Republic who entered Austria over the Hungarian border to travel on to West Germany during Summer 1989 and who became a symbol of the collapse of the strict exit control mechanisms prevailing in Eastern Europe – were greeted enthusiastically. The opening of the border to Czechoslovakia and Hungary created a similar short-lived euphoria (Bauböck 1999: 118f). The mood changed, however, with the Romanian uprising and the flows of refugees and asylum seekers produced by it. In contrast to discourses on Cold War refugees in which the latter were portrayed as victims of communist oppression and were generally perceived with sympathy, the discourse on Romanians emphasized the latter’s “otherness” – their poverty, ill health, the general backwardness of the country and the endemic violence characterizing Romania etc. (see Matouschek/Wodak/Januschek 1995: 59). In a second phase, Romanians were increasingly seen as economic migrants rather than as deserving refugees and were regarded as being associated to all sorts of petty crime, not least, since many of many entered Austria illegally after the imposition of a visa requirement. The way Romanians were perceived in the public and the way public authorities reacted to the inflow was to become paradigmatic for the ambiguous perception and indeed reception of asylum seekers up to this date.

Since the early 1990s and closely tied to the inflow of Romanian asylum seekers, debates on immigration had increasingly focused on security issues rather than on considerations of an economic nature that had informed earlier debates and policies and in terms of categories of migrants, on asylum seekers. With the focus of public debates shifting to “illegal migrants”, “bogus asylum seekers”, trafficking and smuggling of humans, organized crime and since the mid-90s, the involvement of some asylum seekers in drug trafficking, immigration, particularly, as newly arriving immigrants was concerned, was predominantly discussed as a matter of policing. The shift of responsibility within the government from the Ministry of Social Affairs to the Ministry of Interior as lead agency in regard to immigration policy in the late 1980s may have helped to reinforce the changes in perception of, and in policies towards immigrants (Sohler 2000). Evidently, policies and the wider debate towards “settled” migrants were not left untouched by the “criminalisation” of migration policy in general. Although official discourse henceforth was guided by the slogan “integration before immigration”, it stressed control mechanisms, policing measures and measures aimed at reducing “abuse” (of asylum, social benefits, etc.) over measures facilitating integration in a social, economic, legal, or political sense. Recently, the high proportion of foreigners among persons indicted for criminal offences has led to a renewed debate on criminality, security and migration.

As asylum figures began to soar in 1998, after massively decreasing as a result of the asylum reforms (see Table 3 above), both the FPÖ and the Austria’s largest tabloid (“Krone”) launched a massive campaign against asylum seeker, and especially African asylum seekers, who were construed as drug traffickers and criminals. Two events during this period were particularly significant in leading to renewed massive political mobilisation against racism, xenophobia towards Africans and racist police practices. In early May 1999 a Charles Omofuma, a Nigerian failed asylum seeker died while being deported from Vienna to Sofia. He was bound and gagged by the officers who accompanied him, and arrived unconscious in Sofia where doctors pronounced him dead. The incident provoked massive outrage over
deportation practices as well as police practices towards Africans in general. Numerous demonstrations were held in response to the tragic death of the Nigerian, but there was little official reaction to the incident. A month later, a large police raid was carried out against an alleged Nigerian “drug cartel” (“Operation Spring”), which led to the arrest of over 100 persons, including a renowned Nigerian writer, activist and long-term resident of Austria. The timing of the raid was closely related to anti-racist campaigning and from the perspective of the police, anti-racist campaigning of Africans was perceived as “undermining police and the rule of law”.

In addition, both the Omofuma incident and the alleged large-scale involvement of African asylum seekers in drug trafficking were one of the main campaigning issues during the election campaign preceding the October 1999 general elections.

In particular during the early 1990s, also a more principled debate was led on whether Austria was or should be a country of immigration or whether the immigration of foreigners, by contrast, should be regarded as a burden and a threat to the “well-being” and identity of Austrians and consequently, whether it should be reduced as much as possible. Indeed, one of the main objectives of the reform of aliens legislation in the early 1990s was to reduce the number of new immigrants, and to some extent, even to reduce the number of foreigners already present in Austria as well (Jawhari 2000: 54ff). Although immigration and the long term presence of migrants has since been increasingly accepted as irreversible fact, the agenda of restricting immigration flows has remained on the table. For example, immigration was one of key campaigning issues during the election campaign for the 1999 general elections and was also the driving force behind the introduction of a minimum wage requirement and the abolition of immigration quotas for lesser skilled foreign workers in the 2002 reform (Kraler 2003; Kraler/Stacher 2002). The EU’s Eastern Enlargement has similarly led to an intense public debate on the levels of immigration to be expected from the new Member States. Consequently, Austria was – along with Germany – one of the main proponents of long transition periods, only after which unrestricted access to national labour markets would be granted.

During the 1990s, “integration” has become a key concept both in the wider debate on immigration and for immigration policies. Generally, however, integration is rarely discussed as a concept to guide policy makers in designing legal “integration pathways” in a way that favours the wider social, economic and political integration of migrants. Thus, the debate is more concerned with finding remedies for perceived integration deficiencies of individual migrants than tackling known obstacles to integration – e.g. on the labour market in general and in terms of access to employment in particular (König/Perchinig 2003).

In general, the debate rests on the assumption that migrants are reluctant to integrate and therefore have to be coaxed to do so, by force if necessary. Tellingly, the publication of the attendance figures of mandatory German language courses in the framework of the integration agreement (close to 90% of migrants falling under the regulation were exempted from the obligation to attend “integration courses”), has not, as could be expected, led to a re-evaluation of the basic assumption that migrants are “unwilling to integrate” and lack language and general knowledge about the country even after some years of residence. Rather, the new Minister of the Interior, Liese Prokop, has expressed her disappointment

7 Quote from the article “Schneetreiben im Frühling” (“Snow Flurry in Spring”), published in the Summer 1999 issue of the police journal „Der Kriminalbeamte“ (“the Detective”. Quoted after Kravagna 2004: 70
8 Since the 2002 general elections (which had to be advanced from autumn 2003) was overshadowed by the crisis of the FPÖ as well as social policy issues, immigration hardly featured at all during the election campaign. See Kraler 2003
9 See Der Standard, „Integrationsvertrag. Hintergrund: Fast 90% ausgenommen“, 30/12/2004
about low attendance rates and announced to sharply reduce exemption clauses, to reform integration courses and to add civic education to the course curriculum. In contrast to other countries, the country’s Muslim community has only recently become subjects of debates on integration. Interestingly, the debate so far has largely been led in leftist daily and weekly papers (e.g. in Der Standard, and in the weekly magazine Falter), which mainly took up the German discussion on a so-called Turkish-Muslim “parallel society”.

The introduction of the local vote for EU nationals in the course of Austria’s accession to the European Union in 1995 also sparked a short-lived debate on the introduction of the local vote for long-term third country nationals, which, however, quickly subsided as there was no political support for such a step (Schnedl 1995). In December 2002, the Vienna city council introduced the local vote for district councillors’ elections for long-term third country nationals with a minimum residence of 5 years (Walrauch 2003: 14). However, the opposition parties in the city council challenged the reform before the constitutional court, which eventually ruled that fundamental changes of electoral law such as the extension of the franchise to third country nationals can only be changed by amending the constitution. Interestingly, few substantial arguments against the introduction of the local vote for foreign nationals were raised by the opposition parties in the city council and the main argument against local voting rights for immigrants was formal, namely that it contradicted the constitution. The only substantial argument against the introduction of local voting rights for third country nationals was that formal political participation was and should be regarded as the prerogative of citizens. By undermining this principle, the institution of citizenship as such would be undermined (see Valchars 2004: 99). Thus, the initiative now lies with parliament, where, however, support for the introduction of the local vote for immigrants is insufficient to achieve a change of constitution.

Somewhat earlier than the debate on the introduction of the local vote, a debate on the introduction of advisory councils for immigrants began, first in Salzburg, from where it spread to other municipalities, including Linz and Graz (Kodat 1996: 106ff; Mühlbacher 1996: 87ff). The first advisory council for immigrants was introduced in Graz in 1995, a second followed in Linz in 1996. Advisory councils also were established in Steyr, Schwechat, Kufstein, Kapfenberg and Leoben (Grasl 2002: 35). In 1999, the province of Styria obliged all municipalities with a foreign resident population of 1,000 or more to establish advisory councils. It should be added, that the debate on formal political participation of immigrants, either through the local vote or by means of advisory bodies, is very much an elite driven process. Apart from the debate on the introduction of the local vote in Vienna, however, hardly involves the wider public nor a wider share of the immigrant population.

The low score Austria achieved in the most recent Pisa-Study (it moved down several ranks in comparison to the previous study) has led to a sharp and still ongoing controversy over the negative impact of immigrant children on the outcome the study, and by implications, on the performance of the education system in general. Rather than addressing possible root causes (e.g. the stratified nature of the education system which reproduces and exacerbates social inequality rather than redressing it, little support for children for whom German is a second language) the immediate reaction of government politicians was to call for mandatory supplemental language courses for immigrant children along the lines of the integration

---

10 See Der Standard, „Integrationsvertrag. Innministerin plant Änderungen“, 30/12/2004
agreement and to generally deplore the burden which immigrant children allegedly represent for the education system.\footnote{See for example Der Standard, „‚Langjähriges ideologisches Zerwürfnis‘ – Migrationsforscherin im Interview“, 01/12/2004}

Clearly, the focus of the wider public debates on migration is rather limited. In most debates, the focus of the debate is on negative aspects allegedly associated to migration, be it crime, abuse of benefits by “undeserving foreigners”, high unemployment, residential and other localized conflicts, and competition for scarce resources. In addition, debates on integration rarely consider the enabling and restrictive power of the legal framework governing the immigration, residence and “integration” of migrants. The recent, albeit abortive attempt by the Viennese provincial government to introduce the right to vote and stand for office in district level elections in Vienna, arguably was one of the few instances where integration was explicitly understood as a process that should be facilitated by an enabling legal framework, rather than by a set of rules, with which the migrant has to comply.

1.3 Institutional setting framing immigrant participation

In the following chapter, the institutions framing immigrant participation will be analyzed in a broad sense. We differentiate between institutions directly concerned with participation on the one hand, and contextually important institutions, on the other. Among directly relevant institutions we include citizenship, representative bodies, the legal framework relevant for the formation and activities of civil society organisations (associations, and religious organisations, public demonstrations and meetings), interest organisations, and voting rights, while the legal framework governing immigration, employment, social rights of immigrants and specific bodies established to administer integration policies are the most important “contextual institutions”. Together, they form the political opportunity structures relevant for migrants. The political opportunity structure “consists of laws that allocate different statuses and rights to various groups of migrants and formally constrain or enable their activities, of institutions of government and public administration in which migrants are or are not represented, of public policies that address migrants’ claims, concerns and interests or don’t, and of a public culture that is inclusive and accepts diversity or that supports national homogeneity and a myth of shared ancestry” (Bauböck 2005: 2).

1.3.1 The Legal Framework governing immigration, employment, and social rights of immigrants

The aim here is not to comprehensively describe the legal framework on immigration, employment, social rights and anti-discrimination. Rather, we briefly reflect on how the migration regime in general bears on civic participation of migrants and what constraining and enabling context it provides.

In general, immigration legislation is important for participation of migrants in that it allocates different statuses for different categories of migrants and thus, in a way, circumscribes migrants’ scope for agency. The most important way in doing so is by making migrants’ stay less or more secure. Differentiating rights (most importantly residence and employment rights) of third country nationals for different categories of migrants lies at the heart for what recently the term “civic fragmentation” has been suggested (Kraler 2005, Morris 2001). Providing migrants with a long-term perspective and a pathway to legal integration clearly favours their integration into the wider structures of the receiving society. By contrast, keeping migrants in a temporary position and in a position of lesser rights,
irrespective of their actual duration of residence in the country clearly discourages migrants’ participation in the host society.

In Austria, the 1997 immigration reform has greatly improved the “residential security” for long-term third country nationals by the introduction of the principle of “consolidation of residence” after five, eight and ten years. However, access to the labour market remained decoupled from immigration law. Thus, even long-term migrants did not automatically have unrestricted access to employment, which remained dependent on his or her employment career. This major deficiency was addressed by the introduction of the “residence certificate” in the 2002 reform. After five years of continuous residence – defined as possession of a long term permit for five years – an immigrant is entitled to a residence certificate, which not only provides him or her with a comparatively high degree of protection from expulsion (migrants enjoy the highest degree of protection from expulsion only after 8 year of continuous possession of a long term residence permit), but gives him or her also unrestricted access to employment. Even with a residence certificate, the permit may be terminated in case of long term unemployment and lack of means over a prolonged period, subject to various protection clauses, including those of the European Convention on Human Rights.

However, migrants on short-term permits may in fact never have access to the protection accorded to long-term third country nationals as defined by legal regulations. In addition, the 2002 Aliens Act also provided for the massive expansion of temporary “seasonal” employment, by extending the maximum stay as a “seasonal worker” (renamed to “temporarily employed foreign worker”) to 12 months and by allowing the employment of temporary foreign labour in all economic sectors – traditionally, seasonal labour was only allowed in agriculture and tourism. Temporary migrants are not eligible for a series of social benefits (most importantly pensions and unemployment benefits) and above all, they are excluded from access to “denizenship” as Hammar (1990) calls the relatively secure residential status for non-nationals that has emerged across Europe since the 1980s, except in the unlikely event that temporary migrants are granted a long term permit upon application from the country of origin and subject to the conditions applicable to labour migrants (König/Stadler 2003, Waldrauch 2003). It is clear, then, that temporary migrants are much more vulnerable vis-à-vis employers than other labour migrants, but also vis-à-vis state authorities (e.g. in case of ongoing illegal employment after the termination of the official contract).

In Austria, most third country nationals are excluded from a series of non-contributory social rights or enjoy them only if certain conditions are met. Most importantly, third country nationals eligible for family benefits and children allowance (Kinderbetreuungsgeld) only if they have been resident in Austria for a minimum of 5 years and have been employed for at least three months. In addition, they are excluded from non-contributory general welfare benefits distributed by the provinces, housing benefits, and frequently also access to social housing programmes operated by the municipalities, albeit this is now in contradiction with the EU-Racial Equality Directive. Most other welfare benefits are subject to a five year

---

12 There is some anecdotal evidence that “short term migrants” in legal terms may reside in the country for extended periods of time. In one case communicated to one of the authors, a Nigerian had stayed in Austria on a short term permit for 21 years until his permit was finally cancelled.

13 Thereafter, the migrant has to return to his or her country of origin for 2 months. However, it can be expected that a significant minority will stay illegally until their next contract.

14 Among others, the migrant has to prove to be highly qualified and to have a minimum monthly income of EUR 2016.-

15 Except refugees and third-country nationals enjoying equal rights on the basis of bilateral treaties/ EU association treaties.
minimum residence requirement, except so-called “emergency benefits”, which third country nationals can receive only after 8 years of continuous residence (König/Perchinig 2003: 25).16

1.3.2 Basic civic and basic political rights (freedom of assembly, freedom of association)

Even though some basic rights are formulated as citizens’ rights in the constitution, most basic rights granted by the Basic Law of 186717 and the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), which, together with its protocols, form part of the constitution, de facto accrue to all persons resident in Austria, since laws implementing these provisions normally do not contain explicit references to citizens. One important exception concerns the right of freedom of assembly. Although third-country nationals may freely participate in public assemblies and demonstrations, they cannot organize assemblies or demonstrations nor can they lead public assemblies dealing with public issues (Davy/Çinar 2001; Waldrauch/Sohler 2004: 98f).

In the 1951 Law on association, last amended in 2002, citizenship is not a relevant category. Associations have legal standing. Frequently, the status of association is required to be eligible for public subsidies. To be eligible as associations, groupings must have a minimum membership, follow a specified procedure in constituting the association and lay down internal rules (including membership rules as well as rules for voting chairmen and other office holders) in written form. In the past, immigrant associations, and particularly associations with political or religious objectives, however, have frequently been subject to tight control and even harassment by the authorities.

Traditionally, equality and anti-discrimination provisions in constitutional and other laws refer only to Austrian citizens, or to third country nationals vis-à-vis other third country nationals. The Racial Equality Directive18, however, has recently forced the government to adopt comprehensive anti-discrimination provisions and to establish an anti-discrimination body, by broadening the mandate of the gender equality commissioner (see Waldrauch/Sohler 2004: 98f). The Equality in Employment Directive19, by contrast, has not yet been transposed into national law, in response to which the Commission announced that it will sue Austria along with four other non-complying states before the Court of Justice in Luxembourg.

1.3.3 Cultural and religious rights of immigrants

Freedom of expression, including in linguistic and cultural regard, as well as freedom of religion are basic rights granted to all persons irrespective of nationality if other basic rights or constitutional principles are not breached. In respect to religion, the Basic Law of 1867 differentiates between recognized and non-recognized “religious societies”. Recognized

---

16 See also the website www.integrationsportal.at, which gives detailed legal information on eligibility for welfare benefits (28/02/2005).
17 The basic law is part of constitutional law, in addition to the formal constitution of 1920, specific laws with constitutional standing and constitutional provisions in simple laws.
religious communities in the sense of the 1867 Basic Law enjoy a special legal standing as corporations under public law.

The status of religious organisations is governed by the 1874 Law on Recognition of Religious Societies and by the 1998 Law on the Status of Religious Confessional Communities.

The Basic Law of 1867 guarantees certain constitutional rights of recognized religious societies, in particular, their internal autonomy. Furthermore, recognized religious societies and churches enjoy certain educational, fiscal and other privileges (e.g. right to organize religious tuition for children adhering to the respective societies with financial support from the state; right to the ministry of community members in an institutionalized context, e.g. hospitals, prisons and the army, and, depending on the size of the faith community, state support for the ministry in prisons and the army). Ministers of religion of a recognized religious society from third countries are exempt from the regulations of the Foreign Workers Employment Act 1975 and thus, work permit requirements. Also, ministers of religion from third countries are not subject to immigration quotas under the Aliens Law and thus may freely enter the country if the relevant faith communities’ authorities give their consent. Currently, thirteen faith communities have the status of recognized religious societies, including the major Christian denominations, the Islamic Community in Austria, the Jewish Community, Mormons, the Syrian, Armenian, Greek, Coptic, Bulgarian, Romanian and Serbian Orthodox Churches (ICMPD 2005).

In 1998, a new law on religious confessions entered into force, establishing the status of Registered Religious Confessions. Registered confessional communities have juridical standing but do not enjoy the educational, fiscal and other privileges accorded to recognized churches and religious societies. Thus, the new law introduced a two tier system, requiring religious groups seeking recognition under the 1874 law to have first registered as Religious Confessions, before being allowed to seek official recognition as Religious Societies after 10 years, provided they have a minimum membership of two one-thousandth of the Austrian population. Currently, 10 faith communities are recognized as Registered Religious Confessions.

In 1998, a new law on religious confessions entered into force, establishing the status of Registered Religious Confessions. Registered confessional communities have juridical standing but do not enjoy the educational, fiscal and other privileges accorded to recognized churches and religious societies. Thus, the new law introduced a two tier system, requiring religious groups seeking recognition under the 1874 law to have first registered as Religious Confessions, before being allowed to seek official recognition as Religious Societies after 10 years, provided they have a minimum membership of two one-thousandth of the Austrian population. Currently, 10 faith communities are recognized as Registered Religious Confessions.

---

20. The teaching of religion is part of the school curriculum in Austria. Recognized faith communities are responsible for curriculum development and the organisation of religious education while salaries in public schools and private schools under public law are usually paid by the state Tuition in religion is regulated by the 1949 Tuition in Religion Act (Religionsunterrichtsgesetz). Catholic tuition in religion is offered in all public schools, while both Protestantism and Islam is less frequently taught. Recently, curricula have also been issued for Coptic Orthodox, Syrian Orthodox, and Armenian Apostolic tuition in religion. Teachers in religion are appointed by the educational authorities of the respective recognized religious societies, but need a proof of qualification. A formal training as a teacher in religion is preferred, but not a requirement to be admitted a teacher in religion. Both the Catholic Church and the two protestant denominations have since long run teacher training colleges for teachers in religion. Since the academic year 1998/1999, the Islamic Community in Austria runs also its own teacher training college.

21. The Islamic Community has won recognition under a separate law passed in 1912 after Austria’s annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Historically, the Law on Islam pertained to the Hanefitic rite as practised in Bosnia, and, for that reasons was irrelevant after the break-up of the monarchy and remained so until the 1960s. The reconstitution of Islam that would accommodate the various Islamic groupings as well as the establishment of a community structure as a corporation under public law was first suggested by Islamic immigrant associations in the early 1970s. Official recognition of the Islamic Community in Austria (the organisation’s official name) under the 1912 Islamic Law, but pertaining to all variants of Islam was finally gained in 1979 (Waldrauch/Sohler 2004: 110).

22. Before the adoption of the 1998 law, faith communities were usually organized as associations.

23. In the case of the Coptic Orthodox Church, recognition as a religion society was granted despite the community’s small membership.
The elaborated legal framework for the recognition of faith communities as religious societies and the active support the state gives to recognized religious communities (e.g. teacher salaries for religious education in the public school system, tax exemptions, subsidies), has clearly had a positive impact not only on the relationship between the state and faith communities enjoying recognition but also for the religious life of migrants, despite the fact that a wide range of religious issues (e.g. finding suitable places of worship, burial practices and cemeteries for specific religious communities, Jewish and Muslim slaughtering practices etc.) remain controversial and difficult to solve in practice. Nevertheless, Austrian recognition rules and related practices have been frequently cited as an instance of best practice in dealing with religious diversity in a migration context.

For autochthonous ethnic minorities (so called “Volksgruppen”) a separate legal framework exists since 1979 (protection clauses for ethnic minorities were already part of the 1955 Treaty between the Allies and Austria, and the Peace Treaty of St. Germain, concluded in 1919) : It gives the six autochthonous minorities recognized²⁴ a series of specific cultural and representative rights e.g. bilingual education provided the proportion of ethnic minority members exceeds certain thresholds, representation of ethnic associations in the national minority advisory council, state support for linguistic and cultural activities, etc.. In contrast to recognized ethnic minorities, however, the new immigrant minorities don’t have any entitlements to cultural (ethnic minority) rights.²⁵

However, in the regular school system, supplementary tuition in major immigrant languages is regularly offered, mainly to assist immigrant children for whom German is a second language to follow the regular classes, rather than as an expression of the recognition of migrant cultural rights. With the exception of private schools, which may opt for another language of tuition, German is the standard language of tuition (De Cillia 2003). The debate on the most recent PISA study, however, has highlighted major deficiencies of the Austrian education system with regard to immigrant children. In particular, the reluctance to see bilingual education not only in terms of redressing perceived deficiencies on the part of the migrant, but instead, as a means to strengthen certain skills has been criticized in the public debate.²⁶

Many municipalities, however, financially support cultural activities of immigrant associations as part of municipal integration programs or their budget lines for cultural activities (see Waldrauch 2003: 11).

1.3.4 Specialized administrative bodies dealing with immigrant integration, advisory bodies and the local vote for immigrants

Integration programmes and related administrative bodies designing and implementing integration programmes may be interpreted as part of the contextual political opportunity

²⁴ Six minorities enjoy recognition under the Ethnic Minority Act, namely Slovenes, Croatians, Hungarians, Roma and Sinti, Czechs and Slovaks. Apart from Roma and Sinti, ethnic minorities are not only defined by language but also by citizenship, territorially and generationally, not least to exclude co-ethnic immigrants from enjoying the rights accorded to autochthonous ethnic minorities. In the late 1990s, the Polish minority in Vienna applied for ethnic minority status, but was denied the status since, so a study commissioned by the government argued, the Polish minority was mainly comprised of immigrant Poles (Waldrauch 2003: 11).

²⁵ In practice, and particularly in the Southern province of Carinthia, minority rights for Slovenes were never fully implemented and are subject to recurrent controversies between minority advocacy groups, central state authorities, the provincial government, and rightwing nationalist groupings (See Kraler 2004 for a brief discussion of the most recent controversies concerning bilingual signposts)

²⁶ See FN 11
structure relevant to the participation of migrants, insofar they offer migrants means and ways to engage with the receiving society, and thus, to indirectly foster their wider participation in civil society: this can be through language training programmes, by providing basic legal information, by providing financial assistance to immigrant associations, in particular to cultural, political and other activities of immigrant organisations, as well as providing arenas for debates, voicing concerns and representation.

In Austria, integration policy\textsuperscript{27} is largely a matter of the municipalities and has emerged as a novel policy field from about the late 1980s onwards. With the emergence of this policy field, some municipalities began to establish specialised units or bodies, dealing with immigrant integration, predominantly in the field of social work, from which, however, also new activities emerged.

Perhaps the most successful example of a specialized agency for the integration of migrants has been the Viennese Integration Fund, founded in 1992 and formally incorporated into the city administration in 2004. The incorporation of the Integration Fund into the general administration of the municipality follows the shift in policy from a minority to a diversity management approach. While the Fund’s core activities consisted of social work, including mediation services in residential areas with a high proportion of resident immigrants, youth programmes, language courses etc., it also was a major funding source for immigrant associations, and thus in a way, a multiplier for immigrant participation (Koller 1998). In 1999, it established an umbrella organisation for immigrant organisations (“Integrationskonferenz”, integration conference), whose purpose it was to provide a networking and service structure for immigrant associations and advocacy groups dealing with immigrant issues, as well as a structure that could serve as arena for voicing immigrant concerns. However, the integration conference was never conceived as a formal advisory council and thus differs greatly in design and mandate from other advisory structures established by Austrian municipalities. Representatives from the integration conference were also co-opted into the management board of the Vienna Integration Fund. However, the Fund and the Vienna city council was repeatedly criticized for its top-down approach and its reluctance to seriously consider the local vote for third country nationals or the introduction of a more formal advisory council for immigrants.

1.3.5 Membership in interest organisations

Austria has an elaborate and highly centralised system of organized interest groups or “social partnership”, as the neo-corporatist structures established after World War II are known. While some interest organisations are organized as associations (for example, Trade Unions, Industry associations), formal representative structures exist in the form of the Chamber of Commerce (for employers), Chamber of Labour (for employees) and the Chamber of Agriculture (for farmers and agricultural employers). Their mandate, role and electoral regulations are regulated by law.

All employees (except short term contract workers) are formally members of the Chamber of Labour, while every person owning or leading a private enterprise is formally member of the Chamber of Commerce by law. Chamber delegates are elected by statutory chamber members in regular intervals. Third country nationals are not eligible to stand for office in the Chambers of Commerce and the Chamber of Labour (the issue is in practice of little relevance

\textsuperscript{27} In the sense of providing advisory structures and other types of assistance to immigrants.
with regard to Chamber of Agriculture). However, the Chamber of Commerce has recently reinterpreted the principle of reciprocity upon which the passive vote of EU/EEA nationals is based, and has fully enfranchised members who are citizens of countries, where similar representative structures exist and Austrians are eligible to stand for office (Grasl 2002: 42). In the most recent Chamber of Commerce elections in March 2005, citizens of non-EEA countries as well as countries not falling under the reciprocity clause, were excluded from the passive vote, despite a recent ruling of the European Court of Justice in regard to foreign workers that could also be cited as an important precedent for self-employed workers.

The Employment Constitution Act (Arbeitsverfassungsgesetz) provides for formal works councils (Betriebsrat) on the shop floor level, who are elected in regular intervals (normally two years). However, as in chamber elections, third country nationals are excluded from standing for elections. The exclusion of non-nationals from standing for election in works council elections has been increasingly criticized from the early 1990s onwards and in comparative perspective, is unique in Europe, as representation in works councils is elsewhere considered as an employment, rather than a political right.

Since 1991, the Austrian Federation of Trade Union officially supports the introduction of passive vote in works council elections. Nevertheless, the change in policy did not lead to a change in the Employment Constitution Act, due to resistance from individual trade unions and the then junior coalition party ÖVP (Austrian People’s Party). With Austria’s accession to the EU, the right to stand for election has been extended to EU nationals, but third country nationals remained excluded.

On several occasions, the EU commission has reprimanded Austria for not extending the passive vote to Turkish workers, who are entitled to the same employment rights as EU nationals (including the passive vote) (Gächter 2000, Pühretmayer 2000: 43). Finally, in September 2004, the European Court of Justice ruled that foreign workers from countries with which the EU has reached formal agreements on non-discrimination in employment or with which the EU has otherwise concluded bilateral association treaties should be granted the right to stand in elections for both chamber and works council elections. In response, the relevant ministry has announced to grant the right to vote for all third country nationals.

Whether the ruling of the European Court of Justice will lead to a reform of the legal framework governing Chamber of Commerce elections as well as statutory student representative bodies, where third country nationals are similarly excluded from standing in elections, remains unclear.

---

28 As part of the reinterpretation of reciprocity rules, citizens of Croatia, Hungary and Slovenia were given the passive vote in Chamber elections. With the accession of the ten new Member States in May 2004, citizens of these states acquired to stand for election in their capacity as EU citizens. Currently, citizens of Albania, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro and Switzerland have the passive vote in Chamber of Commerce elections.

29 For example Turkey, Morocco and Russia, but also all ACP countries.

The exclusion from the passive vote in a variety of statutory representative bodies is certainly a major constraining factor for immigrant participation. Even though trade unions and other voluntary organisations formally do not exclude non-nationals, relatively few naturalized immigrants and even fewer non-nationals are active in trade unions, partly because election as a works councillor is one of the most important entry gates to the trade union hierarchy. The same holds true for employer organisations and student organisations, albeit arguably to a much lesser extent.

1.3.6 Membership in Political Parties

In Austria, political parties have special legal standing. They enjoy full internal autonomy, subject only to the requirement to lay down their statute in written form and the prohibition of neo-fascist or national-socialist ideological orientation. Thus, in theory, political parties are free to recruit foreign nationals residing in Austria as party members, and even spokesperson, although this has never been the case so far. Rights and duties of party members are defined in party statutes. Usually party statutes don’t restrict membership by citizenship, nor are rights and duties of members differentiated by citizenship status. In practice, however, foreign citizens who are members of political parties are not likely to be elected as party officials, since they are not eligible for political posts which remains the most important criterion for selecting members for party functions.

1.3.7 Citizenship

Historically, citizenship policy has rarely been the subject of political debates, except in the immediate aftermath of World War I. Particularly in the post-war period, however, citizenship, remained uncontroversial and was hardly conceived as more than a legal status.

To some extent, this changed during the 1990s. With the 1998 amendment of the Citizenship Act, “integration” testing was introduced. Naturalizing migrants now have to prove sufficient proficiency in German “corresponding to their personal circumstances,” which, however, is left to the officials implementing the law to decide. According to the explanatory notes to the draft legislation, “the ‘granting’ of Austrian citizenship is the last step after the successful integration of aliens in Austria” (quoted in Valchars 2004: 25). Thus, citizenship is increasingly seen also as a symbolical expression of integration, and as “reward” and “honour” that should be well deserved. In that, the recent citizenship reform follows an emerging international trend that sees an increasing proliferation of formal integration and assimilation tests as well as the introduction of citizenship ceremonies and citizenship oaths (see Kraler 2005). So far, however, the increasing politicisation of citizenship has had little impact on the legal regulations themselves, except, perhaps, as far as the reluctance to introduce ius soli regulations for second or third generation migrants and the continuing non-toleration of dual nationality (except in particular circumstances) is concerned.\(^\text{31}\)

The rules concerning the acquisition of citizenship have remained relatively stable throughout the post-War period, despite frequent reforms. Essentially, citizenship can be acquired in two ways, namely

\(a\) automatically by birth or legitimation\(^\text{32}\), following ius sanguinis rules of transmission\(^\text{33}\)

\(^\text{31}\) An alien acquiring Austrian citizenship must denounce his former nationality. If renunciation is not possible or comes at disproportional costs, dual nationality may be accepted. By contrast, dual nationality is regularly accepted in respect to children born to (married) parents of mixed nationality and where one parent is Austrian citizen.

\(^\text{32}\) In case of marriage of the child’s parents after birth
b) or by naturalization, either by entitlement or by administrative discretion after a regular waiting period of 10 years, unless special circumstances apply (4-6 years) or applicants are relatives of Austrian citizens or of a person becoming naturalized simultaneously (0-4 years) (Waldrauch 2003: 15)34.

In practice, the most important mode of naturalization is by administrative discretion after 10 years.

In general, it seems that naturalizing migrants easily meet the conditions specified by the law (minimum language proficiency, no criminal record, sufficient means of subsistence). Nevertheless, the Austrian citizenship regime must be regarded as rather restrictive, because of a) the strict application of ius sanguinis rules; b) the non-toleration of dual nationality, and c) the high degree of administrative discretion involved. Finally, naturalization can come at great costs (up to EUR 1,100, see Waldrauch/ Çinar 2003). Notwithstanding the relative restrictiveness of Austrian citizenship regulations there has been a continuous increase in naturalizations during the 1990s, largely for demographic reasons35 (see Table 2).

33 If either of the parents is Austrian citizen, the child will automatically acquire Austrian nationality; if parents are non-nationals, the child will acquire its parents’ citizenship, following the rules of the country of origin.
34 Non-nationals may also be naturalized earlier (after 6 years) in case of outstanding achievement or particularly good professional integration. An immigrant acquires an entitlement to naturalization by marriage to or adoption by an Austrian citizen. An entitlement also exists in case of particularly good integration after 15 years – a provision that was introduced by the 1998 amendment of the nationality law but remained largely irrelevant in practice, while an absolute entitlement (subject to certain minimum requirements) exists after 30 years of residence (see Waldrauch/ Çinar 2003).
35 Many migrants that have immigrated to Austria between the late 1980s and the early 1990s are now eligible for naturalization. However, in respect to Turkish migrants, the liberalisation of Turkish citizenship regulations (the renunciation of citizenship was practically not an option for many Turkish migrants since inheritance and other rights were tied to the possession of Turkish citizenship) is arguably one of the major reasons for the upsurge of the number of naturalizations of Turkish nationals (see Çinar 2005).
Part II: Review of research on active civic participation of third country immigrants

2.1 Introduction

The following review of Austrian research literature is structured along several dimensions which we have considered as the most relevant for civic participation, as covered by research existing in Austria:

1) participation in Austrian mainstream interest organisations and particularly trade unions
2) participation of and in immigrant organisations and other Austrian voluntary sector NGOs and social movements in general;
3) political participation: including participation in elections, political parties and functions, or special advisory bodies for foreign third country citizens.

Not all of these research areas have received equal attention from researchers so far. Much of the research done on this topic (and research on migration related topics in general) so far has been done either on initiative of student researchers (thesis and dissertations), or by a small number of specialized research institutes (see Annex). But since there is no institutionalisation of the research field and a strong dependence on commissioned project funding (by national and European government institutions), the research focus has been mainly on policy-relevant issues, and has involved theoretically grounded or basic research only to a much lesser extent.

Recently the first Austrian Migration and Integration report has brought together empirical expertise from various researchers and disciplines, and gives a comprehensive overview of the state of the art of Austrian migration research and also contains a section on immigrant organizational patterns (see Fassmann/Stacher 2003; on civic participation see Bratić 2003, Kroisenbrunner 2003, Perching 2003 in the report). Austrian migration research also closely reflected the changing paradigms of migration and immigrant policies over time (see part I): there was an initial research focus on the analysis of the legal-institutional system of regulating migration and integration, which developed further in the 1990s from a merely social partnership-dominated policy domain, towards a more multi-levelled field of government with a growing number of political (state and non-state) actors at local, federal and European level involved. This also included a certain shift from a state-centred towards a more actors-centred perspective, which also took the perspective of immigrants as civic actors into account. The 1990s were the period, when immigrants became more and more recognized and “visible” as actors and political subjects in the public sphere: e.g. as actors in the antiracist protest movements, as speakers of migrant self-organisations, and since recently also as (naturalized) immigrant politicians.

This is also reflected in the recently growing number of social science studies exploring different aspects of immigrant’s civic participation.

Chronologically, research on civic participation of immigrants started with research on labour interest representation of foreign workers (at the shopfloor) as part of the early studies on the integration of labour migrants since the 1980s. In the 1990s several studies were carried out that focused on the role of migrants associations and selforganisations as vehicles of participation both in the country of origin and in Austria. Initially the Turkish migrants attracted most attention this may be due to their flourishing political and religious associational life, but also because Turkish immigrants were perceived in public discourse as

---

36 See for example Bauböck’s work on citizenship and integration (Bauböck 1994; 2003a und b).
37 The presence of migrants in sports is another example. By contrast, there are hardly any public figures of immigrant background in the mainstream media or in other public functions.
the most culturally “different”, and also least integrated group. Since foreign citizens have been excluded from voting rights at all levels, apart from limited voting rights for works council elections (see above), political preferences and electoral participation of foreigners were not studied by mainstream political research. But political preferences of naturalized immigrants were similarly not taken into account. Studies largely concentrated on the analysis of the legal political framework excluding migrants from equal participation within the paradigm of temporary labour migration.

Only with immigration becoming a major issue in the political debate during the 1990s, and with the share of the naturalized immigrant population significantly growing the issue of political integration of immigrants received more attention. The shift in politics is reflected in growing empirical research on the representation of foreign nationals in works councils and the establishment of advisory bodies for foreign nationals or immigrant NGOs at the municipal level (see Kodat 1996 and Sensenig 1994, 1997). Above all, the adoption of integration policies at the local or municipal level initiated further studies on local policies with respect to migrants’ participation and integration. But also in the context of European integration, issues of equal participation of immigrants became more important, most recently with respect to the implementation of EU- antidiscrimination policies towards ethnic minorities and migrants. In addition, EU-research priorities and research programmes stimulated further research on topics related to equal participation and integration of immigrants in Austria. This resulted in the growth of (currently ongoing) studies with a comparative framework (e.g. the project LIMITS), and an emphasis on themes related to discrimination or anti-racist self-organisations of migrants (e.g. the Equal-project MIDAS, see below).

2.2 Participation in Trade Unions and Labour and employers interest organisations

In contrast to other countries such as Germany, participation of migrants in trade unions and interest organisations in Austria was not encouraged. Although membership to trade unions, which are organised as associations, was not limited to nationals, migrants were indirectly excluded from access to representative functions, since careers within unions usually were closely coupled to previous experience in works councils (see Valchars 2004). The representation and participation of migrants in bodies of labour interest organisation, which had traditionally a powerful role in the Austrian corporatist political system (social partnership) is not well researched. There are no figures on membership of immigrants in trade unions available, since the latter do not hold records on nationality or immigrant background of their members as is the case in some other EU-countries (see Grünell/EIRO 2003).

The first representative survey on the social and economic conditions of labour migrants from Yugoslavia and Turkey carried out in the early 1980ies by IHS (Wimmer et.al. 1986) also included questions on attitudes of immigrants towards interest representation at company level (works councils) and labour unions. The results of the survey showed that only about 25% of the foreign workers asked were of the opinion that the works council of their company represented the interests of foreign workers sufficiently. The Turkish workers were less

38 Examples are the EU Framework-programmes (FP5 and FP6), the EQUAL programme, or the INTI programme.

39 The project „Immigrants and ethnic minorities in European Cities: Life courses and quality of life in a world of limitations (Limits)” is carried out by the Centre for Social Innovation (ZSI) and will be finished in September 2005. See http://www.limits-net.org; and http://www.limits-net.org/download/limits_Folder.pdf (Date of visit 2004-10-01).

40 The survey was carried out in November 1983 and included a sample of 900 foreign labour migrants and their family members from Yugoslavia and Turkey.
satisfied with their interest representation by existing works councillors (15%). From the point of view of respondents, the major reasons for voicing dissatisfaction were that works councillors either exclusively represented the interests of the employers or of their Austrian colleagues, and that they were not acquainted with the problems of foreign workers.

52% of the migrants, and even 75% of the Turkish respondents, expected an improvement of interest representation of foreign workers with an introduction of passive voting rights (for works councils). About 18% declared their basic willingness to stand as candidates for works council elections, if possible, another 16% under certain conditions. Turkish workers were more keen to run for works council elections than migrants from Yugoslavia.

The Austrian case study of a European comparative study on the prevention of racial discrimination and promotion of equal treatment in the workplace\(^\text{41}\) (Gächter, European Foundation 1997: 15-17) also explored the relevance of spokesperson for foreign employees within works councils. A collective agreement, concluded in 1970 between labour and employers interest organisations, introduced the possibility to nominate a foreign employee as a spokesperson for foreign employees by co-option. The study found that the nomination of spokesmen has been keenly encouraged in several Austrian provinces, first of all in Upper Austria and Vorarlberg, during the 1970ties. A survey carried out by the Trade Union in 1996 (cited by Gächter 1997: 15), however, revealed that the agreement was not well known, with the exception of Upper Austria, where there were about 280 spokesman, while in the other provinces there were either none at all or the workers were not aware of these form of participation at shop floor level. In Vorarlberg the Chamber of Labour began to provide training courses for foreign spokesmen from 1976 onwards and encouraged the appointment of such spokesmen within larger companies in the metal- and textile industries, where the majority of migrant workers was employed.

The most comprehensive analysis in this regards is provided by Pühretmayer (1999): The study analyses the political discussion, arguments and programmatic positions of organised interest groups in regard to the introduction of the right of foreign workers to be elected as works councillors or as representatives of statutory labour interest organisations.

In contrast to Germany, where the passive vote for immigrant workers was introduced as early as 1972, a similar debate was initiated only since the mid-1980s by a few experts of the Chamber of Labour, the Social Ministry and social scientists. Social partners, which then were the main policy-making institutions in the area of regulation of foreign labour migration, remained reluctant to grant passive voting rights to immigrants. However, in the 1990s, when integration became a paradigm of migration policies and former “guest-worker policies” were slowly abandoned, the Trade Unions and Labour interest organisations (Chamber of Labour) reformulated their position in favour of passive voting rights of immigrants\(^\text{42}\). Especially certain Trade union branches, such as the hotel and catering union (HGPD), women and youth branches of the Austrian Trade Union and the few migrant interest organisations within the Unions or Chamber of Labour (see below) strongly argued in favour of equal right to representation for migrant workers.

Although, most of the leading interest organisations of Employees and Employers supported such rights in principle, under which conditions (mainly: type of employment permit) such rights should be granted, remained controversial. The conservative “Workers and Employees Organisation” (ÖAAB) opposed the extension of voting rights, mainly with the argument, that ethnic conflicts between migrants would be brought in the policies of interest representation.

\(^{41}\) Carried out by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Wrench 1997).

\(^{42}\) For example the Austrian Trade Union Federation (ÖGB) in 1991 supported the claim for extending passive voting rights in works councils elections for all employees regardless their nationality.
Despite some similar conditions (such as the policies of the recruitment agreements/ “guest worker system”), other distinguishing factors have resulted in different developments in Austria and Germany: among them were the European Community integration (thus a different legal framework – EWG regulations), which in Austria after the EU-accession in 1995 became important; most importantly, the inclusive strategies adopted by Trade unions in Germany very early (especially in the metal sector with a large migrant workforce) concerning migrants participation within the unions that were in contrast to exclusive and paternalistic strategies in Austria. In addition, whereas in Germany the most influential sectoral Trade Union (IG Metall) was a leading proponent for equal participation of migrants, in Austria the most powerful sectoral unions have strongly opposed such policies.

Pühretmayer also describes the development of the few migrant initiatives inside the Trade unions - such as the project group of the Union of private employees GPA in Vienna “Sesam Öffne Dich!” or the electoral initiative “Democracy for all” - since the beginning of the 1990s, which campaigned for equal rights, self-representation and an awareness for migrants interests within trade unions and labour interest bodies (Pühretmayer 1999: 26ff).

In 1992 a project working group of the Viennese GPA (Trade Union of private employees) called “Sesam öffne dich!” was founded by a few union members, among them several with foreign citizenship, which aimed to promote equality of migrant employees within the unions and at the workplace in general. Its major aim was to achieve equal voting rights for works councils and Chamber of Labour for foreign workers, which the labour interest organisations in principle already had agreed upon43. They took several initiatives on that: a petition to introduce the passive vote addressed to the Chamber of Labour in 1993; a folder addressed to diverse Union branches, to mobilize for equal voting rights for foreign employees. Apart from that, they were engaged for measures to promote equal representation of foreign members within the Trade Union (GPA), and active policies targeted at immigrants’ participation (e.g. counselling services, media, equality campaigns), especially with regard to legal protection in cases of discrimination.

Since in 1994 only EEA citizens, but not third country citizens were granted equal voting rights. In response, an im/migrant list was formed to stand for the elections for the Chamber of Labour. The migrant initiative called “Democracy for all” (DfA) was formed by naturalized Austrians and EEA citizens with active support of “Sesam öffne dich!”, some of its members as well stood as candidates. In the Viennese elections for the Chamber of Labour they three migrant representatives within the Chamber of Labour in Vienna were elected between 1994-2000. In 2000 a successor migrant initiative, founded by members of the DfA, activists of an antiracist political initiative called “Die Bunten” (The colourful) and several activists from diverse migrant associations44, the „Bunte Demokratie für alle“ (BDFA) was formed and ran for the Viennese Chamber of Labour election. The BDFA finally won one seat, but also became politically active beyond the sphere of labour interest representation as networking organisation and for mobilizing for political rights for immigrants45. (see Bratić 2001: 527; Waldrauch/Sohler 2004: 475; Pühretmayer 1999: 26-27).

The project working group “Sesam öffne dich!” was dissolved in 1998, since the GPA didn’t support their activities any longer (Pühretmayer 1999: 26; Grandperret/Nagel 2000: 34ff). The working group “labour migration” has since taken up the agenda of “Sesam öffne Dich!” and,

44 These comprised representatives from associations of diverse immigrant background such as „Die Bunten“, the Serbian cultural association Nikola Tesla, the Turkish-leftwing organisation ATIGF, the African counselling association AIKAO, the Latin American association Casa del Pueblo, the Polish Federation, and Demokratie für Alle (DFA). See the Declaration and statutes of BDFA at http://web.utanet.at/labournet.austria/bdfa.htm.
45 For example, they organized parallel elections during the Viennese municipal elections in 2001 in order to protest against exclusion of third country nationals from voting rights.
in contrast to its predecessor, is embedded in wider trade union strategies to reach out to particular types of employees that traditionally were not unionized.46

**Participation in elections of labour interest organisations**

There is only one recent survey among migrants in Vienna (Jenny 2003: 135; see below) that investigated migrants’ electoral participation in works councils elections and Chamber of Labour elections in more depth.47 The participation in such elections differed significantly between foreign nationals and naturalized immigrants, the participation rate of the latter turned out twice as high than that of foreign nationals.

According to that survey, the general participation of migrants in activities of Trade unions was rather high (6%) compared to activities in other organisations, and higher than in political parties. The respondents also expressed a high trust in Trade Unions (Jenny 2002, see below).

So far, there are no in-depth studies, which explore the role of migrant activists at the shop floor level or within labour or employers organisations, partly because the number of trade union activists with a migrant background was (and remains) so low.48

In the recent elections of representatives of the Chamber of Labour in Vienna (May 2004) several migrant candidate lists (such as “Bündnis Mosaik”, “Bunte Demokratie für alle”) competed, although their success remained rather limited (e.g. only 1% voted for the list “Bunte Demokratie für alle” in Vienna).49 In most of the provinces naturalized immigrants of Turkish origin made up the majority of candidates on such migrants’ lists or of candidates with foreign background on party lists in the Chamber of Labour elections.

Recently a few surveys – such as the Working Climate Index50 on working conditions and satisfaction of employees at the workplace, carried out in regular intervals (four times a year) by the Chamber of Labour among 900 of their members51, especially focused on migrants as a vulnerable (discriminated) group at the workplace, in order to identify specific problems and disadvantages of migrant workers in companies (Zucha/SORA 2003).

### 2.3 Participation in and of immigrant organisations and NGOs

Corresponding to the widespread neglect of immigrants as civic and political subjects in Austrian politics and public discourse, research with a perspective on migrants as active participants in organisations started comparatively late. During the 1990ies some initial studies explored the socio-cultural and political activities of immigrant organisations in the Austrian institutional context. They had a mainly descriptive character, describing the formation as well as the institutional and ideological development of the major organisations from the political and religious spectrum and looking at their institutional and organisational networks and co-operations in Austria, and abroad (see Kroissenbrunner 1996; Reiser 2000). The focus of these studies was to analyze their activities and aims as social, cultural, religious and political organisations in the Austrian context, and to investigate their specific role and function for migrant communities in the Austrian immigration (and integration) context (see Kroissenbrunner 1996, 2003; Bratić 2003).

---

47 24% of the respondents had already participated in elections of works councils, 30% in elections of the Chamber of labour (Jenny 2003, 135).
48 See, however, an article on the history of the initiative “Sesam Öffne Dich”, a working group within one trade union, and written by trade union activists (Grandperret/Nagel 2000).
49 See the SORA analysis of the results: [http://www.gpa-fsg.at/content/akwahl2004/wien_sora.htm](http://www.gpa-fsg.at/content/akwahl2004/wien_sora.htm) (Date of visit: 10.12.2004)
51 Membership in the Chamber of Labour is statutory for the overall employed population.
The recently published first Austrian Report on Migration and Integration (Fassmann/Stacher ed. 2003) provides a summary of the state of research within this newly developed research area (see Perchinig 2003, Bratić 2003, Kroissenbrunner 2003).

2.3.1 Community organisations of migrants from Turkey
The research initially put a strong focus on community organisations of migrants from Turkey, and consequently on homeland-political and Islamic organisations founded since the late 1960ies. Pioneer studies were those from Viehböck (1990) on left-wing Turkish and Kurdish political organisations in Tyrol (in the 1980s) and from Kroissenbrunner (1996) and Reiser (2000) in Vienna. Additionally, several studies were carried out on the development of Islamic religious communities and their organisational infrastructures (mosques, Imams, schooling) in Austria. Later, also ethnic or religious minorities within larger immigrant groups (e.g. Kurds and Alevites among Turks) came into view of such studies (Reiser 1997; 2000; Six-Hohenbalken 2003).

Kroissenbrunner (1996) has drawn several major conclusions in her qualitative study on five prominent Turkish immigrant organisations, covering the left-wing and right-wing political spectrum and Islamic organisations, located in Vienna, but having Austrian or European wide importance as federations:
First, she observed, that the development of Turkish organisations in Austria, or, more precisely, in Vienna has been starkly different to other European countries (such as Germany). There, a significant shift occurred from mainly homeland-oriented party-political organisations towards organisations with a focus on the country of immigration. One major reason she identified for the considerable time lag in building-up effective structures of migrants’ interest-organisation, was that migrant associations were not recognized as political interest organisations by national and municipal governments for a long time, and that no institutionalised mechanisms and bodies of consultation had been established (until then). In her view, structural exclusion thus has favoured the “ethnicisation” of migrant participation and organisational patterns, that is, has led to socio-political participation largely along ethnic and ethnic-religious lines.

With regard to institutional network-building, she found that left-wing organisations had built up much stronger links and co-operations with left and liberal political parties than right-wing, conservative and Islamic organisations, which were unable to establish similar “partnerships“ at political-institutional level. However, internal cooperation and networks between Turkish organisations across ideological, political cleavages were not institutionalised. Nevertheless, she also noticed the tendency that – despite the highly ideological and political orientation of Turkish organisations, homeland-orientation within these associations was becoming weaker. Within the left-wing political associations (as ATIGF and the Austrian-Turkish Friendship association) she recognized a certain tendency towards professionalisation and specialisation (e.g. migrant counselling). Right wing and Islamic organisations, by contrast, aimed at fulfilling comprehensive community functions.

Kroissenbrunner states that different strategies of mobilisation have been adopted by the left-wing Turkish organisations, aiming for network-building with Austrian political parties,

52 On the development with regard to Islam, its institutions and the role of Imams see Strobl 1997 and Heine/Kroissenbrunner 2001
53 Her explorative study was based on interviews with representatives of Turkish organisations as well as written material published by the organisations.
54 The organisations covered were two Turkish muslim organisations (“Milli Görüs, and IKM – Union of Islamic Cultural centres in Austria), a left-wing federation (ATIGF – Federation of workers and Youth from Turkey in Austria), a socialist-kemalist organisation (ATDD – Association of Austrian-Turkish Friendship), and the umbrella organisation of right-wing associations (Federation of Turkish Cultural and Sports-Association in Austria (ADÜTF). Migrant organisations of Kurdish and Alevite migrant groups were not included in her study.
whereas right-wing and Islamistic spectrum of associations rather seemed to promote a more closed “parallel society” by establishing own community infrastructures. In most of the organisations analyzed, the majority of board members still was made up by first generation immigrants. Nevertheless, all of the organisations tended to more and more address their efforts and activities towards second generation youth, but until then with little success (Kroissenbrunner 1996:151).

She concludes that the organisational structures were in a process of change: first of all with respect to the emergence of new elites within these organisations, and secondly, in respect to the integration of the second generation of immigrants.

In her more recent study (Kroissenbrunner 2003) she develops her analysis of Turkish immigrant organisational patterns further, concentrating on the role of Muslim organisation networks of the Turkish community in Austria. The description focuses on the qualitative development of the most important Muslim immigrant networks (so called “mosque associations”) in Austria, mainly on the Turkish organisations – which are the “Islamic Federation” (Milli Görüş) and the Union of Islamic Cultural Centres (IKZ). She embeds her description of these Muslim socio-political networks in a short historical review of the institutionalisation of Islam in Austria, especially the establishment of the “Islamic Faith community” in 1979 and the establishment of ATIB, as the representative umbrella organisation associated to the official Turkish government Board for religious affairs (“Diyanet”). An additional focus was put on the meaning of “Muslim leadership”, associated to the role of Turkish Imams. According to Kroissenbrunner „Muslim Leadership“ comprises persons, which fulfill public functions in the migration context, which are members of organisations communicating with the receiving society, e.g. who are active as teachers in public schools or superiors of mosques (associations), and thus have a religious or/and leading role within the Muslim community. Above all, muslim leadership means the teaching and transmission of Islam to the Muslim Community in a new migration context. With regard to this Muslim elite in Austria, Kroissenbrunner highlights that there are no „radical“ Muslim preachers, that Muslim elite has rather loose contact to political parties and political migrant elites55, thus in general showing a rather de-politisized picture. She found that there is no continous, active political lobbying of the different (leaders of) mosque associations with politicians.

She also points out, that the present number of active Imams in Austria is rather low (about 20 to 25 in Vienna) and that there is considerable fluctuation among them.56 Their working conditions (labour contracts, infrastructure) and German knowledge are often due to short-term sending conditions and insufficient language training rather bad. This also hampers their possibilities to actively participate in the Austrian society but as well to address one of their major target group, Turkish immigrant youth (who have less command of the Turkish language any more).

Another comprehensive study, from a cultural anthropological perspective, has been undertaken by Reiser (2000) in his dissertation on “Identity and interest politics of Turkish migrant associations in Vienna”, where he explores the context of the formation and development of six umbrella organisations of Turkish immigrants57, including those with

---

55 One exception is the former Integration officer of the Islamic Faith Community in Austria, Omar Al Rawi, now member of the city council for the Austrian Socialist Party SPÖ (see below chapter 2.9).
56 This is largely due to Turkish state policies to temporarily post imams to countries of Turkish immigration across Europe, for an average period of three years (See ICMPD 2005).
57 Those included: Avusturya Alevi Birlikleri Federasyonu (AABF) – Federation of Alevite Communities in Austria/ Viyana Alevi Kültür Birligi – Cultural Association of Alevites in Vienna (federations at local and Austrian Level); Federation of Turkish Cultural and Sports-Community in Austria (ADÜTF); Avusturya Türkç İslam Birliği (ATIB) / Turkish-Islamic Union of cultural and social cooperation in Austria; Avusturya Türkç Yeni Rizgariya İsci – Gençlik Federasyonu (ATIGF) / Federation of workers and youth from Turkey in Austria; Eniya Rizgariya
Kurdish and Alevite backgrounds, and one women counselling organisation (“Orient Express”).

The recent conference paper (Sohler 2004) gives an overview of the historical development and structures of the Turkish and Kurdish migrants’ associations in the Austrian, and, in particular the Viennese political and institutional context, with a special focus on their relevance for civic and political participation. Outlining the development of Turkish (umbrella) associations, she analyses their growing importance as immigrant interest organisations during the 1990ies, and thus their significant role for building institutional networks and political alliances. Here she points out the unique patterns and trajectories of Turkish immigrant organisations, characterized by strong politicisation and political cleavages (due to oppositional party-associated organisations), strong transnational networks influencing organisations’ political orientation, and a strong focus on integration issues, leading to enhanced network-building with Austrian mainstream (political) organisations. She finds that the comparably high priority the intercultural and integration agenda is given, especially within the (left) political spectrum, is associated to these organisations’ strong ties with broader social movements (in particular NGOs) as well as political parties. She points to a shift of perspective away from policies in the country of origin and religious-cultural community organisation towards immigrant interest representation and integration policies in Austria within the Turkish umbrella organisations. She observes two major developments during the 1990ies with regard to interest representation: first, the formation of cultural and religious identity political (organisation) strategies within the community of Kurdish and Alevite migrants. Their focus strongly remains on recognition as cultural or religious minorities on an equal basis (addressed to both the Austrian and Turkish authorities). Secondly, the evolving efforts of creating a common interest organisation for the Austrian-Turkish immigrant community: above all such strategies became pronounced by the foundation of the umbrella organisation “Union of Turkish Associations in Austria” (ATB) in 1998, which aimed to form an overarching Turkish immigrant interest organisation vis-a-vis the Austrian authorities and political representatives. These processes reflected, on the one hand, the growing presence of naturalised immigrants, and on the other hand, the changing self-perception (and -consciousness) within the migrant communities as new citizens and a sizeable and important immigrant minority in Austria.

2.3.2 Community organisations of the Former Yugoslavian immigrants

Although immigrants from the Former Yugoslavia form the largest immigrant communities in Austria, their self-organisations largely remained underresearched, apart from a few studies devoted to them (Božić 1998; Bratić 2000; 2003). This corresponds with their public image as a rather “invisible” and apolitical immigrant community until the nineties. In his 1998 study, Božić analyzes associations of migrants of ethnic Croatian origin that were established after the dissolution of Yugoslavia and national independence of Croatia. Besides, he investigates the relationship between Croatian immigrants that came as guest-workers and refugees and the „autochthonous“ ethnic minority population (the Croat minority of Burgenland). He outlines the formation of separate organisations of the Croatian immigrant communities since 1990 in the context of refugee migration and national independence, and

Netewa Kurdistan (ERNK) / National Liberation Front of Kurdistan / Federation of Kurdish Associations in Austria (FEYKOM); Islamic Federation in Vienna (IF) (alias İslam Toplumu Milli Görüş / Islamic Society national perspective (IGMG); Avusturya İslam Kültür Merkezleri Birliği (IKM) / Union of Islamic Cultural Centres in Austria; and the womens counselling organisation „Orient Express – Conselling, education and cultural initiative for women (OE).
points to their efforts of becoming politically recognised as part of the native ethnic minority group of Croats in Austria. In an exploratory article and drawing on several interviews with community activists, Bratić (2000) highlights the community role of Yugoslavian first generation community organisations, comparing it to Turkish self-organisations. He briefly sketches up to then largely unknown history of the Yugoslavian Federation of associations since the 1970ies: His main focus, however, is on the reasons for the mainly apolitical nature of the Yugoslavian migrant community as sports and folklore associations until the 1990s. He argues that Yugoslavian immigrant organisations reflected the structures of home-country institutions and orientation (communist one-party system, prospect of return). In addition, they were strongly influenced by the close but paternalistic alliance with Austrian Trade Union Federation and labour organisations, which tended to support cultural and sports activities, rather than political activities. As he shows, this contrasted with the organisational patterns of Turkish communities, which were highly politicised, reflecting the political cleavages of the home-country, but also, much closer ties to Austrian political organisations.

A more recent article by the same author (Bratić 2003) gives a more comprehensive and updated overview of the formation and development of organisational structures before and after the war in the former Yugoslavia and the resulting break-up of Yugoslavia, when migrant organisations restructured along diverse national, ethnic and political cleavages. Thus, he sketches the separate development of the associations of the Serb, the Bosnian, Croatian and Kosovo-Albanian communities.

### 2.3.3 Other immigrant groups

There is a research tradition with regard to autochthonous minorities, such as the Czechs and Slovaks minorities. Several articles and a recent book publication describe the development of organisations from a historical perspective within the Czech and Slovakian refugee communities that partly built on earlier organisations from within the autochthonous minorities (see Valeš 2001; 2004). Moreover, various exhibitions on the history of immigration to Austria (Eppel 1996; Gürses/Kogoj/Mattl 2004) and a migrant associations monograph contributed to further historiographical work on recent immigrant organisations and their struggles for recognition and participation.

There are no specific case studies available so far on organisations of the rather new and smaller immigrant communities from other non-European countries of origin, except some studies on African migrants (Ebermann 2002) and Indian migrants (Hintermann 1995; 1997) which also include chapters on their organisational activities, especially with respect to community needs and social integration. There are also a few articles on the Chinese community (see Kreissl 1999) and the Filipino community (Reiterer 2003) and their associational life.

Both in terms of size of these communities, but also in terms of patterns of immigration, the “new immigrant minorities” differ considerably from Turkish, Ex-Yugoslavian or Eastern European immigrants that also impacted on their patterns of civic participation. Indian Hindus, for example, tended to organise in informal social networks, mainly for the purpose of religious and social activities. As these immigrants became settled, an increasing number of

---

58 In contrast to other recognized ethnic minorities, which are autochthonous in a more narrow sense, the Czech, Slovak and Hungarian minorities in Vienna date back to immigration during the late Habsburg era (1870-1918), although a large numbers of refugees of the Hungarian crisis (1956) and the Czechoslovakian (1968) added to these.

59 See the website on the exhibition “Gastarbeiterij” [http://www.gastarbajteri.at/](http://www.gastarbajteri.at/).

60 See the monograph of the Yugoslavian (now Serbian) migrant association “Jedinstvo” (Belovuković et.al. 2001).
formal organisations were set up, which better served their particular religious needs and interests (e.g. recognition as faith community, establish and maintain temples), or to maintain transnational relations with international “expatriate” or ethnic communities in the home country (such as the Philippines or Chinese communities), often initiated by home-country government authorities. Within the Chinese communities also economic purposes (“ethnic businesses”) and the education of the second generation strongly influenced formal organisational patterns of country-fellowmen (e.g. Chinese and Taiwanese schools). Exile parties have not been formed as far as recent research indicates. Recently, associations of different Asian communities have also united in a socio-cultural network organisation - the “Asian Community”.

African communities have organised very early since the sixties in official national community organisations (Ghanese, Nigerian), often formed by students. They also engaged in Austrian solidarity movements with African countries. During the 1990ies, related to the increase and growing diversity of immigration from African countries, the organisational spectrum flourished and began to differentiate considerably. Above all, immigrants from African countries founded more social service organisations to support the reception and integration of African migrants and in particular of refugees, but also shifted their focus more on antiracist political mobilisation and network building (among the different migrant community organisations and with Austrian NGOs).

2.3.4 Civic participation of migrants in Christian contexts

Although some of the recent studies indicate the important role of the Catholic Church functioning as network-institution to initiate immigration and to build social support networks among certain immigrant communities – in particular for the Polish, Croat, Hungarian, or the Philippine or Indian migrant communities – there is no particular research on participation in Christian Churches available. Some survey results from 1993 among 408 Polish migrants showed that 82% of the Polish respondents attended events of the Polish church. (Fassmann/Kohlbacher/Reeger 1995). Also the survey „Living in Vienna“ indicated that foreign citizens to a far higher degree participated in religious activities (attending mass or other forms of religious worship).

2.3.5 Mapping structures and activity fields of migrant organisations

So far, only two studies have mapped the organisational landscape of migrants associations in Austria, the first focusing on Vienna (Waldrauch/Sohler 2003; 2004), while the second mapped immigrant organisations in the other provinces of Austria (MIDAS 2004).

The study of Waldrauch and Sohler (2003; 2004) provides a comprehensive overview of the existing immigrants’ associations and organisations, though only for Vienna: It covers all immigrant communities from diverse (national) origin, settled in Austria since the beginning of labour immigration in the 1960s, and all types of social, political, religious, cultural, interest -, youth and women’s organisations. The study explores the quantitative and qualitative dimensions of migrants’ organisation structures (density of organisations related to migrant population, main organisational principles and constituency, main aims, functions and activity fields). It applies a broad range of research methods, including the analysis of data drawn from the Viennese register of associations (statutes of associations), analysis of documents from other public sources, publications and websites of immigrants’ associations, semi-structured interviews with 32 activists of migrants’ organisations and migration experts,
and also a comprehensive survey among the 650 migrant associations in principle included in the survey.

Table 7: Migrant’s organisations according to national origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National origin (background) of members</th>
<th>Absolute numbers</th>
<th>in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe (incl. Turkey)</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thereof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Yugoslavia</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thereof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia+Montenegro</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia + Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Europe</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thereof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia (excl. Turkey)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thereof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple countries</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants with unclear national origin</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In total</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Organisational density

In general, the organisational density of the population with an immigrant background was found to be rather low, compared to the total population. The average ratio is 1:600 (number of migrants’ organisations related to immigrant origin population). An interesting result in this respect is, that relatively new immigrant groups, like African and Asian immigrants, have a higher organisational density than the traditional immigrant groups from Turkey and the former Yugoslavia. The African and Asian immigrant communities have the highest density (1:200 for African migrants; 1:370 for Asian migrants). A rather high density can be found

---

61 The survey questionnaire was sent to 650 associations (by mail and email during June until August 2002). The response rate turned out to be very low (14,4% from a total of 550 questionnaires, which finally were deliverable), and thus the survey results were not representative.

62 Organisational density measured by number of organisations (of a certain immigrant group) related to the (estimated) size of the respective immigrant minority group (of origin). The estimation of the size of each immigrant minority adds up the number of foreign citizens, the number of naturalized persons (from 1961 until 2001) and the (first generation of) children (with Austrian citizenship since birth) of naturalized immigrants (Waldrauch/Sohler 2004).

63 According to an estimate at the beginning of 2002 about 440.000 or 28% of the Viennese population are made up by foreign citizens, naturalized immigrants or their descendants.
among the Turkish immigrant minority (1:700), whereas it is very low among the former. The results can be summarized as follows:

**Number of migrant organisations**
Altogether, about 730 organisations were found and qualified as migrant’s organisations. 554 of them were officially registered associations, 174 were other organisations - either not formally registered or with another legal status than associations (such as religious faith communities, churches, networks, etc.) - , in which migrants constituted a majority of members and chairpersons. About 140 of these were “mixed” organisations, that is organisations in which first and second generation migrants participated along with Austrians with no migrant background.

Table 8: Organisational density according to national origin (background)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National origin (background) of members</th>
<th>Size of immigrant minority</th>
<th>Number of organisations</th>
<th>Density of organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European countries (incl. Turkey)</td>
<td>361,000</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>74,700</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Yugoslavia</td>
<td>164,600</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia + Montenegro</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia + Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>27,200</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Europe</td>
<td>94,950</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>16,450</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>8,350</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia (excl. Turkey)</td>
<td>51,850</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>10,350</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>8,650</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>8,750</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In total</strong></td>
<td><strong>438,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>728</strong></td>
<td><strong>602</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Immigrant minority = citizens of a country + naturalized immigrants from the respective country + their descendants (date of calculation: 2002).

*Density of organisation = “members” of an immigrant minority divided by number of organisations of the respective immigrant minority.


The comparison of different national groups of origin shows that the relatively highest share of organisations was founded by Turkish migrants (110 or 15% of all), whereas migrants from the former Yugoslavia – the largest migrant group in Austria – have formed significantly less organisations (93, 13%). 140 associations (19%) were established by migrants from Asian countries (mainly China, India, Iran and the Philippines), while 82 or 11% were established among the Turkish immigrant minority (1:700), whereas it is very low among the former. The results can be summarized as follows:
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The comparison of different national groups of origin shows that the relatively highest share of organisations was founded by Turkish migrants (110 or 15% of all), whereas migrants from the former Yugoslavia – the largest migrant group in Austria – have formed significantly less organisations (93, 13%). 140 associations (19%) were established by migrants from Asian countries (mainly China, India, Iran and the Philippines), while 82 or 11% were established

---

64 It was distinguished between two categories: migrants’ associations with at least 75% migrants as constituency (members and chairpersons), and so-called “mixed organisations” including also non-migrant Austrians as members (between 25% and 50%).
by African migrants, which to a much higher degree than other organisations comprised a multinational constituency (members and board members). A comparably high number of Polish migrant organisations (36) was found (see Table 7).

On the basis of the register of associations the study found that only a share of about 2.6% of the overall (officially registered) associations in Vienna (in 2001: 21,250 associations) were migrant associations.

Yugoslavian immigrant community (1:1800), and especially among the Serbian community (see Waldrauch/Sohler 2004: 654-656; see Table 8).

According to a comparative calculation, the density of organisation of migrants can be estimated as much lower than among the Viennese population in general (1 association per 73 inhabitants) (see Waldrauch/Sohler 2004: 554-558).

**Dominant organisational principles**

Common national origin and religious affiliation of the members were found to be the dominant criteria for setting up migrants' organisations:

The dominant principle among migrant organisations in general was the common country of origin (for 57% of the organisations). Especially for the Turkish, as well as the Serbian and Polish organisations (79% each) this principle of organisation was the most frequent. Among one third of the African and American organisations regional or continental (common) origin were most frequent.

On the other hand, local origin from the same region or town was only important for a small proportion (8%) of the organisations, though of greater importance among migrants from Bosnia-Herzegovina (69%). The ethnic group affiliation/identification mostly determined the association of Croatian and Bosnian migrants (in two third of their organisations), to a lesser degree also those of immigrants from Turkey (mainly those of Kurdish origin; 17%).

A common religious affiliation was the basis for about one third of all migrant organisations (221). 38% of these religious associations have a Christian background, in the second place ranged organisations with an Islamic background (32%) – at least half of them were Turkish organisations. Especially for the Turkish (38% of organisations) and the Asian community (31% of organisations) this is an important criterion.

A common experience and/or interest as immigrants or foreign nationals in general, as refugees or according to gender, age or socio-economic strata (class, education, professional status) were clearly of secondary importance. Only 3% (22) organisations were women’s organisations and 2% youth organisations, while 6% were based on a certain profession and another 6% on educational status (Waldrauch/Sohler 2004: 656-661).

**Main activities and aims**

In terms of their main activities, the vast majority of organisations can be qualified as cultural/fo lkloristic, religious and sports organisations. Political or interest organisations, in contrast, form only a small proportion. Nevertheless, the study points out that many organisations show a multifunctional activity profile.

An evaluation of the three most important activities of migrants’ organisations showed that practice and maintenance of home-country culture and folklore (37% of all organisations), religion (22%), meeting places/social community and leisure (22%) and sport (15%) constituted the three most frequent activities. In “mixed” organisations such activities clearly were of far less importance.

Almost one third of the organisations had a focus on social integration and offer services to support immigrants (counselling, support, education etc.).

Political activities in a broader sense – including claims-making both related to Austrian and
home country politics, public information on immigrants and ethnic minority issues, or anti-racism and anti-discrimination campaigning – for 14% of the organisations is high on their agenda. Interest representation (either for a certain professional or ethnic group) is an important activity for 10% (see Table 9).

The important role attributed to *ethnic solidarity* on the one hand, and *integration support* on the other hand within migrant organisations is underlined by the analysis of the major purposes as declared in the statutes of associations (see Waldrauch/Sohler 2004: 583ff).

But the quantitative analysis also revealed the diverse organisation patterns and main activities of the different (national) immigrant groups:

To summarize, the organisational patterns of immigrants from the *former Yugoslavia* show a strong focus on homeland cultural (folkloristic) activities and sports, but concentrate less on integration activities and political and interest organisation than migrant organisations in average. In contrast, *Turkish organisations* are much more active concerning religious needs and infrastructures (mainly in the form of Islamic organisations), integration support and political activities. The Turkish/Kurdish community also established the greatest number of network-organisations (9 of the overall 22 umbrella organisations) organising at a national (Austrian) and European level.

Table 9: Activities (among the three most important activities) related to national/ethnic background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>national/ethnic origin of members</th>
<th>practice of homeland-culture/ folklore</th>
<th>practice of religion</th>
<th>sociability/ leisure</th>
<th>sports</th>
<th>Integration, assistance, education</th>
<th>Politics in a broader sense*</th>
<th>Other interest represent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe thereof:</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Yugoslavia thereof</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia/Montenegro</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia (+BiH)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Europe</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple countries</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear (national) background</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in %</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total absolute (728)</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of 279 statutes shows that the most often declared aims of organisations were leisure activities incl. folklore (76%), solidarity among their group of origin incl. interest representation (51%) and cultural events incl. folklore (54%). About 40% of the statutes included aims related to integration support (incl. counselling, aid and care services, integration support such as German-language courses, and other education/training activities). Aims concerning information, awareness raising and mediation between majority and minority also ranked high with 41%.
The study also provides an overview of the evolution of organisations for selected immigrant communities, namely for the Ex-Yugoslavian, Turkish, Polish, Czech and Slovakian, Hungarian, African, Indian, Philippine and Chinese communities as well as for organisations of migrant women and mixed organisations not based on nationality or ethnic origin, most of which are antiracist self-organisations. The analysis provides important insights into the diverse dynamics, trajectories and factors shaping organisational patterns of immigrant associations from about the 1960s up to the present. Three sets of factors were found to be important: (1) migration and settlement patterns, including social and demographic characteristics, and changes of immigrants’ social status over time (social mobility); (2) the political and institutional setting for reception and integration of immigrants in Austria; and (3) inter- or transnational relations and networks maintained to the country of origin or co-ethnics elsewhere. The analysis shows that the interplay of these diverse factors resulted in different patterns of institutional integration and participation within the various communities under study.

The results of the study also suggest that institutional gate-keepers, both from countries of origin and in the Austrian (Viennese) context (such as trade unions, NGOs and faith communities, political parties) played a major role. In particular since the 1990s, the changing institutional framework – due to restrictive immigration and asylum policies on the one hand, and emerging integration policies at municipal level (including funding policies of migrant organisations) on the other, as well as the rise of xenophobia and racism against immigrants, resulted in significant changes in the orientation and activities of migrant organisations, with a shift of activities towards integration services, political campaigning and network-building against racism and discrimination. Finally, also interest representation as new immigrant minorities, either based on the common struggle for equal participation and against discrimination, or with respect to recognition as cultural (ethnic) minorities became more important.

Recently, interim results of the ongoing EQUAL-project “MIDAS – Effective strategies against racism and discrimination in the labour market”\(^{66}\), have been published. The major practical aim of the project is to empower immigrants’ capacities to counter racism and discrimination by way of promoting self-help-capacities and cooperation networks among migrant organisations throughout Austria. As a corollary, the research module accompanying the project maps present migrant associations in Austria. The study found that there were 447 associations that could be classified as migrant associations in the 8 Austrian provinces studied (Vienna was not included in the study). A survey\(^{67}\) conducted among these migrant associations and 127 additional interviews with representatives of associations collected data on the perceived need and interest for network-building among migrant associations as well as their ways to cope with daily discrimination and racism.

The findings published so far reveal that:

- A large proportion of migrants associations found (40%) are located in the western provinces of Austria (Vorarlberg and Tyrol). A relatively high number exists in the

---

\(^{66}\) See [http://www.midasequal.com/de/empowerment/index.html](http://www.midasequal.com/de/empowerment/index.html). (Date of visit: 2004-10-01)

\(^{67}\) It covered questions on address/contact details, activities, membership, and interest for co-operation and networking with other organisations.
provinces Upper Austria, Styria and Lower Austria, whereas only few associations exist in the provinces Salzburg, Burgenland and Carinthia.

- The main activity fields of migrant’s associations researched were cultural, social and educational activities, followed by sports in the fourth place. Religious (123 associations) and political activities (74 associations) were less common.
- The majority of associations have own facilities for associational activities (“Vereinslokal” 58%), but only a minority of organisations are well equipped with computers or websites.
- Two third of the associations do not get any or only small amounts of public subsidies for their work.

The interim analysis of the survey and expert interviews suggests that there is a broad consensus that networking with other migrant organisations and with mainstream Austrian organisations is desirable and necessary. Nevertheless, differences in expectation in respect to co-operation and networking with other associations became obvious (Zentrum für MigrantInnen in Tirol/Projekt MIDAS 2004). Following the research, several regional fora and working groups to promote the networking of migrants associations have been initiated.

2.3.6 Migrant volunteering

As a recently completed comparison of „Migrant and ethnic minority volunteering“ in selected European countries revealed (Grilz-Wolf/Strümpel 2003), the role of migrants in volunteer work is understudied topic in Austria, about which very little is known. There is no statistical information about the general volume and scope of migrants’ volunteering in Austria available. But as other studies (Waldrauch/Sohler 2004; Midas 2004) indicate, the volume of volunteer work - within migrant self-organisations and associations seems to be relatively extensive in comparison to employed and project financed staff.

Based on a survey among organisations active in volunteer work, “good practice” initiatives in promoting or supporting migrant volunteering in Austria were identified (see Grilz-Wolf/Strümpel 2003b: 8-9).

The study emphasized the importance of volunteering of elderly migrants, in view of demographic changes and the very low participation of older migrant volunteers (8%) compared to elderly native Austrians (with 36%). The study also pointed out, that different cultural backgrounds are important factors explaining different approaches towards and practices of volunteering. The study also shows that migrants were more active in informal social and family networks than in formal volunteer organisations - the reverse was true for the Austrian population and that motivations to engage in voluntary work migrants and native born Austrians differed. The study concludes that migrants face more barriers to participate in volunteering, including lack of financial resources and time, or of necessary qualifications or language skills (Grilz-Wolf/Strümpel 2003: 10-11).

68 First of all, this concerned a different role attributed to cultural or political activities in networking (networking as political awareness raising vs. networking limited to cultural and sports activities).
69 The project covered several countries (national reports) on Germany, France, Great Britain, The Netherlands, Denmark and Austria.
70 Those were: a Viennese Caritas Project (Volunteer work); the Foreigners-Integration Council in Linz; Neighbourhood community centres; the Association of and for older migrants; the legal advisory and social support organisation for migrants Zebra and her project “Volunteer group for counselling migrants in deportation arrest”; the Viennese association for promoting social and cultural work (Zeit!Raum).
2.4 Integration research and civic participation of migrants

With “integration” becoming an important policy field at municipal level since the late 1980s and early 1990s, the focus of research on civic participation began to shift from the national level towards the local and community level. Several studies on the integration of immigrants in the provinces, mainly initiated by local authorities, have since been carried out. Some of them also compared different models of cities regarding integration and diversity policies on an international scale (Wolffhardt et al. 2002).

By the late 1990s, also quantitative studies among immigrants were conducted that analyzed different dimensions of civic participation and integration (e.g. activity in associations), and also migrants’ expectations with regard to political participation. In Vienna, the representative survey “Living in Vienna” and the specific data analysis concerning the migrant population, has covered migrants’ integration in different areas (housing, labour market, etc.) and also different aspects of social and political participation.

With regard to other Austrian provinces two studies should be mentioned: the study on integration of immigrants in the province of Upper-Austria (Gunz et al. 1999) and the study on integration of migrants in Styria (Schröttner/Sprung 2003).

2.4.1 Surveys on civic participation of immigrants (Vienna)

The dimension of individual participation of migrants in associations and political organisations was explored in two representative surveys for the Viennese context, the survey “Living in Vienna („Leben in Wien“ - LIW) in 1994/95 (see Hofinger/Waldrauch 1997; Hofinger et al. 1998) and the survey „Expectations of the affected migrant population concerning voting rights of foreign nationals“ (Jenny/SORA 2002).

The survey “Living in Vienna“ (LIW) was carried out in 1994/95 among a sample of approximately 7,000 Austrian and 1,000 foreign citizens. It included several items concerning migration status and on the situation of the foreign immigrant population. The design of the survey and the large sample of immigrants allowed a special analysis of the immigrant data sample with regard to several dimensions of integration (integration and social contacts, experiences of discrimination, labour market integration, perspectives to stay or return, naturalization and family reunion, German language knowledge etc., Hofinger et al. 1998). It also included an analysis of the individual participation in associations and in other sorts of religious, social or political organisations (such as political parties, churches, self-help organisations, etc) – defined as (frequent) participation in events or meetings held by organisations. Since the survey asked for civic participation in general, it didn’t allow for a distinction of non-immigrant and immigrant organisations. However, participation rates of Austrian and foreign citizens could be compared. The survey results show that foreign citizens had on average lower participation rates than Austrian citizens: whereas 32% of all Austrian interviewees said to actively participate in associations, clubs or groups, only 21% of foreign citizens from the former Yugoslavia (Serbia/Montenegro 17%, Croatia 25%, Bosnia-Herzegovina 22%), 20% from Turkey, and 35% from Poland did so. Naturalized immigrants (26%) participated in associational activities to a higher degree than foreign citizens (see Hofinger/Waldrauch 1997 and Hofinger et al. 1998, Sohler/Waldrauch 2003: 151).

---

71 A follow-up survey of LIW has been carried out last year, but there has been no special analysis on the situation of the immigrant population so far.
72 The questions asked for the frequency of active participation in events and meetings of sports-, cultural-, hobby-, self-help organisations and pensioner associations or –groups, as well as of churches, political parties, and other associations and clubs
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Only in cultural associations was the participation rate of foreigners generally higher (8%) than that of Austrian citizens (4%). As shown in the table below, foreigners also participated far less than Austrian citizens in meetings of political parties or clubs (see Table 10).

Table 10: Participation in activities of associations, clubs or groups related to nationality (Survey “Living in Vienna”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austrian since birth</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian naturalized</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Austrian in total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreigners in total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>78.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey „Leben in Wien“; Hofinger et.al. 1998; Table and calculations: Harald Waldrauch

With regard to differences between national migrant groups, Turkish citizens and citizens from Yugoslavia and Bosnia participated less in associational activities, but had higher participation rates in cultural associations. Polish migrants were even more active in associations than Austrians. Concerning religious activities (attending mass or other forms of religious worship) foreign citizens participated to a far higher degree than did Austrians (see Zuser 1998: 56f).

The first survey on migrants political participation (Jenny/SORA 2002, see below) carried out in Vienna also covered questions on participation in other civil society organisations, as well as in trade unions or political parties. The survey didn’t ask for formal membership but for frequent participation in meetings or events of these different kinds of organisations or political parties. The study shows that sports, cultural- and religious associations or groups were the types of organisations in which migrants were most frequently active: of the total 700 interviewees from third countries (foreign citizens and naturalized persons) 17% in each case participated in activities of sports- and cultural associations, 15% in religious associations or groups, 8% in parents associations and 6% in social assistance/care/ and charitable associations. 6% were active in trade unions. Only 1% (2% of naturalized migrants) stated to frequently participate in activities of political parties. 52% of the interviewees did not participate in any kind of organisation (Jenny 2002: 78ff, see Table 11).

Cultural associations (18%) were considered as the most important organisations followed by sports associations (15%) and social assistance/care/ and charitable associations (14%). According to the study social interaction between migrants of diverse ethnic origin and (native) Austrians takes place in sports associations most often, whereas within cultural or religious associations migrants tend to engage with co-ethnics/ co-nationals rather than with Austrians (Jenny 2002: 80). According to the study, the extent of participation of migrants in civic life (measured by participation in associational life) did not have a significant influence on the (willingness to) electoral participation of immigrants (see Jenny/SORA 2002).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities in organisations or groups</th>
<th>Migrants with Austrian citizenship (in %)</th>
<th>Migrants with foreign citizenship (in %)</th>
<th>Total (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports association</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural association</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious association or group</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents association or -initiative</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Union</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (support) association or -initiative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights organisation or –initiative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological organisation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s organisation or -initiative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers association</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development-aid (solidarity) initiative or association</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students association</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth organisation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political association or party</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens’ action committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other association or group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these organisations</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jenny 2002: 78; Table 64, Question: In which organisations or groups do you frequently participate in meetings or events?

**Main fields of social and political engagement in Vienna**

The question what kind of social or political activities already had been done (once), showed that migrants had been most active with regard to work in parents associations at schools (13%), engage for intercultural tolerance (12%), participate in a demonstration (11%), go to political rallies, election campaign events (e.g. 1st of May) (10%) or to become active against discrimination of minorities (9%).

The readiness to get involved in civic activities in the future, was most pronounced with regard to activities related to engage for tolerance between different cultures (48%), - against discrimination/disadvantage of minorities (42%), to work in parents initiatives at schools (31%) and to contact a politician to make him/her aware of problems (26%) and to attend political rallies or election campaigning events (23%) (Jenny 2002: 82-83).

### 2.4.2 Local studies on integration and participation of migrants

The study of Gunz et.al. (1999) examines the social situation and integration of foreigners, the majority of whom come from the former Yugoslavia and Turkey, in Upper-Austria. Among the fields analyzed were the housing sector, the education system and the labour market. The study also analysed different subjective dimensions of settlement and integration, including identification with the country of settlement, experiences of discrimination and wishes for political participation. As part of the study, a standardized survey was conducted among 455 immigrants (of which 63 were naturalized Austrian citizens).

According to the survey immigrants were reluctant to get in contact with Austrian (mainstream) associations and also (but to a lesser degree) social services, they also had less...
contact to Austrians than to their fellow-countrymen. Half of the respondents answered that they didn’t like to go to Austrian associations, because they had little or no information about them, 43% said they were not interested, and one third because they didn’t feel comfortable there (Gunz et.al. 1999: 155, 166). The survey also showed that most migrants had repeatedly experienced rejection and discrimination. According to the survey, one of the key demands migrants wanted to be addressed by the government, was political participation. Thus, 78% of the respondents expressed their wish for the right to vote, 60% for passive voting rights for works councils, while only 18% demanded an advisory council for foreigners (Gunz et.al. 1999, 161ff).

In their study on migrant integration in Styria Schröttner/Sprung (2003) deal with different aspects of institutional integration: intercultural opening of public social services, intercultural competences as part of qualification and training (especially in the social-pedagogical professional education sector), and self-organisation of migrants. The project combined a theoretical research agenda with a practical focus on educational (training) measures (concerning intercultural competences; migrant women’s selforganisation and empowerment). The major focus of the project was on migrants’ selforganisations, and more precisely, the meaning and function of selforganisation, and its role for participation and empowerment. The practical part of the project aimed to strengthen the autonomy, self-consciousness and self-help-potential of migrant women by means of selforganisation. The training curricula and workshops held in the framework of the project intended to qualify migrant women in project planning, professional management of associations, public relations etc., in order to improve their skills and their role as “multipliers”, which could stimulate further self-organised activities.

2.4.2.1 Participation of migrant women

So far there is no systematic research on civic participation of migrant women. It seems that their role as active participants in Austrian society has even been more ignored and underestimated, since they have been far less represented in formal associations or functions (e.g. as chairpersons). However, the recent study by Waldrauch/Sohler explicitly looked on organisations of migrant women: Though their share of the overall number of migrant organisations is very small (only 3% of all migrant organisations in Vienna are women organisations), the study showed that women’s organisations have developed a very specialized activity profile, involving social care and social assistance and advisory services for women and children.

In many respects they took a leading role in developing targeted social services for migrant women, e.g. with regard to health services, education and qualification facilities or organising self-help for victims of violence (in contexts of human trafficking, violence within families, etc.). They also play an increasingly important role as interest organisations for women’s rights and in lobbying against structural discrimination and marginalisation as migrant women.

Erna Appelt’s study (2003) summarizes the existing research on migrant women in Austria and includes a study of living conditions of migrant women in Innsbruck (Tyrol). In her analysis, she specifically looks at the political engagement of women in self-organisations, exemplified by the case of the African Women’s organisation in Vienna, which is very active in awareness-raising and political lobbying against “Female Genital Mutilation” of African women. However, she also points out the (legal) discrimination migrant women are facing in

---

73 51 interviews with migrant women of different national background (13 Former Yugoslavia, 20 Turkey; 13 Philippines; 4 from African countries; 1 Japan)
Austria, when immigrating as dependent family members of the primary (male) permit holder, since their residence permit is made dependent upon their husband’s permit, while divorce or death may easily lead to the cancellation of the permit. In addition, migrant women experience strong discrimination at the labour market and at the workplace, especially, however, African and Turkish women (Appelt 2003: 169; see also Hamid 2002).

2.5 Antiracist and social movement organisations

In Austrian social movement research, which is generally an under-researched field, the role of immigrants only recently became a topic of research. One of the major studies in this field is certainly the study on anti-racist mobilisation emerging in the context of the protest movement against the FPÖ (Austrian Freedom Party) lead anti-immigrant campaigns, in particular after 1993 (with the FPÖ initiated referendum against foreigners74) and also against the parallel move towards restrictive migration policies of the SPÖ-ÖVP coalition government (Görg/Pühretmayer 2000 and 2001; Pühretmayer 2002). This study, which has been conducted within a 6 year long thematic research programme on Xenophobia and Racism75, explored strategies and political potentials of these newly arising anti-racist movement organisations. Based on interviews and focus group discussions with some of the important activists from anti-racist groups and NGOs, several of them from migrant organisations or with immigrant background, the study found that structural (legal) discrimination and social exclusion of immigrants still was a major factor preventing migrants from active political participation and self-representation: Even within the anti-racist NGO movement such patterns of exclusion, related to paternalistic “substitutive” policies (“Stellvertreterpolitik”), could still be observed. Furthermore, several major problems faced by anti-racist organisations, such as the lack of accessible resources (infrastructures), constraints of time and financial resources due to exhaustive project-administration (to ensure funding), the high extent of dependency on public subsidies (which would encourage political “good behaviour”) etc. were identified, which all potentially narrow the organisations’ scope for political action. In addition, the authors observe that the anti-racist movement was strongly split, partly also due to competition for funding, and that they hardly achieved access to or could exert influence on mainstream political structures and institutions. Nevertheless, it was concluded that a significant reorientation within migrant communities towards an Austrian political agenda had occurred, while several efforts to bundle activities and build networks and alliances among organisations were on the way. Activists themselves expected changes towards more active political participation of migrants in the future from the growing “second generation” of migrants born in Austria and the increased self-consciousness among migrant activists.

Anti-racist political mobilisation among the African communities in resistance to several racist police assaults against African migrants, in particular after the death of an African refugee during his deportation in 1999 has been highlighted in other articles, mainly by activists themselves (Johnston-Arthur/Görg 2000; AutorInnenkollektiv 2000). A few publications, mainly from activists themselves, have described and discussed the changing patterns of political selforganisation of immigrants in the late 1990ies, by analysing them from a social movement perspective (see especially: Bratić 2002, 2001). They basically argue that there has been a major shift in strategies and patterns of participation – away from cultural and lobbyist strategies towards offensive strategies of participation and political self-representation, driven by new anti-racist self-organisations: Bratić outlines that these political migrant self-organisations mainly developed as a resistance against “structural racism” and

74 See FN 1
exclusion in the Austrian society. He sees a major shift away from so-called “defensive” types of migrant organisations towards forms of organisation directed at participation. In the latter he sees an emancipation of a younger generation of migrant activists, who are increasingly turning away from the traditional patterns of first generation migrant organisations, which he characterizes as rather closed “ethnic” organised groups. In addition, first generation migrant organisations were mainly dominated by men, were limited to the own ethnic group and concentrated on the maintenance of cultural identity, language, religion etc. within their own group. He sees “participatory” forms of organisation represented by new multi-ethnic (or non-ethnic) organisations such as ANAR (Austrian Network against Racism), Die Bunten (“The colourful”), BDFA ( Colourful democracy for all), whose trends of development and initiatives are outlined in the article. Bratić argues that these new organisations and initiatives as radically diverge from “established” immigrant organisational patterns, in that they are highly politicised, not organized on basis of ethnicity or national origin and thus are ethnically mixed, follow non-hierarchical types of network-organisations (Bratić 2001: 531ff).

2.6 Participation in advisory boards or foreigners/integration-councils

In the mid-90s when the establishment of foreigners advisory councils was discussed more widely in some Austrian cities, a few studies have been commissioned by local authorities in order to either implement such advisory bodies for immigrants (such as in Salzburg: see Sensenig 1994 and 1996) or to evaluate different models of practice and experiences from other European countries with foreigners advisory councils and give policy recommendations for introducing participatory bodies (for Vienna see: Pelinka et.al. 1997). Most studies have mixed research on the attitudes of relevant political actors including migrant representatives, and policy-advice and implementation strategies with a focus to actively engage migrant communities and “elites” in the discussion and implementation process, as for example was the case in Salzburg. All of these studies emphasized that advisory bodies could not substitute or be an initial step for democratic voting rights. But with several municipalities, among them Salzburg and Vienna, rejecting the introduction of foreigners advisory councils, no further research followed.

Up to now, there are only some explorative studies which summarize the first experiences with the implementation of such advisory councils (Schröttner/Sprung 2003 for Styria; Afro-Asiatisches Institut et.al. 2002 for Graz/Styria), but none of these studies has further explored the impact of such immigrant consultative bodies in the political process or the strategies adopted by immigrants.

The already mentioned study of Schröttner/Sprung (2003) has explored the development of „foreigner’s advisory councils“ in two Styrian towns (Knittelfeld and Leoben) and the situation in Kapfenberg where the establishment of a foreigners advisory council failed. In interviews with active members and representatives of the local administration they found, that only few immigrants have participated in the initial process of building-up such advisory councils. Several factors have hampered the process in the respective local contexts: first, there were no established (political) migrant community organisations, and thus often no qualified foreign immigrants, which could carry out such political functions easily. Often just a few committed persons were active, which neither represented the local migrant population in terms of national origin nor in terms of different immigrant interest groups. In the view of members who were interviewed for the study, the lack of infrastructural resources (personnel, financial subsidies), as well as the lack of th networks and cooperation between migrant
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76 Eventually, political support from the city was not forthcoming and no advisory council could be established in Salzburg, as well as in some other cities where similar initiatives were started.

77 The report includes a chapter on political participation, which gives a brief description of election outcomes and major activities of the Foreigners advisory council in Graz (established 1995).
organisations and between migrant organisations and other institutions has hampered regular, continuous work of the advisory councils. The study concluded that according to the experiences of active representatives further support of self-organisations, provision of infrastructure, qualification and institutional participation (in working groups etc.) would be needed to make advisory councils more effective (Schröttner/Sprung 2003: 178ff).

A recent article on the legal conditions of immigrant participation outlines that the voting participation in elections of those Foreigner’s advisory councils has been considerably low among the eligible foreign voting population. As the example of the latest elections of the Foreigner’s advisory Council in Graz (Styria) in January 2003 has shown, only 14% of the eligible 17.874 Third country citizens participated in these elections, albeit this is still much higher than during the first election in 1995, when only 3% participated. In general, thus, the mandate of advisory councils is limited and its real influence thus very much depends on the ability of “councillors” to make their concerns heard and the openness of municipal councils and administrations, to listen to the concerns raised by immigrant representatives. A formal definition of the role and rights of advisory councils in city policy making and in regard to the implementation of policies certainly helps to make advisory councils more meaningful, both as an instrument of participation and as a tool for making policies more responsive to problems experienced by immigrants. However, advisory councils for third country nationals have also been criticized on principled grounds, because by establishing separate structures for third country nationals, they tend to reinforce the legal exclusion of third country nationals, while “separating” concerns of third country nationals from those of other immigrants, and particularly naturalized immigrants from the same communities (Grasl 2002: 36).

2.7 Political participation

Since third country nationals are largely excluded from formal channels of political participation and as there is a considerably time lag between immigration and naturalization (see part I), political participation of immigrants (naturalized and foreign citizens), and in particular political preferences and voting behaviour of immigrants has been hardly studied by mainstream empirical political research. The dominant perspective of research on political behaviour has been and largely still is to analyze the attitudes of Austrian (born) citizens towards equal participation of foreigners and immigrants. Recent surveys on attitudes of the Austrian population with regard to “migration and xenophobia” (1998 and 2001) showed that between 42% (in 1998) and 35% (in 2001) of the respondents agreed to the statement that any political activity of the foreign migrant population should be prohibited (Lebhart 2004: 101; IOM 2004: 50).

Apart from one single study in Vienna (SORA 2002), there have been no special surveys among (naturalized) immigrants, which would investigate political interests and attitudes or voting preferences of the immigrant population. Nevertheless, the perspective has shifted markedly, as the size of the electorate with an immigrant background is expanding rapidly with the bulk of the recently naturalized population consisting of former “guest-workers” and their descendants, conflict refugees from
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78 The members of conservative Islamic organisations (List of Islamic Cultural Centres - IKM) gained most of the votes (23,6% of 2.554 votes) and (3 of 9) mandates within the local “Foreigners Councils”. In the second place the Kurdish List for Democracy obtained 2 mandates. See [http://www.graz.at/politik/ab-neu-layout-neu/start.htm](http://www.graz.at/politik/ab-neu-layout-neu/start.htm) (date of visit: 2004-10-01)

79 The waiting periods for naturalization, for example, do not refer to actual length of stay in the country, but to the length of time the applicant has a long term residence permit. Many third country nationals thus may become eligible for naturalization only considerably later than the standard waiting period of 10 years.
the former Yugoslavia who entered Austria in the early 1990s, and, albeit to a much lesser extent, former citizens of Central Eastern European states. At the same time, political parties are increasingly becoming aware of naturalized immigrants as potential voters. Virtually all parties (including the Freedom Party) are now recruiting candidates of immigrant background, although many immigrant candidates do not have a realistic chance of being elected. The emergence of immigrant politicians has become most visible during the 2001 municipal elections in Vienna, during which immigrant candidates were actively promoted and specific campaigning strategies were designed targeting immigrant communities.

2.7.1 Surveys on political interest and electoral participation

One of the pioneer studies in this respect is the recent study on immigrant political participation of the social research institute SORA (in cooperation with IFES) by Jenny (2002), although it is limited to the city of Vienna. The survey on “Expectations of the affected migrant population concerning voting rights of foreign nationals” has been commissioned by the Viennese Integration Fund in view of the planned, but eventually abortive limited introduction of voting rights for third country nationals at district level in Vienna. The study explored political interests of the migrant population concerning politics in Austria and the country of origin, participation in political elections in Austria, and also expectations and willingness to vote concerning the politically debated municipal voting rights (Jenny/SORA 2002; 2003; Jenny/Zucha/Hofinger 2003).

The survey, conducted during March and April 2002, covered a sample of 698 immigrants from third countries living in Vienna, originating from the largest (national) immigrant populations in Austria. One third of the interviewees were migrants from the Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), 17% from Turkey, 11% from Bosnia-Herzegovina, 9% from Croatia, and 8% from Poland. The sample included foreign citizens (426 persons with foreign nationality) as well as naturalized immigrants (272 persons). The composition of the sample with respect to national origin was highly representative of the Viennese migrant population from third countries.

The questionnaire focused on topics related to political interest, trust in political institutions, media consumption and willingness of political participation in Austria.

The degree of political interest varied significantly between interest in Austrian politics and in home country politics:

More migrants were interested in Austrian politics than in the politics of their country of origin. Almost one third (27%) of the migrants interviewed showed a high interest in Austrian politics, 32% expressed some interest, 22% only a little and 19% none at all. Thus, just under 60% declared to have some interest in political events in Austria.

By contrast, much fewer interviewees were interested in politics of the country of origin: 36% declared to be more interested in Austrian politics than in politics of their home country, 12% expressed more interest in their home country’s politics. 52% had equal preferences for both (Jenny 2003: 134). The interest in Austrian politics was higher among naturalized immigrants and Austrian born second generation immigrants.

Compared to similar surveys among the (non-immigrant) Austrian population, the immigrants interviewed expressed less interest in politics than Austrian citizens. Nevertheless, these survey results do not allow for generalisations concerning differences in political interest between migrant and non-migrant populations, as the sample did not include Austrians with no immigrant background.

Higher levels of education and better competences of German language correlated with greater political interest.

With regard to trust in political institutions migrants expressed a very high level of satisfaction with “democracy in Austria” in general (36% very and 54% rather satisfied).
Most of all migrants expressed trust in the courts, the Viennese municipality and mayor, as well as the labour unions. Compared to Austrian citizens migrants show a higher trust in labour unions (second place after juridical courts), and far less trust in the Austrian media (fifth place) and government (last place). But both migrants and non-immigrant Austrians expressed low trust in political parties (Jenny 2003: 132-133).

Electoral participation and willingness to participate in elections

More than half of the migrants interviewed in the study have not participated in elections in their home country or in any other country before. Concerning the participation in Austrian elections the participation rate of naturalized interviewees in the last municipal election (of 2001) was 48%, and thus significantly lower than the general turnout of almost 67%. As the authors conclude in a summary article „there is evidence of a discrepancy in participation rates between migrants and more long-term Viennese residents” (Jenny/Zucha/Hofinger 2003: 11). The survey results also indicated somewhat lower participation rates of immigrants from the former Yugoslavia (42%) compared to Turkish migrants (48%).

Table 12 Electoral participation of naturalized immigrants in the Viennese municipal elections 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>48 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>men</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants from Serbia and Montenegro</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants from Turkey</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants from other countries</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jenny 2002: 62, Table 53; based on the sample of respondents with Austrian citizenship (n=272)

As one reason for this lower participation rates, the study identified an information deficit among naturalized migrants with regard to their rights to vote. 8% of the naturalized migrants didn’t know that their acquisition of Austrian nationality entitles them to vote in municipal elections. 10% believed that they didn’t have the right to vote. As a result of insufficient or false information, almost one naturalised person in five did not exercise his or her right to vote.

The willingness of foreign citizens to vote in municipal or district elections was affirmed by some 70%. 43% stated that they definitely intended to participate in municipal elections, while 27% only declared that they would “probably” vote. The willingness to vote was higher among well educated interviewees than among those with a lower level of education. With regard to country of origin, the Polish immigrants expressed the highest willingness to participate, whereas migrants from Turkey and the Former Yugoslavia didn’t differ with respect to this question.

The study found that the willingness to electoral participation depended on several factors: In general, foreign citizens showed to be more likely to turn out to vote, if they were highly satisfied with life in Austria, have a good command of German, especially in reading and writing; if they were convinced that one can advance one’s own concerns and interests by being politically active; and if they had previously participated in elections in their country of origin or in another country. To a lesser extent, participation was also positively influenced if there were candidates from one’s own ethnic group.

But not all these factors were significant to the same extent for different migrant groups: For example, among immigrants from Turkey and the Former Yugoslavia there was no significant effect of the previous experience of having voted in the country of origin or in another country on the level of participation.
Among migrants from the former Yugoslavia, the willingness to vote differed in relation to date of immigration. Migrants having immigrated earlier, tended to be less inclined to vote than migrants with a short duration of stay. Migrants considered the right to vote as the most important political instrument for realising their own wishes and interests. Those with foreign nationality primarily hoped that the right to vote would bring about improvements in areas such as the labour market and working conditions, housing situation and social security, where they were most likely to be subject to discrimination and disadvantages. The study did not evaluate the party preference of the respondents: But in summary article the author expects, that probably the Social Democratic Party (SPÖ) would be in a favourite position to mobilize most of the new immigrant vote, followed by the Green party (Jenny 2003: 139).

2.7.2 Refugees/ asylum seekers and political participation

Patterns of political participation and interest of refugees and asylum-seekers, have so far received almost no attention:

A survey of Caritas (2002) in Styria among 104 Geneva convention refugees about their political interest and participation found that about 30% were interested exclusively in Austrian politics and a further 37% in both Austrian as well as home country politics. Only 19 of the refugees interviewed were active members of associations or organisations and none of them was member of a political party. The political parties who were considered as representing interests of refugees the most, were the Socialist party and the Green party. The Foreigners Council in Graz was almost not known and utilized as an instrument for political participation by these refugees. The rather low degree of active participation of refugees in political life was mainly explained as a result from the rather short period of stay of most of these refugees in Austria, and by their experiences with very different political systems in their countries of origin (Caritas 2002: 77-80).

Recently a project on „Strengthening Refugee participation in European Asylum policies and Programmes (SHARE)“ has been carried out from 2002 to 2003 by the Austrian refugee network NGO „Asylkoordination“ under the lead of ECRE (European Council on Refugees and Exiles) and funded by the European Refugee Fund. It had the general aim of capacity building among refugees and members of refugee community organisations with a view to enhance their participation in the development and implementation of European asylum policies. The rationale of the project was to enable refugees by way of training to take a more active role in asylum policy debates at a political and practical level refugees . The project intended to involve more refugee-led organisations within the refugee interest organisation ECRE at EU-level. Networking on national and international level among involved refugee-community organisations was initiated by this project. In the project, several leaders from refugee community organisations (such as from Afghanistan and Iran) participated as “multipliers” and contact persons to their respective communities. In several trainings and meetings the members of refugee community organisations were trained on legal and policy making structures at national (Austrian) and European level concerning asylum. They were also provided with basic knowledge on possible funding sources and partnership building and networking with other Refugee community organisations at national and EU level, and enhance possibilities and access for lobbying activities at EU policy level.

---

80 Besides Austria ECRE member organisations in Belgium, Greece, Spain and UK participated in this project-partnership.
2.7.3 Immigrant politicians: political parties

The role of immigrants as politicians in different policy domains and different levels of governance (European, national, municipal, local) has not been explored so far in Austria. Due to the fact that only a few (naturalized) immigrants were able to achieve political functions within political parties and other public or social partnership institutions, and those who did above all in lower ranks. The institutional closure of the social partnership institutions to immigrants reveals their important role as gate-keepers for careers in the political sphere. However, a recent study on immigrant politicians showed, that participation in migrants’ community organisations was also important in promoting political participation and integration in political parties, predominantly in left-wing political parties.

Up to date, there is only one study that examines the active involvement of citizens of immigrant origin in political parties - as candidates and politicians - at the municipal level of Vienna. In her master thesis Grasl (2002) examined the chances and barriers of immigrants’ political participation in a case study of “ethnic” origin candidates and representatives of political parties in the Viennese district and city council, as well as representatives in labour or economic (employer) interest organisations. Grasl based her research on 13 biographical interviews with naturalized politicians of immigrant origin, both of the first and second immigrant generation. The main focus of the interviews was on their political socialisation and motivation for political involvement, the conditions (barriers and opportunities) they faced within the Austrian political system, their specific role as intermediaries between their parties and ethnic communities, and their position within mainstream political parties. The study also explores the political debate, programmatic and strategies of the political parties concerning political participation of immigrants, and analyses the institutional setting, which has hindered or recently supported active immigrant participation in the political domain.

The interviews with immigrant politicians point to several factors contributing to their socialisation into political parties and eventual emergence as candidates:

The study suggests that a high level of education is highly favourable to reach a political position in Austria. Most of the interviewed politicians have a high education level (7 with an academic degree or a post-graduate diploma) and most immigrated to Austria either as children or young adults. Although they had diverse social backgrounds - 7 from middle-class background, 5 from working class background -, none of them was a typical labour migrant, and those among them who were children of first generation migrant workers (“Gastarbeiter”) had attained higher education levels and occupational positions than their parents. Their language competence and higher education was favourable for participating in political life. For many of them experiences of discrimination in Austria and the increasing experience of xenophobia since 1989 have been an important motivation to engage in politics. More than half of the interviewed activists regarded a minority-friendly policy and one third the principle of “equal opportunity” as the main motive to become engaged in a political party. Most of them consider their political candidacy as a signal to express that migrants want to participate in public life and in order to become “visible” as migrants. Most of them see themselves in a role of intermediaries between members of their own immigrant community and majority population. In addition, candidates also want to be role-model for other immigrants to become active.

Another commonality among these new immigrant politicians has been their former activity in associations or self-organisations, youth organisations, or interest organisations like students organisations, unions and labour organisations, in Austria as well as in their home country. In this respect, civic activities were another important factor for the formation of social and political capital of immigrants, which enabled them to participate in the political realm. Especially those who act as intermediaries between their communities and Austrian majority – such as intellectuals, activists in self-organisations, labour union activists, migrants
working in counselling organisations etc., were most likely to succeed in getting access to political functions.

Grasl states that despite an increasing participation of migrants in political functions, their integration at the political elite level remains still marginal - 4% of the members of the Viennese city parliament, and not at all reflects the actual proportion of the immigrant population in Vienna (16.4% foreign citizens and an estimated 28% with an immigrant background). According to Grasl elite-formation among minority members from immigrant communities has been hindered by institutional mechanisms of exclusion, such as disfranchisement as foreign nationals, from employment and careers in the civil service, from representation within unions/interest organisations, which both constitute important institutional spheres for recruitment and careers in party political functions. On the other hand, also their social disadvantaged status at the lower end of the socio-economic and educational strata has hampered individual opportunities for active political participation (with regard to language competence, education, political networks, etc.). The author concludes that an emancipation process away from the traditionally dominant paternalistic model of integration and participation has been initiated, pushed forward by these new immigrant politicians. Above all, the Green Party and the Austrian Social Democratic party have been open to immigrant candidates and promoted further political participation of the immigrant population or addressed these voters in election campaigns. The latest Viennese elections in 2001 have demonstrated the high potential of immigrant candidates to mobilise the so called “ethnic vote” within their respective immigrant minority communities. Ethnic minority candidates from the first and second generation were very

---

81 According to estimates of the population with an immigrant background, which add the Austrian born and naturalised immigrants since 1961 to the foreign population, about 28% of the Viennese population have an immigrant background. The proportion of foreign born is slightly lower, namely 23.6%. The category foreign born, however, is imprecise as an indicator of immigrant background since Austrian nationals born abroad are also included. Also while Austrian born children of parents with a foreign nationality are included in statistics (since they acquire their parents’ citizenship at birth following ius sanguinis rules), Austrian born children of naturalized immigrants are not covered by any existing statistics.
successful in obtaining preference votes (“Vorzugsstimmen’’); they made up one fourth of the total 36 candidates which won more than 100 preference votes (Grasl 2003: 144).

Table 14: Number of migrants represented in the Viennese district councils (elections 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>candidates with immigrant background</th>
<th>Elected district councillors with immigrant background (all councillors) (April 2002)</th>
<th>In % (of councillors of each party)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPÖ (Social Democratic Party)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11 (of 496)</td>
<td>2,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÖVP (Austrian Popular party)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (of 215)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPÖ* (Freedom Party)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (of 206)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grüne (Green Party)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17 (of 166)</td>
<td>10,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIF (Liberal Forum)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (of 25)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>30 (of 1108)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grasl 2002: 89-91; Grasl 2003; * = no information available

No studies have been carried out so far on the role of immigrants as politicians and representatives in municipal councils of other Austrian provinces. Similarly, with the exception of one article written by trade union activists on the history of the initiative “Sesam Öffne Dich”, a working group on immigrant participation in organized within one trade union (Grandperret/ Nagel 2000), migrant involvement in trade unions, the Chamber of Labour and the Chamber of Commerce, has so far not been studied at all.

2.7.4 Transnational politics and modes of citizenship

The perspective on transnational activities and relations of migrant networks in shaping participation patterns of immigrants in the Austrian society must be regarded a “blind spot” in social research. Although studies on migrant community organisations partly explored transnational practices as well as homeland governments’ and homeland organisations’ influences on organisational patterns, only recently more systematic and theoretically guided approaches were applied, mainly from a social and cultural anthropology perspective. Ethnographic research methods and approaches, especially those of “transnationalism” and “globalism” research and (migration) network analysis, were applied to explore immigrant’s political activities (see Six-Hohenbalken 2003 on the Kurdish diaspora communities and transnationalism; Strasser 2003 on “translocal” political strategies of immigrant activists). In her habilitation Sabine Strasser (2003) explored, how new “translocal” strategies of political participation of immigrants develop, based on three biographical case studies of politically active immigrants in Vienna. Her research focus was on the influence of migration and integration politics “from below” on the national self-identity/image, by looking at the political forms of participation, their aims and strategies to attract attention within the realm of NGOs and political networks. The case studies concentrated on migrant activists with Turkish immigrant background, analyzing transnational relations and practices within different political networks. The networks and activists chosen came from feminist and antiracist political NGOs. In contrast to other studies which analyze political participation and

---

82 For a theoretical article see Bauböck 2003.
83 In her study Strasser combined a theoretical network-analysis approach of transnational studies research (Hannerz) with biographical analysis.
claims-making of immigrants as principally shaped by the institutional setting of the receiving society, personal biographical experiences and positioning within different local and translocal networks as well as their interaction were the focus of Strasser’s study. In particular, she focuses on the question, if and how processes of “belonging” at the local level combine with strategies and contexts of countries of origin, and how these processes interfere with political debates on national identity, racism or islamophobia, particularly after the formation of the centre-right coalition government between the Austrian People’s Party (ÖVP) and the FPÖ in 2000 and in the aftermath of 9/11. Methodologically, Strasser relied on ethnographic fieldwork methods (interviews with persons involved in the different personal networks of the activists and extensive participatory observation of their activities) to explore three different person-centred networks84, comprising family, friends, political alliances, and working relations. She analyzes cultural patterns in these networks, the processes of boundary making and opening towards other persons and groups, and the scope and potential of such networks. Finally, she compares the different patterns of the personal networks with each other.

Another comparative project funded by DG Research on “Migrants, Minorities, Belonging and Citizenship. Glocalisation and participation dilemmas in the European Union and Small States” (carried out in 2003 and 2004)85 compares the changing meaning of citizenship and belonging in the context of “glocal” and transnational spaces. It aimed to explore the changing notions of citizenship and modes of belonging within the different legal and institutional citizenship regimes, but also for different groups86. In order to explore such modes of belonging field work (by interviews and participatory observation) has been conducted in places, which exemplarily represent such “glocal” arenas of interaction. For the Austrian case study such field work was undertaken in one particular subcultural, and intercultural centre and meeting place in Vienna – the WUK (Viennese working and cultural centre) - , where different cultural and grass roots organisations, among them a lot of immigrant organisations are active. Due to the rather limited scope of persons interviewed87 and their understanding of citizenship and belonging and the particularity of (only one) research-site, the results of the empirical part do not allow for generalisations or comparisons between different migrant (and non-migrant) groups. One conclusion drawn by the authors was that research concepts and methods need to be refined to capture the “fluent” modes of belonging (Bauböck ed. /Fischer et.al. 2004: 97ff).

2.8 Civic participation in general (with particular emphasis on migrants)

Apart from the various studies on immigrant civic participation summarized above, the bulk of mainstream studies on civic or political participation do not include im/migrants in their sample or as a particular object of analysis.

For example a survey on civic participation of Austrians in different kinds of civil society and political organisations, as well as social movement organisations (Ulram 2000) did not include migrant organisations as a distinct category or immigrants as interviewees. It showed the traditionally very high density of organisation (membership in organisations) among the

---

84 The three personal networks included: a woman active in a migrant organisation for women and an antiracist network (Tschuschenpower); a women active in a Muslim initiative (Initiative of Muslim Austrians); and a man with Kurdish-alevitic background active as local (district) counsellor in the Green party;
85 Coordinated by the University of Bergen, the project covered six small countries (case studies) – besides Austria, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Hungary and Norway.
86 i.e. majority population, second and third country nationals, historical native minorities, extra European citizens of Member and Associated states and persons who define themselves as not belonging to any group, see Bauböck et.al. 2004, Editors foreword ii.
87 Seven persons attending the WUK were interviewed (three with an Austrian native background, four with a migrant background).
Austrian population in general, which at least provides for approximate comparison with results from studies on immigrant patterns of participation.

Research on volunteer work and the NPO sector has increasingly gained in importance in recent years - mainly within a research programme established at the Department of Social policy of the Viennese University of Economics (Badelt/Hollerweger 2001; see Annex) – but did not cover the aspect of migrant voluntary work. Based on a survey the study found that about 51% of the respondents (above the age of 15) were active as volunteers during the last 12 months. Informal community support (neighbourhood help) was one of the most important activities in which Austrian volunteers were involved. Whereas the total volume of volunteer work is regressive, in particular with regard to informal community support, the volume of volunteer work in formal organisations has slightly increased, above all in religious organisations (Badelt/Hollerweger 2001: 7-8)

2.9 Immigrants active in public life

So far, there are no representatives with an immigrant background in the Austrian national parliament. Similarly, very few politicians of immigrant origin (from non-EU countries) achieved political positions in the municipal parliaments and only very recently. Mostly their tasks in the public sphere is yet limited to migration-, integration and minority-related policy themes or to act as communicators to immigrant communities (and voters). Concerning immigrants active in associations and NGOs there are numerous representatives and activists of immigrant organisations, NGOs and immigrant advisory councils which have gained certain importance, but normally their publicity is restricted to the local level or certain social communities or networks, thus it seems impossible to pick out any of these persons as examples for widely known public figures.

Although immigrants with EU citizenship are not in the focus of this report, it is a politician with an EU immigrant background (Greece) which can be considered as one of the most successful and prominent immigrant politicians. In addition, her inclusion also seems justified against the background of Austria’s late accession to the EU (1995) and the fact that she immigrated to Austria well before 1995.

Maria Vassilakou

She was born in Greece/Athens 1969, and came to Austria/Vienna as a student 19 years ago. As a student she became active in students interest politics and later became general secretary of the Austrian Student interest Representation (Österreichische Hochschülerschaft). When she stood for election as a student representative in the statutory student representative body in 1995, however, she was rejected as a candidate by the Ministry of Science, since only Austrian citizens had the passive vote then (the passive vote later had to be extended to all citizens of the European Economic Area). Later she was active in the Viennese Green party and was elected as a representative (of the Green party) in the Viennese municipal council. 2001 she took office as city councillor (also responsible for integration, human rights/minority, anti-discrimination issues) of the Viennese municipal government. In 2004 she became Chairperson of the Viennese Green party and was nominated as top candidate to run in the next Viennese elections. In response, she resigned from her office as city councillor to concentrate on her party function.

http://www.vassilakou.at/ (Date of visit: 2004-11-11; For a political statement of Maria Vassilakou on migrant political participation and her own experiences as a migrant politician, see: Wiener Hefte 1/2003).
Alev Korun
She was born in Turkey/Ankara and raised in Istanbul. She joined the Green party and is now vice-chair (Landessprecherin) of the Viennese Green Party and district councillor. She works as a Parliamentary Advisor on Minority, Migration and Human Rights Issues for representatives of the national parliament and in the parliamentary committees on human rights and home/interior affairs. In her political function she acts also as contact person for NGOs and initiatives working in the area of refugee-, migrants-, antiracism and minorities. She ran for office for the Austrian Green Party in the national elections 2002.
See http://www.gruene.at/referentinnen/korun.php (Date of visit: 2004-11-11)
(For a political statement see: Wiener Hefte 1/2003)

Omar Al-Rawi
Another important example of a successful immigrant politician is the social democratic politician Omar Al-Rawi. He is an immigrant from Irak, born 1961 in Bagdad, who emigrated to Austria in 1978, in 1988 he became Austrian citizen. As a student he became politically active in the Austrian students interest representation (ÖH). After his university diploma he worked as an engineer in the construction industry and became active as works councillor and chairman of the works council in his firm. In 1999 he became authorised representative for matters of integration of the Islamic Faith Community in Austria, the officially recognized representative body of the Muslim community. He also was the co-founder of a Muslim network-organisation “Initiative of Muslim Austrians”, founded to counter Islamophobia and to raise awareness and understanding for the Muslim population in Austria. He became an active speaker for the Muslim community in the media. In the Viennese municipal elections in 2001 he was one of the most successful candidates (winning 2558 preference votes, which was the third best result). In July 2002 he took office as representative in the city parliament for the Social Democratic Party (SPÖ).

Anas Shakfeh
He is the most prominent and highest official representative of the Muslim community in Austria. He was born in 1943 in Syria, and lives in Austria since 1965, where he studied Medicine and Arab Language, Literature, and Culture (“Arabistik”). In addition, he was also trained as an interpreter. In 2000 he took office as the President of the Islamic Faith Community in Austria (Islamische Glaubensgemeinschaft in Österreich). At the Islamic Faith Community in Austria, is he is also the head of the High Council, the executive organ of the Islamic Faith community. In addition to his religious duties, he also acts as supervisor for Islamic Faith education in the public school system for the Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture.
See "Der Standard" 10.02.2004; and the website of the Islamic Faith Community in Austria: http://www.derislam.at
3 Part III: Expert Assessment

3.1 Main fields of civic activities

What are the main fields of civic activities that immigrants engage in (e.g. religious associations, parent associations, political parties, etc.)?

Up to now, the best researched dimension of civic participation is certainly the sphere of migrants’ organisations: however, to a large extent, knowledge is limited to Vienna, where most of the Federations of migrant associations and NGOs working to support immigrants are located. Nevertheless, the conclusions of the existing research concerning the main fields of activities in migrant organisations can be qualified as more or less secure knowledge (a).

From several studies we know, that migrants engage most frequently in cultural, sports and religious activities of associations. A similar picture emerges from the few studies of migrant associations in the other provinces of Austria, although there are less organisations, which in turn, however is related to the settlement patterns of the migrant population. A trend towards a substantial increase of activities of migrant associations that can broadly be classified as provision of integration support for immigrants (i.e. legal advice/social counselling services, refugee assistance and health services, German language courses, education and labour market integration etc.) can be observed for the 1990s (Waldrach/Sohler 2004). This has certainly been an effect of emerging municipal integration policies and related funding priorities for migrant associations.

A few surveys on individual participation and interest of immigrants in social and political activities (also limited to the Viennese context) show a comparably high degree of migrant participation in activities of parents associations at school, engagement for intercultural tolerance and against discrimination of minorities and participation in political demonstrations or rallies (Jenny 2002).

A few surveys on individual participation and interest of immigrants in social and political activities (also limited to the Viennese context) show a comparably high degree of migrant participation in activities of parents associations at school, engagement for intercultural tolerance and against discrimination of minorities and participation in political demonstrations or rallies (Jenny 2002).

Up to now, there is not much secure knowledge from research on the other fields of civic and political participation of migrants (such as volunteering or voting participation). But some findings on the participation in three major fields can be summarized:

1) Immigrants’ interest representation: The formation of interest organisations and consultative bodies for immigrants/foreign citizens has only been a very recent phenomenon compared to other European countries. Migrant organisations voicing migrants’ concerns and demanding equal rights gained in importance during the 1990s, not least because of the development of progressive equality and anti-discrimination policies at European level. Their influence, however, has been very marginal, due to limited skills and infrastructures and lack of legitimacy and acceptance among the immigrant population itself. It seems that migrants favour (to have) direct municipal voting rights (Jenny 2002; Gunz 1999) or participation in mainstream organisations (political parties, works councils) instead (qualified as b).

2) Political parties: With regard to representation and activities of immigrants in political parties almost no research results are available at present. From recent case studies in Vienna we know that participation and visibility of migrants in the political sphere and efforts of political parties – mainly from the left-wing - to address migrant voters and to promote migrant politicians have considerably increased in the last years. Still, migrants are far underrepresented in relation to the total size of the resident immigrant population.

88 Also due to difficulties in data collection (e.g. no central register of associations, difficulty of getting access to provincial registers of associations) and because of the high importance of informal activities (in family and social networks), the picture remains incomplete.
As, for example, the results of the Viennese municipal election (2001) have shown, immigrant origin politicians are most active and represented within the Green Party. Compared to other parties, migrants also take more influential, leading political positions such as city councillor, district club presidency or commission presidency. The Social Democratic Party holds the second highest number of municipal and district councillors with immigrant background. By contrast, there are no immigrant politicians (in first, second or third generation with a third country background) in the national parliament.

3) Labour interest organisations/trade unions: There is neither statistical information, nor other data on organisational density of migrant workers in relation to trade unions. Recent surveys for Vienna indicate that trade union activities rank rather high compared to activities in other organisations (such as human rights, women-/ student-, and youth organisations or political associations and parties) and that migrants declare comparably high trust in these institutions (Jenny 2002). But it may be stated that membership of first generation migrant workers from the Former Yugoslavia in trade unions has been traditionally high, while a high degree of politicisation among left-wing Turkish workers lead to a strong political activism within trade unions during the 1980s. Nevertheless, legal exclusion resulted in long-term institutional exclusion, keeping migrants from taking representative functions within the trade unions and labour interest organisations (Chamber of Labour). This also constituted further a major barrier for migrants to enter mainstream politics, since careers within social partnership-organisations up to the 1990s were important channels to the political system in general. In response to a recent judgement of the European Court of Justice, however, all third country nationals will be granted the passive vote.

3.2 Differences by ethnic/nationality group

What ethnic and nationality groups are particularly active, and why?

Several studies so far indicate that there have been different patterns of participation and institutional integration of the two largest immigrant communities with similar immigration patterns (as labour immigrants since the 1960s): in general, Turkish immigrants engage more in religious, political and integration organisations, whereas immigrants from the Former Yugoslavia have so far more been active in homeland oriented cultural as well as sports organisations.

It has also been pointed out that Turkish immigrants have been far more active in the political realm than immigrants of the former republics of Yugoslavia. Furthermore it has been outlined that a majority of politicians with immigrant background (in the SPÖ and Green Party) are of Turkish or Kurdish origin (Grasl 2003; Waldrauch/Sohler 2004). Nevertheless these patterns changed significantly during the 1990s due to newly arriving refugee flows from Bosnia, Croatia and Serbia (Kosovo). In general, the different patterns of institutional integration can be explained on the one hand by the different role that homeland politics and institutions (religious, political support and control, transnational emigrant networks) have played for these communities. On the other hand, the migrant communities found different modes of institutional integration and network-building with Austrian organisations and institutions: The Turkish migrants (of the left-wing first-generation organisations) relied - as a consequence of their highly politicised organisations – more on closer networks with political

89 The councillor has since retired.
90 Others have their origin in diverse countries such as Egypt, Latin America, Iraq, Iran or Greece. Only one representative originates from in the former Yugoslavia, though they constitute the largest immigrant minority group in Austria.
NGOs and parties (SPÖ and Green Party in Vienna), whereas the Yugoslavian communities institutionalised stronger ties with trade unions (ÖGB) and labour interest organisations. For several immigrant groups (e.g. from Poland, Croatia, or the Philippines and India) links to religious communities, churches and ethnic minorities were important avenues of participation. Discrimination and structural disadvantage (as labour immigrants in the lower social strata), the long-term status as foreigners (instead of immigrants) and thus the dominant perspective of return due to restrictive citizenship policies, has also shaped (and consolidated) the organisation in separate ethnic associations. Nevertheless, aggravating conditions for integration as well as racism towards certain immigrant groups have also lead to intensified political mobilisation within some immigrant communities, above all the African communities.

3.3 Comparison with majority population

Is the degree of active civic participation of immigrants high or low compared to the majority population?

A variety of recent studies indicate that participation levels of immigrants (as active members) in formal associations are lower than that of Austrians in general (see Waldrauch/Sohler 2004: 557; Ulram 2000; Hofinger et.al. /Zuser 1998). This has also been shown with respect to electoral participation, where naturalized migrants tend to have a lower turn-out than the average (Jenny 2002). But there are too few comparative studies, which would explain such differences sufficiently. From the existing research only hypotheses can be derived. It seems that civic participation of migrants traditionally took place in informal community networks to a much higher degree than is the case for natives, because they face barriers for formal organisation related to their precarious status as migrants (e.g. they were object of special police observation as political activists; they had an insecure residence status as asylum-seekers or labour migrants; they had insufficient language knowledge or information on procedures etc.). Thus, the degree of civic (community) participation may be underestimated.

It seems that the specific socio-demographic composition and the disadvantaged social position of immigrants is a major factor contributing to minor participation rates. Since the share of academic educated persons is rather low within the immigrant population (from third countries) the organisations have been far less differentiated according to social status. The available research shows that mainly immigrants with an academic education or political refugees have become active in founding migrant (interest) organisations. With regard to gender, the dominance of men as activists in political interest and cultural/leisure organisations has been found to hold true for both Austrians (Ulram 2000) and migrants.

What is the relation between engagement in ethnic or migrant organisations (e.g. any organisation having the name of the minority in the name) compared to mainstream society organisations? Are there transitions and overlaps?

---

91 Within the Green Party migrants from Turkey are organised as “Green Anatolian Community in Vienna” (Grüne Anatolische Gemeinschaft in Wien). [http://www.igm.gruene.at](http://www.igm.gruene.at)

92 At least this can be observed in the formation period, and only later, with consolidation of residence and family integration, they founded formal organisations, also for pragmatic reasons (such as to be officially recognized as interest organisations, faith communities, and to be eligible for public subsidies).
According to several studies, ethnic organisation (still) seems to be the dominant pattern of organisation: some organisations based on origin started to struggle for recognition as ethnic minorities\(^93\) during the 1990s, such as the Croat and the Polish community organisations. Nevertheless, there is a considerable and increasing share of multi-national/multi-ethnic and mixed organisations, a trend which can be observed in particular among religious, youth and women organisations, as well as in the social immigrant service/care sector, and with regard to political (antiracist) mobilisation. The increasing heterogeneity of migrant organisations in terms of their ethnic or national composition also reflects the need for organisations to change in order to represent or integrate new target groups and address wider issues of integration. In a sense, migrant organisations increasingly transform themselves into mainstream Austrian organisations, since they increasingly have a constituency with Austrian citizenship and an immigrant background, or as the services of the migrant (counselling) organisations become part of mainstream social services (public and NGO sector).

In addition, there is an important overlap of antiracist and anti-discrimination agendas, which promotes transversal alliances (campaigning for equal rights) between antiracist NGOs and immigrants’ organisations. They also have pushed processes of mainstreaming of interests of immigrant minorities further, particularly in the context of recently implemented diversity and anti-discrimination policies in Vienna.

As some research result indicate (Jenny 2002), sports organisations were those in which social contacts with Austrians are most frequent, whereas in cultural and religious organisations social contacts with immigrants (from same national origin) dominated.

### 3.4 Important issues and research gaps

**What issues do you consider to be of particular interest and importance in the field?**

**Where do you see the major research gaps?**

Against the background of progressive citizenship integration (naturalization) and equality policies resulting from EU-(anti-discrimination) directives, which both have enhanced civil rights and democratic participation of the population of immigrant origin, it would be of particular interest to see how and if the “second generation” and naturalized immigrants change democratic processes, or which barriers they face to participate on equal terms. Conversely, the effect of naturalization on civic participation certainly deserves more attention.

In general, there is a lack of research on the topic of civic and political participation of immigrants in Austria. In particular in respect to “industrial democracy”, that is, immigrant activists’ role in organized labour as well as in respect to immigrants as political actors in the mainstream political system (e.g. as politicians and voters) much still has to be done.

Although the development of participation in immigrant organisations has been studied to a much greater degree, their interaction within different political and institutional “opportunity structures” and their influence on policy-making, has not yet been studied systematically. In the following, we would like to sketch some of the major research gaps and possible avenues for future research:

- The in-depth study of influences of transnational relations and activities of migrant communities on political participation in the country of settlement, and the analysis of the changes occurring with the large-scale naturalization of first generation migrants have not yet received systematic attention.

---

\(^{93}\) Some of them were integrated in the institutional framework of ethnic minority representation, such as the Czech, Slovakian or Hungarian (former refugee) minorities.
- More integrated and theoretically challenging approaches in analyzing causes for varying degrees of immigrant civic participation, for example, by applying network-analysis and social capital approaches (as done, for example, by Fennema and Tillie for the Netherlands\textsuperscript{94}), have not yet been carried out in Austria.
- Studies with a cross-sectoral view looking at participation of migrants in several domains, and studies which would apply institutionalist approaches more systematically (e.g. suggested by a recently presented research framework, see the special issue of JEMS 2004\textsuperscript{95}) are still lacking in Austria.
- Apart from studies on legal and institutional frameworks of participation (see Waldrauch 2001; 2003; König/Stadler 2003) only very few studies (mainly in the field of citizenship studies) have adopted a more comparative research perspective, from which theoretical questions could be derived. The Network of Excellence on migration (IMISCOE)\textsuperscript{96}, funded by the EU’s 6\textsuperscript{th} Framework Programme, however, may serve as a useful framework for further research in this direction.
- Research on political participation of immigrants in general is still in the early stages, studies looking at the actors’ perspective with regard to strategies and issues of claims-making, or the impact on politics or on changes in policy-making processes are still missing.
- The role of migrant women in active civic participation is certainly a topic to deserving more attention, not least since women’s organisations traditionally had a very innovative and effective role in the Austrian context.
- Institutional barriers and patterns of discrimination (“political opportunity structure) which prevent participation of migrants on equal terms in Austrian mainstream organisations, remain understudied, in particular in regard to the “industrial democracy” and political parties.
- There is a lack of comparative studies, which would compare different ethnic immigrant groups concerning their patterns of organisation and participation in different national, local and transnational contexts. It would be interesting to explore, how and why different immigrant groups adopt different strategies of civic participation and which major socio-economic, institutional and individual factors influence political behaviour of immigrants.

\textsuperscript{95} See the latest special issue of the Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies (JEMS) on “Social Capital and political integration of migrants”, Vol 30, No.3, May 2004
\textsuperscript{96} See http://www.imiscoe.org/ (Date of visit: 2005-01-05)
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5 Annex

Active civic participation of immigrants – Mapping of Research Competences in Austria

Summary:

Research on civic participation of immigrants has emerged as a novel research field largely from within migration studies during the 1990s.

Currently, the institutional context of migration research in Austria is undergoing major changes, with new institutional structures emerging, others dissolving, and institutions with a major track record in migration research reorientating their scientific focus away from migration studies. At the same time, the increasing Europeanisation of research has facilitated the strengthening of research networks within Austria.

However, overall migration studies remained marginal, even though the number of institutions active in migration research, including several international organizations with a research expertise, grew significantly during the 1990s. At universities, however, migration studies never got a real foothold. A research focus on xenophobia and racism, funded by the Ministry of Science between 1995 and 2001, certainly helped to strengthen the capacity of migration research in Austria but changed little in institutional terms. Similarly, the substantial growth of project funding available in the framework of EU programs (FP6, Equal, INTI etc.) has also enlarged the funds available for migration research and to some extent also the range of topics analyzed, but they do not change the overall dependency on project funding. Thus, in general, the research scene has not changed much in recent years.

Traditional political science or sociological approaches to civic participation, on the other hand, rarely take immigrants into account. In mainstream research, there is a strong tradition of empirical research on political participation, voting behaviour, and associational patterns. In addition, there is a certain research tradition on the Austrian women’s movement and political participation of women. With the emergence of participatory approaches to solving conflicts in regard to large construction projects (e.g. extension of airports) and in regard to similar context, there is an increasing number of mainly young researchers analyzing models of participatory governance. Below, only the most relevant and important researchers and research institutions are given.

1. Active civic participation of immigrants - leading institutions

6 (In alphabetical order)

6.1 European Centre for Social Welfare Policy and Research
Berggasse 17
A-1090 Vienna
Phone: ++43-1-3194505-0
email: ec@euro.centre.org; migration@euro.centre.org
http://www.euro.centre.org/
head/ director: Prof. Dr. Bernd Marin
Researchers: Dilek Cinar, Harald Waldrauch, Karin Sohler, Trauner Helene, Theodora Manolakos (Research areas: citizenship policies, integration of migrants, political participation, migrant’s organisations, anti-discrimination); Charlotte Strümpel and Margit Grilz-Wolf (Research areas: Civic participation in general, voluntary work, participation of elderly and migrants)

The European Centre is a private research institute, constituted as an intergovernmental, UN-affiliated organisation. Its main research is in the social policy sector (pension and social security system, care services for elderly, health and youth related research). It has a research department specialized on migration research “International Migration, Social Integration, and Diversity Management”, which currently is involved in several projects with a main focus on issues of discrimination of migrants, anti-discrimination policies and citizenship (acquisition policies). Recently a comprehensive study on migrants associations in Vienna has been published.

For current projects and selfdescription see http://www.euro.centre.org/ec_pa2.htm

Another research department of the European Centre “Ageing, Care Policies and Social Services” has a research focus on different aspects of civic participation, mainly with regard to the voluntary sector or social care services, with view to different groups (elderly persons, immigrants). Two recent projects have been carried out on this topic. For current projects and selfdescription see http://www.euro.centre.org/ec_pa4.htm

Institute for European Integration Research (EIF), Austrian Academy of Sciences
Prinz Eugen-Straße 8-10
1040 Vienna / Austria
Phone: +43(1) 515 81-75 65
Fax: +43(1) 515 81-75 66
http://www.eif.oeaw.ac.at/
e-mail: eif@oeaw.ac.at
Director: Prof. Sonja Puntscher-Riekman
Relevant Researchers: Rainer Bauböck, Bernhard Perchinig

The Institute for European Integration Research at the Austrian Academy of Sciences is dedicated to the analysis of the European integration process and its democratic quality. Research projects are carried out in three overlapping areas: European Governance, the European Public Sphere and European Citizenship.

Two senior researchers, Rainer Bauböck and Bernhard Perchinig, are active in migration research, with a focus on citizenship, multiculturalism, anti-discrimination, and participation of migrants. Currently, the EIF co-ordinates the FP6 research project on the acquisition of citizenship in the “old” 15 EU Member States (NATAC), which will be concluded in September 2005.

Institute for Conflict Research (IFK)
Lisztrasse 3
A-1030 Vienna
Phone: + 43 1 713 16 40
Fax : + 43 1 713 99 30
http://www.ikf.ac.at/
e-mail: institute@ikf.ac.at
Head: Anton Pelinka
The Institute's objective is to carry out scientific research in political, social and individual conflicts and their possible solution on an interdisciplinary basis as well as to provide relevant support for decision-making - in the sense of scientific political counselling. Basic research forms the foundation of this field of activities. The main emphasis of the research activities is put on the following areas:

- the development of democracy in liberal systems (esp. within the EU)
- research on migration
- conflicts in the field of public and personal safety
- gender research
- research on prejudice (esp. xenophobia and racism) including civic education and conflict training
- labour market and social security with regard to native and foreign employees
- historical social research.

Together with the Institute for Applied Linguistics of the University of Vienna and the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Human Rights, serves as the Raxen Focal Point within the EUMC’s Raxen network (see [www.eumc.eu.int](http://www.eumc.eu.int))

**University of Graz – Department for Education**

6.2 **Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz**

Institut für Erziehungswissenschaft
Abteilung für Weiterbildung/ Adult Education Centre
Merangasse 70
A-8010 Graz
[http://www-gewi.uni-graz.at/edu/](http://www-gewi.uni-graz.at/edu/)
Email: EMail: erzwiss@uni-graz.at; annette.sprung@uni-graz.at
head/ director: Rektor Univ.-Prof. Dr. Alfred Gutschelhofer
Researcher: Annette Sprung

Her main research focus is on integration of immigrants; intercultural education, intercultural competences in public services, selforganisation and participation of immigrants (with focus on immigrant women). She is currently involved as partner in an Equal partnership “open up”, dealing with development of antiracist strategies in the labour market.

6.3 **ÖAW - KMI**

6.3.1.1.1 **Commission for Migration and Integration Research**

Prinz Eugen-Str. 8, A-1040 Vienna
Phone.: +43 (1) 51581-7796
Fax: +43 (1) 51581-7566
E-mail: wiebke.sievers@oeaw.ac.at (Administrator)
Website: [www.oeaw.ac.at/kmi](http://www.oeaw.ac.at/kmi)
Chairman: Heinz Fassmann
Researchers: not applicable
As a networking institution, the Commission is not involved in research as such. It took over part of the responsibilities of the *Austrian Forum for Migration Studies*, which was based at the ICMPD (see below). Heinz Fassmann of the Institute for Urban and Regional Research (see below) is currently chairman of the commission. On behalf of the Academy’s Institute for Urban and Regional Research and the Institute for European Integration Research, also based at the Academy, the Commission coordinates the Academy’s involvement in the EU funded research network on migration, IMISCOE (www.imiscoe.org). Two out of 9 thematic clusters of the network are led by institutes at the academy, namely Imiscoe cluster B3 on “Citizenship, Legal status, and Participation”, which is coordinated by Rainer Bauböck of the Institute for European Integration Research (EIF), and cluster A1 “International Migration and its Regulation”, which is coordinated by Heinz Fassmann. Members of the Imiscoe cluster B3 with an expertise in civic participation of migrants include, among others, Marco Martiniello, Hassan Bousetta, and Jean Tillie.

7  **SORA – Institute for Social Research and Analysis, Ogris & Hofinger GmbH**
Linke Wienzeile 246
A-1150 Wien
Tel. +43-1-585 33 44
Fax +43-1-585 33 44-55
E-Mail: office@sora.at
Website: http://www.sora.at/english/
head/ director: Günther Ogris and Christoph Hofinger (executive directors and heads of research)
Researchers: Christoph Hofinger; Vlasta Zucha (migration research, political participation of migrants, labour market integration and discrimination of migrants); Ruth Picker (political participation of young people); Marcello Jenny (former collaborator)

One of the major (private) social research institutions, which focus on electoral analysis (electoral behaviour and political preferences) and political opinion research, and employment and organisational research. The institute has a special research branch on migration related topics.

Self-description: “SORA is one of the leading private institutes for social sciences in Austria. Our institute guarantees high scientific know-how, well-founded knowledge of methods and multi-disciplinary orientation, which leads to an efficient and target-oriented research of our customers’ questions. In the fields of research and advice we focus on elections & politics, employment & organization, market communication as well as on migration.” (see [www.sora.at](http://www.sora.at))

**Zentrum für Soziale Innovation –ZSI (Centre for Social Innovation - CSI)**
Linke Wienzeile 246
A-1150 Wien
Tel. +43-1-4950442
Fax. +43-1-495044240
e-mail: institut@zsi.at
Chairman and manager: Univ.-Doz. Dr. Josef Hochgerner

Researchers: August Gächter (Research areas: immigration/integration policy; migrant integration at the labour market; discrimination and antidiscrimination of migrants at the
workplace, Trade union policies towards migrants); Barbara Herzog-Punzenberger (migration research: especially with regard to education and integration of second generation youth in Austria; citizenship etc.); Christa Maad (Research areas: Social integration of immigrants; Managing Diversity; Turkish female immigrants; gender mainstreaming); Rossalina Latcheva (LIMITS project)

8.1.1.1 Self-description: The Centre for Social Innovation (CSI) is a private research institute mainly working in the field of labour market research and technology application and its impact on society.

For as self-description see http://www.zsi.at/en/index.html

The institute has a research focus on “work and equal opportunities” which carries out projects related to Equal opportunities and integration of migrants (topics of research have been for example ethnic economies, gender equality, aging society as well as integration or exclusion). The CSI has been involved in several projects on migrant participation in the labour market (ethnic economies; EQUAL project on intercultural opening Opening in Styria). The CSI is currently involved in several projects on civic and political participation e.g. the project within an Austrian NODE research programme “Europeans have a say: Online debates and consultations in the EU”, which investigates the quality of political discourses online, and seeks to identify how citizens’ input concerning political issues on a European level are reflected in current EU policy.

Another EU-project “LIMITS: Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities in European Cities. Life-courses and Quality of Life in a World of Limitations” aims to identify the causal factors that influence the evolving strategies of immigrants and their descendants towards improving their personal well-being. In each of the six countries (Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, and the United Kingdom) involved, two (comparable) immigrant groups in one city are studied (for Austria immigrants from Turkey and Serbia were chosen). In each case 300 individuals are interviewed face-to-face about themselves and the households they are part of. In a standardised format information will be collected on event histories of migration, work, family formation, civic activity and other areas and will be supplemented by event histories of legal changes, major political and social events etc. From this will result a database of approximately 3,600 cases that will be accessible to other analysts after the termination of the project. The analysis within LIMITS will primarily aim to identify patterns of strategies for the improvement of well-being and the influences shaping them.

Independent Researchers:

Sabine Kroissenbrunner-Cahit, political scientist (Research field: Islamic and Turkish migrant organisations), currently associated as external researcher to the Institute of Conflict Research (see above).

Ljubomir Bratic, philosopher, currently collaborator in the BUM (Büro für ungewöhnliche Maßnahmen), an agency for antiracist public information established within the EQUAL Partnership “Open up” (Empowerment against Racism at the labour market) see http://no-racism.net/openup/ (Research field: antiracist organisations; self-organisation of migrants; organisations of the Former Yugoslavian immigrant communities)

Hans Pühretmayer, political scientist, lecturer at the Viennese University institute of Political Sciences (research field: policies on voting rights for works councils; anti-racist organisations)
Alexandra Grasl, political scientist, contact person for the national network of the EMN/IOM, research field: Political Participation of Migrants; Email: alexandra.grasl@fsw.at

2. Immigration - leading institutions

8.1.2

8.1.3  ICMPD – International Centre for Migration Policy Development
Gonzagagasse 1,
A-1010 Vienna
Phone: +43-1-5044677-0
Fax: +43-1-5044677-75
e-mail: icmpd@icmdp.org
www.icmpd.org
Head: Gottfried Zürcher
Researchers: Veronika Bilger, Haleh Chahrokh, Martin Hofmann, Michael Jandl, Albert Kraler, Cecilia Lundstrom, Dietlind Scharzenberger,

(Self-Description): ICMPD is an inter-governmental organization with a European focus and global interests. It strives at being the centre of excellence in migration policy development. It fosters regional and international orderly migration regimes by supporting governments and institutions through policy expertise, research and information, dialogue and networking facilities. Its services are provided on request, are not agenda driven and delivered by way of an informal working pattern.

Between 1997 and 2003, the ICMPD hosted the Austrian Forum for Migration Studies (AFM), a documentation centre and networking facility, whose agenda has, as far as networking is concerned, since been taken over by the Austrian Commission for Migration and Integration Research. While the greater part of activities is related to training and consulting services, its Research and Policy Department (former Austrian Forum for Migration Studies) is engaged in a series of research projects on integration and integration policy, immigration policy and undocumented migration. The ICMPD is also a member of the EU funded Network of Excellence (IMISCOE) and co-manager of Imiscoe C9 “The Governance of Migration. Immigrant and Immigration Policy Making”, co-ordinated by Giovanna Zincone (FIERI, Turin).

The ICMPD also hosts the online portal for integration (“Integrationsportal”), an online advisory and networking tool for immigrants, immigrant associations immigrant advocacy and counselling organizations (www.integrationsportal.at).

ÖAW – KMI (Commission for Migration Research)

See above

9  Institute for Urban and Regional Research (ISR), Austrian Academy of Sciences
A - 1010 Vienna,
Postgasse 7/4/2
The focus of the ISR is on socio-economic integration of migrants, and in particular residential patterns of immigrants, labour market integration, and dynamics of migration in Europe. The ISR coordinates the Imiscoe A1 cluster “International Migration and its Regulation”.

9.1.1 IOM - National Contact Point within the European Migration Network (EMN)

International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Mission with Regional Functions for
Southeastern Europe, Eastern Europe and Central Asia
Nibelungengasse 13/4
1010 Vienna - Austria
Tel: +43 1 585 33 22
Fax: +43 1 585 33 22-30
Email: mrfvienna@iom.int
http://www.iomvienna.at
http://www.emn.at/

In the framework of the European Migration Observatory, IOM Vienna was designated in 2002 by the Austrian Ministry of Interior for the establishment of the National Contact Point Austria within the European Migration Network.

The European Migration Network (EMN) will build a systematic basis for monitoring and analysing the multidimensional phenomena of migration and asylum by covering a variety of its dimensions – political, demographic, economic, social, and by identifying its root causes. As a national contact point IOM Vienna is expected to carry out the task of gathering, regularly updating and analysing data as well as responding to new information needs through appropriate research. On a long term, it is planned on the part of the EU to make this institution also available to a broader public in Austria.

Recently the IOM published a review study of migration research in Austria ("The Impact of Immigration on Austria's Society", which is the Austrian contribution to the European pilot study "The Impact of Immigration on Europe's Societies". This final report will be made public in Spring 2005.)

3. Civic participation – leading institutions

9.1.2
9.1.3 University of Vienna – Department of Political Science

9.1.4 Institut für Politikwissenschaft – Universität Wien

Neues Institutsgebäude,
Universitätsstraße 7,
A-1010 Vienna
Phone: +43-1-42 77-47701
Fax: +43-1-4277-9477
www.univie.ac.at/politikwissenschaft
service.politikwissenschaft@univie.ac.at
Head: Prof. Sieglinde Rosenberger
Researchers: Herbert Gottweis (Social movements, participatory governance, genetics and microbiological research and the public); Hannelore Eva Kreisky (gender theory, women’s movements, democratic theory), Birgit Sauer (democratic theory, state theory and gender), Sieglinde Rosenberger (Austrian political system, gender and democracy, welfare policy).

The University of Vienna’s Department of Political Science is the largest political science institute in Austria. Since the appointment of Eva Kreisky as Head of Department in the mid-1990s, it has developed a strong focus on gender, in particular on gender democracy and participation of women the Austrian political system and gender theory. Recently, it has also developed a focus on participatory approaches to regulating genetical and microbiological research.

9.1.4.1.1

10 University of Innsbruck – Department of Political Science

Institut für Politikwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck
Universitätsstraße 15,
A-6020 Innsbruck
Tel.: +43-(0)512-507-7051
http://www.uibk.ac.at/c/c4/c402/
http://homepage.uibk.ac.at/homepage/c402/c40238/
Researcher: Erna Appelt, University professor at the department of political sciences
Research focus: Migration and Asylum, particularly gender research;
Email: Erna.Appelt@uibk.ac.at

11 University of Economics Vienna

12 Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien

Institut für Allgemeine Soziologie und Wirtschaftssoziologie
Augasse 2-6,
A-1090 Wien,
Tel. +43/1/31336-4737,
Fax. +43/1/31336-707
13 http://www.wu-wien.ac.at/inst/sozio/local.html

The institute of general sociology and economic sociology is specialized in research on sociology of organisations; Researchers: Simsa Ruth (Research on: Nonprofit organisations)
At the Viennese University of Economics an interdisciplinary research programme focus on Non-profit sector organisations has been established. (see research focus "Funktion und Management von Nonprofit Organisationen", http://www.wu-wien.ac.at/npo/forschung/home.htm)

23 University of Vienna – Department of Sociology

24 Institut für Soziologie
Rooseveltplatz 2
A-1090 Wien
Austria
Telefon: +43 (1) 4277-48201,
Fax: +43 (1) 4277-9481 und –9482
http://gerda.univie.ac.at/ifs/
E-Mail: soziologie@univie.ac.at
Head/director: Univ. Prof. Dr. Jürgen Pelikan

Researchers: Reinprecht Christoph (professor of sociology; Research fields: sociology of migration, social problems, migration and age) Email: christoph.reinprecht@univie.ac.at

24.1.1.1.1 Institute for Advanced Studies
Institut für Höhere Studien (IHS)
Stumpergasse 56
A-1060 Vienna
Austria
Phone: ++43 - (0)1 - 599 91 - 0
Fax: ++43 - (0)1 - 599 91 - 555
Email: communication@ihs.ac.at
www.ihs.ac.at
Head/manager: Bernhard Felderer
Researchers: Claire Wallace (research on the sociology of migration, especially East-West migration);
The private research and post-graduate training institution has several departments for economics, sociology and political science research and training.
Within the departments of sociology and political sciences a research focus on migration and integration developed during the 1980s and 1990s. Currently this focus has shifted towards, a few current projects are on participation in a wider sense: Within the department of Sociology there is a focus on Youth issues also concerned with topics of civic and political participation of youth. At the Department of Political Science which has specialised in European Integration (policies), a current research focus (EU-project) is on “New Modes of Governance (NEWGOV).

24.1.2 Institutes specialized on Electoral research/opinion polls and political particiation

SORA (see above)

24.1.3 IFES
Institut für empirische
Sozialforschung GmbH
Teinfaltstraße 8, 1010 Wien
Tel.: +43/1/546 70-0
Fax.: +43/1/546 70-312
ifes@ifes.at
http://www.ifes.at/

24.1.4 Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Angewandte Politikforschung/ Zentrum für Angewandte Politikforschung/ Fessel GFK
1030 Wien,
Ungargasse 37 / 1. Stock
Phone: +43-1-2536660
Fax: +43-1-5236660-5664
e-mail: info@polimatrix.at
http://www.polimatrix.at/
Head: Prof.Dr.Fritz Plasser
Researchers: Prof. Dr. Fritz Plasser, Wolfgang Meixner (political communication, voting patterns in Austria)

The Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Applied Political Research was established in 2001 and closely collaborates with Fessel GFK, a commercial market research institute. The Institute is the main centre for empirical election research.
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26.1.1.1
Websites consulted


Ausländerbeirat Graz, http://www.graz.at/politik/ab-neu-layout-neu/start.htm (Date of visit: 2004-10-01)

Austrian Ministry of Science – http://www.bmbwk.gv.at/forschung/fps/fremdenfeindlichkeit/kd.xml. (Date of visit: 2004-12-10)


Austrian Academy of Science – Website of the IMISCOE Network of Excellence (Date of Visit: 2005-01-05)