

DEMOGRAPHIC STATISTICS AS INDICATORS OF INTEGRATION:
Comparative behavior and differences between continents of origin

AUTHOR: Graciela Sarribe, Universitat de Barcelona, Spain
sarribe@ub.edu gsarribe@yahoo.com

ABSTRACTS

The aim of this paper is to test new indicators about integration. The more integrated people are, the more the relations they have with the State will be normal. These relations can be a sign of normalization in the new society. Legal Residents have very accurate data. Amnesties are rather the same. On the other side, Census and *Padrón* are voluntary. People do not equally trust the State. A greater trust in the State matches with greater success rates in the regularization processes, for people carrying out voluntary registration. The more immigrants relate voluntarily with the State, the more possibilities will they have of getting residence permits.

Questo paper vuol testare nuovi indicatori circa l'integrazione. A maggior integrazione della gente, tanto più normali saranno loro relazioni con lo Stato. Queste relazioni possono essere segno di normalizzazione nella nuova società. I residenti legali hanno dati molto precisi. Si dica lo stesso dell'amnistie. Il censo e il *Padrón* sono volontari. La gente non crede ugualmente nello Stato. A maggior fiducia nello Stato, maggiore saggi d'esito nei processi di regolazione per chi esegue registrazione volontaria. Quanto più gli immigranti si relazioni volontariamente con lo Stato, tanto più possibilità avranno di conseguire autorizzazione di residenza.

L'objective de ce travail est de tester des indicateurs nouveaux pour l'intégration. Dans la mesure que les personnes maintiennent des relations normalisées avec l'État, elles sont plus intégrées. Ces relations peuvent être le signe d'une normalisation dans la société d'accueil. Les résidents étrangers avec carte de séjour sont bien enregistrés ; aussi bien que les personnes que demandent des Amnisties. Par contre, le recensement et le *Padrón*, en étant volontaires, n'ont pas des données si faibles. Les étrangers n'ont pas confiance dans l'État aussi bien les uns que les autres. Si les personnes ont plus de confiance dans l'État, la possibilité d'être régularisée est plus grande. Si les étrangers font des registres volontaires, ils auront plus de possibilités d'obtenir la carte de séjour.

TEXT

The Minister of Work and Social Affairs of Spain has its own definition of integration. In its webpages (<http://www.mtas.es/migraciones/default.htm> and <http://extranjeros.mtas.es/>), the Secretary of Immigration and Emigration proposes:

“A process whose aim is to achieve gradual incorporation and share of legal resident immigrants in our country’s social and economical life in an environment of respect and mutual participation.”¹

As L. Recolons has recognised [Recolons, 200x], we have evolved from a social dimension where integration was the characteristic of a group to an individual dimension where each individual may or may not be integrated.

There are several aspects about the Minister of Spain’s definition that we must consider. Firstly, it is a process, so it needs a period of time to conclude. Perhaps, it will be completed in the future. We can consider it opened and unfinished. Secondly, under the Minister’s point of view, participation is one of the indicators of people’s integration. The country’s social and economic life is mentioned as the measure of the process of participation. Thirdly, the proposal is to take under consideration only people with permits. In consequence, people without it cannot be “integrated”. Finally, mutual respect is mentioned, as is participation for a second time.

I agree with the notion of participation because people who have come to the country want to have access to education for their children in the new society, to the public health system for all the family and, obviously, to residence and working permits. In my opinion, it is not necessary to be “legal” to begin a long process of adaptation, more than integration. Residents with permits are only a part of the total of foreigners living in Spain. In countries where a lot of people are outside the “legal System”, saying that only legal residents can be integrated equals to leaving apart a large group of people². In Spain, there’s no restriction for foreign people in order to register, so they can have a sanitary card and educate their children in public school. In consequence, if we consider that people who are attended by the public health system and have their children in public schools have begun the process of integration, there is obviously no need of any legal permit. It is possible that the process of integration begins regardless of permits because there are many sorts of public and administrative relations that foreign people may establish with the Spanish government, even if they are not “legal residents”.

But, this does not mean that all the people have the same opportunities to actually register in the *Padrón* (the Population Register of any municipality in Spain). Registration implies having a home and not everybody can have it. Generally, families have a home to live in. But those who work in the agriculture and live outside villages do not necessarily have it. That makes a great difference between nationalities just because they are working in different economical sectors. Africans tend to work in the agriculture while Americans work in the tertiary sector. So, many African people have temporary employments in the countryside, while American people rather live in the cities.

My point of view is that integration begins when people arrive in the country and become residents, not when they get permits. With the current Regularization Process (2005), a big number of people who have been living for many years with their family in the countryside will have the first opportunity to

¹ “Proceso dirigido a conseguir la gradual incorporación y participación de los inmigrantes con residencia legal en España en la vida social y económica de nuestro país en un clima de respeto y participación recíproca”.

² Foreign “legal residents” were 1,982 million in 31/12/2004. One day after, Foreign People in the Municipal Registration (*Padrón*) were 3,731 million; 88% more!!! (www.ine.es, official data) 6-02-06

obtain permits. During the long period they have been living in the countryside, they have used the public health system, and their children have been attending to public schools. For me, the process of integration didn't stop just because they had no permits. Permits are only a step, a very important one, which will allow them to stay in the country and pay taxes, and, in consequence, to have more rights than they had before.

The aim of this paper is to test new indicators about integration. In previous works, I have put forward the idea that administrative relations between people and the State can be regular, easy and voluntary [Sarrible, 2002b]. The more integrated people are, the more the relations they have with the State will be normal. In other words, these relations can be a sign of normalization in the new society: more relations mean a major belief in the State, and a major trust in civil and political institutions.

ABOUT DATA

There are a lot of data about Foreign People and the State. For instance, about Health and Security System, Work, Taxes or Education. "Foreign people" is just a category of the whole society. Yet, there is a great difference in opposition to Spaniards because foreign people may be "legal" or not. We can consider that there are two kinds of registrations. Compulsory, which can only be carried out by people with permits, and voluntary, which might be carried out by anyone staying in the country, even if they have no permits or their situation is not regular.

The Home Office has a "List of Legal Residents": foreign people with permits, that is to say, with a right to stay in the country. Citizens from other European Union countries do not need permits, but they are included as well in the whole (under a special category) because they are not Spanish. On the other hand, there is the *Padrón*: a urban Register for all the people that have a home. That requirement means that people in the country working in the agricultural sector or in the primary sector who do not have an address cannot be included therein. Even if all the people have the right to do so, it does not mean that all foreign people would be in the list as well. During this Regularization Process many people avowed that they did not register because they did not know they could, or because, being not legal, they did not trust authorities.

I do not consider the *Padrón* a good tool for estimating the number of foreign people living in Spain, because there are normal differences in the attitudes and behaviours among people with different origins. Some people tend to register, while other people do not do it in the same proportion. In consequence, we cannot consider that the total number of foreign people in the *Padrón* is really the number of all foreign people living in Spain, but the minimum number. Perhaps, differences between total figures and Legal Residents might be an estimation of the minimum quantity of "illegal foreign people residing in Spain", which means people without permits. If people register accordingly to the information received through the social network of their community of origin, they do not do it in the same extent. Previous works have proved that most Americans register, but many Asians and Africans do not [Sarrible, 2005a, Sarrible, 2005b and Sarrible & Mustafá, 2004].

Other data that can be brought to consideration are Census and Amnesties. The first one is a voluntary survey that took place trough all the

country in November the 1st, 2001, thus in a very special moment: right after the first Amnesty and before the second. Amnesties took place in 2000 and 2001 to allow the regularisation of all the people without permits in these years. Data on Amnesties are important because they allow us to compare the quantity of immigrants that presented the documents with the quantity of them who actually obtained the permits. Nevertheless, we suppose that people obtained permits if all the requirements were fulfilled. In this case, Amnesties are not considered voluntary, because people *do need* permits, so they are obligated to ask for it. It is the same situation Legal Residents have, for they must take documents to the Police Department to have permits. Some of this data and indicators have been used in previous works to make comparisons between communities of origins [Sarrille, 2002b, 2004b, 2005a]

Data published by the Government include only foreign people living in Spain, and it is not necessary to have permits to register. Legal Residents have very accurate data because they must show documents to obtain permits. Amnesties are rather the same, because those who want to have permits must present all documents required to prove that they are under the condition for obtaining permits. On the other side, Census and *Padrón* are voluntary. People need not being “legal”, but they must be living in a home, have an address of their own and can be registered either in the Survey or in the Municipality Register. In exchange, they are allowed to have access to public education for their children and to the Health System. When a process of regularisation comes, they will have the documents proving they were already residing in the country for a period of time before it.

ADMINISTRATIVE INDICATORS ABOUT FOREIGN PEOPLE

In a previous work [Sarrille, 2002b], we have proved that, in the city of Barcelona, the relations vary between the different communities of origins and the State, NGOs and other institutions. Americans have a tendency to declare, to show documents, to trust the people who receive them. On the other side, people coming from Asia or Africa rarely show their origin or their identification documents and try to mask their identity. These are two categories: the first one will have facilities in a process of regularisation, and the second one will rather have difficulties.

It may be that, because of these initial relations, future is conditioned. The more one trusts the State, the more documents he will get to prove his residence, and the more easily he can have permits. The less one believes in people or administration, the fewer opportunities to prove that he has been here for a period of time, and the less probabilities has in order to obtain the permits in any regularisation process. This vicious circle had an end in the last process of 2005 because, from that moment on, the information is equal for all the people. From that moment on, immigrants can understand the importance of administrative registration even if they have no permits, or, in other words, even if they are not “legal residents”.

The indicators set forth here are important because they are different from the common ones. Some of them have been used in previous researches though, perhaps, they will not be useful in the future. In the last, ongoing process of regularisation on 2005, it was made clear for everybody who wanted

to become “legal” that inscription in the *Padrón* or any other official register is a must for obtaining residence permits. If the information varied from one community networks to others, currently there is a common basis about the Administration and the basic relation with the Spanish State.

The aim of this paper is to show different data and indicators about the relations between foreign people and the Spanish State due to community of origin. First of all, the probability to obtain permits in the Regularisation Processes in 2000 and 2001³ will be analysed. In the second part, comparisons between compulsory and voluntary registration are shown, i.e. between the List of Residents and the *Padrón*. In the third part, new estimations considering List of Residents, people asking for amnesties and new arrivals allow a comparison with other indicators. The proposal is to show the coincidences between attitudes towards voluntary Registration, facilities to obtain permits or to be regular after a process of Amnesty and quantities of new arrivals. On the other side, there is the people who have more difficulties, that are less admitted; perhaps because their relations with the State where not so natural. We cannot estimate the quantity of irregular people not appearing in any registration but, supposedly, they are not many and, in the moment, they tend to disappear.

The fact that there are a lot of people without permits does not mean that there are more difficulties to obtain it. In the Latino American case, massive arrivals have taken place these years, voluntary inscriptions were a common behaviour and, maybe in consequence, more people have obtained permits in the process of 2000 and 2001 and probably in the one which is going on now in 2005. There is not an inverse relation between quantity of persons without permits and the probability to obtain one. Probably, it depends on others factors, such as the normal administrative relations described here.

1. AMNESTIES: admitted and refused

The periodicity with which processes of regularization have been carried on in Spain points only to a huge necessity of digging up the people who live marginal to the administration but who, otherwise, work and live in the country. In an article published on the 8th of October, 2005, the Minister of Work and Social Affairs of the former PP government, Manuel Pimentel, acknowledged that it is a selfish attitude to regularize permanently the immigrants who are in the country and got in without permission, because that blocks the possibility of giving legal permits and entries to the people who ask for them in the Spanish Consulates, which would be the logical way of regularizing immigration.

If there are too many “irregular” people, regularization processes are organized frequently. As a consequence, people who are already working get permits. Therefore, people who ask for them in the consulates cannot obtain one because there is an insufficient number of permits and country shares run out with each new process. This is what we know as “the perverse effect of social order”, a distortion in social laws, which end up sheltering or easing the same situations they were intended to avoid [Boudon, 1977].

Gualda Caballero and Ruiz García [2004] have proved the increase in origin's contracts from 2000 to 2004 in the South of Spain, so now there are no

³ In a Conference in the University of Joao Pessoa (Brazil, 2004), the comparison between Latino American and other foreign people was presented and discussed in a Master Program. The indicators about Continents of origins have been used in this presentation but the ones about countries are new.

more working places for unemployed people in the area. An accurate profile in the country of origin is searched for. Feminine manpower grows and it changes origins (from south to north, from Africa to Northern Europe). That means increased unemployment among people already living in the country, or the loss of the working permit, being unable to find a work place.

That's the reason why in the last ongoing regularization process (2005) people are required to have a work place in order to get the residence permit, a requirement which was not to be fulfilled in the processes of 2000 and 2001. Sadly, the truth is that there are always a lot of people living in the country without permits. After the previous processes are over, there are still people outside the system, who do not meet the constraints and hope to do so in the next occasion. All this means a never-ending spiral of people who remain at the margin of the system, and who cannot be eradicated by the processes.

AMNESTIES 2000. According to the Annual of Migrations of 2002, this is the fourth regularization process which takes place in Spain, following the ones of 1985, 1991 and 1996. It was an insufficient process that had to have a continuation the next year with another one, called "rooting" process. They are in fact two different amnesties. Processes are not the same nor do they concern the same people. In both cases previous stay in the country was a must, without a need for justifying income with a working contract. In the case of the first regularization (2000), the period of stay should get to June the 1st, 1999. In 2001, the requirement was to "have been in Spain since before the 23rd January, 2001, and prove the rooting situation (family, work market)"(Annual of Migrations, 2002).

In the Table 1, the success rate relating the permits given over the total of permits demanded is calculated and shown, classified in continents and significant countries of each region. Both the regularization process of 2000 and the rooting process of 2001 have a similar average success rate: 66'13 % in the first case and 63'61 in the second, which means that two demands out of each three were accepted. While in the 2000 process the success rate in the different countries is pretty regular, in the 2001 process there are larger differences.

CONTINENTS. In 2000, America, in the first place, Oceania and Europe are over the average. Asia is slightly over the average and Africa slightly under it. Further below the average are the stateless and unknown (only 16'42% success rate), who obtained only one permit out of each six demands approximately. Continent by continent the averages are similar, generally, though that is not the case with the rates of some countries, where the differences are widely revealed.

However, in 2001 differences between continents were also remarkable. Over the average we still find the same continents, though a lot closer one to each other: in order, Europe, America and Oceania. Africa does not get half the demands requested and Asia gets a few more than the quarter part. Stateless and unknown petitions have a success rate under the average and, but, higher than Asian and African's. This could mean that the expectations built up by the new amnesty were higher than the actual possibility of getting a permit, at least for part of the population.

Table 1

YEAR 2000 REGULARIZATION PROCESS and YEAR 2001
ROOTING PROCESS (AMNESTIES)

by CONTINENTS and some COUNTRIES: given/demanded
success rate

AMNESTIES	2000	2001
CONTINENT/Country	%	%
AMÉRICA	85,11	73,94
Argentina	85,36	77,56
Brazil	82,01	72,01
Colombia	83,37	75,77
Ecuador	86,88	78,11
Peru	83,34	73,44
ASIA	67,77	26,06
Bangla Desh	43,13	11,34
China	72,46	45,32
India	58,35	12,54
Pakistan	63,63	9,41
AFRICA	66,06	45,69
Algeria	77,27	30,89
Egypt	47,42	27,62
Morocco	68,51	53,96
Nigeria	56,28	42,63
Senegal	53,41	21,16
EUROPE	71,67	74,87
Bulgaria	72,96	76,07
Poland	81,51	67,81
Rumania	70,76	76,86
Ukraine	70,99	74,79
OCEANÍA	83,58	72,97
stateless/Unknown	16,42	57,84
TOTAL	66,17	63,61

SOURCE: Annual of Migrations 2002, on-line browse

It seems the two more successful continents are coincident in both cases and, furthermore, show the same norm in another research: if the declarations to the administration are complete and exhaustive, later on the possibilities of obtaining a permit will be higher [Sarrille, 2002b, 2004a and b]. If we estimate that the success depends on reliable information (regarding the relations with the State administration), we can consider the information flowing through American, European and Oceanian networks is more realistic and allow the creation of more accurate expectations. Plus, the amount of demands carried out does not depend *solely* on the amount of non-legal people residing in the country. In those moments, the number of people coming from America, and who had registered in the *Padrón*, was considerably higher than the number of

people from other continents. America gets a high success rate, but goes on having a lot of people without permits, at all times.⁴

COUNTRIES. In 2000, America is characterized by the proximity in the success rates of the countries presenting a higher number of requests in the process. There are no major differences between them. Something similar happens in Europe, but Poland, with over an eight accepted petitions out of each ten, surpasses the rest of the countries. On the other hand, the differences inside the other two continents are enormous. In Asia, there's a big variation between the cases of Bangla Desh (four accepted petitions out of ten) and China (more than seven out of each ten). In Africa, we find a similar situation: Egypt gets almost five of each ten requests, while Algeria gets almost eight. Nigeria and Senegal both are over the average.

In 2001, the differences are bigger both in continent averages and among countries. We could say that the process constituted a new hope for all those who could not make their request in the previous one, or those who were denied the permit. Whereas in the first process 247,098 requests were carried out, in the second the number went up to 351,269. Even though in both occasions the acceptance is similar, about two out of each three requests were accepted, in the second process over 100,000 more people were out of it who, assumedly, live in Spain. That is what the frequency of the processes in Spain and their proximity in time show: a high number of people with no permits residing in the country.

When three out of each four American's demands were approved, almost all the countries which did so are close to that proportion. In the case of European's, there is a slightly wider range, which never goes beyond a difference of $\pm 9\%$. Differently enough, Africa and Asia show remarkable disparities. Africa's average rate is under the global average, and only Morocco is above it, while Senegal and Egypt are below 30% acceptance rate. In the case of Asia there's a fluctuation between China, which does not get given half the requests made, and the rest of the countries, which do not even get to one accepted out of each ten requests carried out. Asia's average rate is set to one out of each four.

The situation of the different continents presents a wide disparity in the amnesty of 2001. America, Europe and Oceania get given three out of each four petitions; Africa does not even reach a two out of four proportion, and Asia stays in just one. Should we wish to summarize the global results of both amnesties, we should say that both processes are complementary. Where the first one, 2000, was insufficient, the second, 2001, tries to rescue the people who were not admitted in the former. However, it is obvious that, even though in both processes two requests out of each three were accepted, broadly speaking, the disparities between continents are remarkable in the second one, but not in the first. America, Europe and Oceania obtain the higher success rates or, in other words, their demands generally meet the requirements. Asia and Africa are below the average in both processes, but in the second they do not even reach a 50% success rate. The expectations built up by the process were greater than the real possibilities of obtaining permits for some people, but not for others.

⁴ As a proof, Table 2 shows the rates calculated following these data.

ESTIMATIONS ON “LEGAL” RESIDENTS AND RESIDENTS WITHOUT PERMITS

There is not an accurate and complete estimation on all the people (foreign or not) who live in a territory, nor can it be. Whereas the evaluation might be precise enough about the people with the nationality of the country they live in, it will not be so about foreigners, regardless of their legal condition (regular/irregular).

We can make more or less successful attempts to count immigrant collectives, following different criteria. In my opinion, the first criterion we must observe is that not all collectives have equal opportunities, nor do they share the same information, nor the same opinion about the State and its administrations [Sarrille, 2004]. First of all, if they have documents, they will be in the Residents list. Only people who have already taken the necessary steps to get a permit and, therefore, meet the requirements, may appear in that list. Second, information flowing in the different communities of origin conditions people's attitude towards voluntary inscriptions. That has been proved in the case of the Census of 2001 [Sarrille, 2004], and we can observe considerable differences that match the success rates of the amnesties and other parameters which try to measure the relations between the different collectives and the administration, through secondary sources.

We lay down various estimations in order to being able to compare the foreign population with permits and the foreign population which get voluntary inscribed, that should add up to a larger number. In principle, if there is people without permits from every origin in different proportions, the amount of people from a given origin should *always* be greater than the amount of legal residents from that origin. The capability of inscribing in a free-for-all voluntary registration, with no need for permits and without discrimination, should allow us to add up the people with permits plus all those who do not have one. That is to say, theoretically, that the voluntary registrations should allow us to estimate the foreign populations living in the country according to the ratio of people who decide to get inscribed therein.

A first comparison between two registers is shown in Table 2, containing data coming from the *Padrón* (January the 1st of each year) and from the Legal Resident lists (December the 31st, previous year). The difference of one day obeys to nothing else but a statistical criterion.⁵ An index has been calculated using the *Padrón* as numerator and Residents as denominator. If the index surpasses 100, we may suppose that immigrants without permits (“illegal immigration”) have registered, as well as all the immigrants with permits (“legal immigration”), who need not do it.

In theory, the possibility of it being below 100 is to be unexpected. It implies two possibilities. The first one is that immigrants without permits do not exist. The other is that not every legal resident gets inscribed in the *Padrón*. The first supposition is not true. One can admit, therefore, that the number of registered immigrants is inferior to the people living in the country, because not even *all* residents with permits are inscribed in the *Padrón*. This estimation would not then be useful to calculate how many people are residing in the country in total, and much less how many of them do not have permits. On one

⁵ On EUROSTAT legal residents appear with date of January the 1st, not December de 31st, in order to unite them with the rest of European countries. The statistics are the same in the case of Spain.

hand, an increase in the number of immigrants without permits in regard to those who do have one (shown by an index above 100 and rising), may be dependant on the increasing of illegal immigration in the period, which overtakes the regularization which took place in those same years. On the other, it still is a clear indicator of the will of relation with the state, for immigrants carry out a voluntary inscription, even when they are in an illegal situation.

Table 2

Indexes relating foreigners in two registers: *Padrón*/Residents x 100

YEAR	TOTAL	EUROPE	AFRICA	AMERICA	ASIA	OCEANIA	Stateless
2000	115,3	121,6	107,5	124,1	85,2	124,8	59
2001	152,9	154,3	114,4	221,1	99,2	170,7	
2002	177,8	175,8	131,5	252,4	104,3	194,5	
2003	201,2	197,7	142,6	282,3	126,9	205,6	62
2004	184,2	185,7	133,9	237,9	121,1	188,6	56
2005	186,3	198,5	140,8	219,1	134,2	204,8	80

NOTE: *Padrón* date 1-1-x+1/Legal residents date 31-12-x

Table 2 is the blatant evidence that people do not equally trust the State and that their attitude towards the administration and, in the case, towards the municipality register (*Padrón*), which is voluntary, differs from one continent of origin to another. It is also true that attitudes may change, as may do the information in their different networks. In the first two years, less people coming from Asia register than the total amount of residents with permit. In the rest of the continents, indexes increase, though with oscillations, as is the case of Africa. That may have different causes: the number of people without permits varies along time, the attitude towards administration changes, the number of regularized people in both amnesties (2000 and 2001) is smaller than the number of people who have come into the country and have no permit. Yet, we must reckon amnesties have allowed the incorporation in the following years, of previously resident individuals without permits. The quantity of people without permits is to be expected to decrease after a regularization process.⁶ In the cases of America, Europe and Oceania the increase in the index is evident. For one thing, it is probable that the number of people without permits grows and, for another, that there exists information in the communities which considers advantageous the inscription in the municipality register (*Padrón*). Possibly, most people know there are benefits in voluntary inscription. People who do so live in homes of their own and familiar cores, which can be declared upon inscription.⁷

About Stateless and people whose nationality is unknown, we only have data for four years. They are missing twice in the *Padrón*, even though there is a number of Residents. Much on the contrary, compared to other immigrants, these people tend to the so called “invisibility”, that is, they prefer not doing anything which is not compulsory, such as getting a permit. Not even when they

⁶The “Calling Effect” (consisting in the conclusion that regularization processes cause a greater arrival of immigrants) is not to be exposed nor discussed here, for that increase may obey to a group of not so easily settled factors.

⁷ Fraud has even got to the point of declaring 60 people living in the same normal lodging. An information on the matter published in the newspaper *Metro*, 10th October, 2005, page 4: “In Barcelona there are hundreds of overpopulated flats”

have got one, dare many of them inscribe in the municipality register. We must point out that they call themselves “stateless”, but that denomination, such as “refugee”, must be given and stated by the Spanish administration, and mostly that is not the case.

In short, we could mention some points:

- It is not possible to estimate the total quantity of foreign people who reside in Spain, even having both compulsory and voluntary registrations.
- The numbers displayed in voluntary registrations, such as *Padrón* or Census, give a minimal idea of the total quantity of residents.
- This attitude may vary depending on the origin (continent) and on time.
- A greater trust in the state matches with greater success rates in the regularization processes, for people carrying out voluntary registration.

ESTIMATIONS AND COMPARISONS BETWEEN DIFFERENT SOURCES

Given the fact that people coming from different continents do not register freely in the same proportions, it will be difficult to consider that voluntary registrations will contain the whole foreign population, documented or undocumented. *Padrón* and Census, which constitute the options of voluntary registration, would, logically, contain more population inscribed than the List of legal residents, beforehand. Nevertheless, we have already seen that this theoretical hypothesis may not be actually precise. Next, we will calculate two indicators to record, once more, the different attitudes of the immigrants in Spain in the light of their continent of origin. This is a synthesis proposal, which contains most of the sources we have been working with up to now. But we will not necessarily work with the same quantities we have formerly used to calculate other indicators. In the first place, an index will be calculated, as is shown in Table 3. In that case, we will set forth a comparison between Census (date November the 1st, 2001) and legal residents two months later.

In the second place, we will compare estimated populations by means of adding up the results of the processes which took part from January the 1st, 2000 to January the 1st, 2002. That implies the process of assuming a basis population, legal residents the last day of the previous year (December the 31st, 1999), adding all the people who requested an amnesty both in 2000 and 2001 and, then, examine the results. If, during the period, immigrants without permits kept on entering the country, *Padrón* will have more people than the addition of legal residents and amnesty requesters. If it has less, it means that not even after having requested an amnesty do some immigrants want to register in the municipality. It is also significant about the amount of undocumented people currently arriving and residing in the country. Fluxes are never the same for all continents, and these last years it seems that it was greater from America, which can be detected by this mean.⁸

The advantage of this easy addition is that it presumes that everyone who is requesting an amnesty is actually in the country, even though he or she does not register in the municipality. It allows, then, a close estimation of the people living in Spain, though not voluntarily registered. The inconvenient lays in the fact that some people who requested the amnesty in 2000, may also do so

⁸. Ministry's data referring to detected “illegal” immigration concerns only the people arrived via the sea, and, such, only from certain origins.

in 2001. That is not a usual case, for when the second process began, the first one was still unconcluded, and people could not know the result of their requests. Broadly, it was a new chance for people who could not acquire the necessary documentation at time for the process of 2000.

Table 3

COMPARISONS between different sources on foreign populations by continent:

1. Basis INDEX 100; Census November the 1st, 2001 and Residents December the 31st, 2001

2. ESTIMATION on foreign population living in SPAIN on January the 1st, 2002.

CONTINENT	1. INDEX	2. ESTIMATION
EUROPE	127	166
AFRICA	108	103
AMERICA	207	206
ASIA	80	78
OCEANIA	142	164
Stateless / Unknown	33	
TOTAL	140	139

1. Foreign population who carried out the Census / Legal residents x 100 = INDEX

2. Residents on December the 31st, 1999 + Amnesty requests in 2000 + in 2001+ newcomers = *Padrón* on January the 1st, 2002

1. INDEX

In this case, we will establish a comparison between “legal” residents on December the 31st, 2001 and Census two months earlier, on November the 1st, 2001. As immigration from outside is positive, at the end of the year, there will be more people than two months before. That’s why, if an error must happen, it would be in a different direction than what indicators show. Being the Census a voluntary survey, those who register do not get direct or evident benefits. In this case, we have also chosen a basis rate of 100. If the result equaled 100, everybody inscribed in the Census would be a legal resident two months later. If it is superior, there would be more people freely registered and, therefore, without permits. If it is inferior, it means that not even having permits people is to register in the Census.

Most people who register in the Census and have no permit come from America, where one out of each two people who do so is not in the Residents list at the end of the year. This is indicative not only of a desire of improving the relations with the State administration, but also of important non-regular fluxes from that continent.

Just as happened before, Oceania and Europe also display high indexes: people without permit tend to fulfill the voluntary poll. In the case of Africa, hardly more people than those who have permits get inscribed in the Census. It is the same for the whole of Spain but, in the case of Catalonia, where African residents were majority in that date, the calculated index is lower, and just reaches 94. As for Asia, there are less people in the Census than in the Residents list at the end of 2001. The behavior of the Stateless and those whose nationality is unknown is the same as in previous occasions: they try to avoid registering.

To summarize: if there are a 40% of residents without permit as the average in all Spain, they seem to concentrate in the three continents which get higher success rates in the Amnesties, America, Europe and Oceania. Africa

either has no people without permits – a most improbable thing – or a part of its population does not register. It is evidence that not all Asians register. *Padrón* allows estimations on people without permits only in the cases of the first three continents, whose populations tend to register regardless of their situation, though not for Africa and Asia.

2. ESTIMATION

This calculation allows not only to forming an idea of the attitudes of people from different continents about administration concerning voluntary registration, but also of the sum of people arrived in that interval of two years and who, not having permits, have registered. On those who have arrived but not registered no estimation whatsoever can be done, with this sources.

The most outstanding feature of the two indicators in Table 3 is their almost perfect match. In this case, when we added up all the amnesty requests, we wanted to bring under account all the population who presented them, not only those who got the acceptance. This is a way to count up as many residents as able, who, by other means, would remain unknown. That is to say, all those people who do not have permits, wish to get one but are not always ready to register.

The second remarkable feature is that amnesty processes, even if in the supposition that they could grant permits to everybody who demanded one (which is not the case, for many people do not meet the requirements), would not be enough in order to regularize all the people already living in the country, because immigrants keep on permanently coming. If the amnesty had been solved favorably to everybody, in January the 1st, 2002 there would have been 40% more people residing with a permit.

On the other hand, people coming from Asia still do not register, even when they are taking the steps towards demanding an amnesty. That indicates the administrative relations with the State are reduced to the minimum: only those who are obligatory, including the requests for residence permits. It is a mistake to assume that there are no undocumented immigrants from this origin, for in all the amnesty processes, including the ongoing process of 2005, a noteworthy number of Asians have also made their requests.

The case of Africa is below the minimum levels. The sum of people residing legally plus all the African amnesty requesters of 2000 and 2001 get close to the quantity shown in the *Padrón* on January the 1st, 2002. That does not mean the arrival of undocumented immigrants is inexistent, but rather that their number may be small, almost nothing, and that's why the municipality registration does not allow accurate estimations on this continent.

On the opposite edge, we can find the three continents that had the higher success rates in the amnesties and that, nevertheless, accumulate a bigger amount of people without permits. That means, in the first place, that there is a notable undocumented immigration arriving from those origins. In the second place, these people tend to register. Consequently, we can estimate at least a minimum amount of people without permits, an operation neither available for Asia nor for Africa.

America's case is extreme: it has the highest success rate in the amnesties while, at the same time, having the biggest share of people without permits in the Census as well as in the *Padrón*. This people, that appear to be

entering Spain in big quantities these last years, tend to inscribe in all existent voluntary registers, and that fact allows us to have an approximate idea of those who do not have permits and live in the country.

The indicators of Table 3 have served us to confirm two aspects already pointed out in the previous ones. Firstly, that *almost all* people who register come from three continents. Europe, America and Oceania get a better success rate when requesting amnesties, and, also, people from these origins are permanently arriving to Spain, so there is always a high population without permits. On the contrary, people who do not get registered do not allow adequate estimation on the sum of people without permits and people who have arrived in the last years, and do not have such a high success rate in the amnesty processes. Certainly, the lack of registration and the lack of permits are linked.

To summarize, the more immigrants relate voluntarily with the State, the more possibilities will they have of getting residence permits. That is so because of the proving methods: if they get registered, they will be able later on to prove they have already been in the country for a period of time before. It is also related with the trust they put in these administrative relations: if they get registered, they show up, they are telling the State where they are living, so the State will be able to determine how many people without permits are residing in its ground. On the contrary, people who hide themselves and do not declare their stay will have later on increased difficulties in getting a permit, so they tend to remain further on at the margin of the State, to make themselves even “less visible” for the State and its administration.

CONCLUSSION

We must innovate all the time in the construction of indicators of integration. Comparisons in Barcelona City with data from NGOs and other organizations have shown that foreign people from different origins (by continent) had different behaviors in the relation with Institutions [Sarrille, 2002 b].

Attitudes towards the registration on the city “*Padrón*” by continents of origins have changed with the last Regularization Processes. Even though we have established that there were different behaviors according to the communities of origin (by continents), this disparities will nowadays disappear because the shared information is equal for everybody. So, perhaps, most indicators used in this work will not be useful anymore in the near future. Others must be constructed or we will have to search for alternative ones in order to replace them. All demographic phenomena (such as births or marriages) can be indicators of family formations and, in the long term, of an intention of a long stay in the country.

We must go on and consider official data about education, health, and social assistance. The relations that communities of origin establish with the administration of the Spanish State are important to realize their participation in civil society. Demographic indicators can help us, for they can show voluntary situations or consequences of marriages and births, such as the education of new generations.

Integration is a long process, but it does not begin when foreign people have permits. In my opinion, integration begins with people’s arrival in the

country. Administrative relations with the State may depend on the previous experiences as a citizen in their country of origin. The process of integration in the new society might expend more or less time. It will be very different for people from different continents or countries. Trusting in the State can facilitate integration and administrative relations in the new society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BOUDON, Raymond (1977) *Effets pervers et ordre social*, PUF, Paris.
- HAO Lingxin y Yukio KAWANO (2001, 38, 3, 375-389) Immigrant's Welfare Use and Opportunity for Contact with Co-Ethnics, *Demography*, The Population Association of America.
- ECO, Umberto, Michel Camdessus, Jean Daniel y Andrea Riccardi (2005) *Islam y Occidente, Reflexiones para una convivencia*, Editorial Sudamericana, Buenos Aires.
- GUALDA CABALLERO, Estrella y Marta RUIZ GARCÍA (2004, 2, 4, 36-65) Migración femenina de Europa del Este y mercado de trabajo, *Migraciones Internacionales*, EL Colegio de la Frontera Norte, México.
- INE, Web del instituto, *Cifras sobre población extranjera: Explotación el Padrón y Residentes legales*, Madrid
- LATTES, Alfredo E; Pablo A Comelatto y Cecilia M. Levit (2003, 17, 50, 69-110) Migración internacional y dinámica demográfica en la Argentina durante la segunda mitad del siglo XX, *Estudios Migratorios Latinoamericanos*, CEMLA, Buenos Aires.
- MARTÍNEZ LÓPEZ, Albert (2000, 46, 603-629) La emigración gallega a ultramar: A Coruña 1858-1867, *Estudios Migratorios Latinoamericanos*, CEMLA, Buenos Aires.
- METRO (13/10/2005) Barcelona tiene más de 20000 "pisos patera", pg 4.
- MINISTERIO DE TRABAJO Y ASUNTOS SOCIALES *Anuario de Migraciones 2002*, Madrid, edición impresa y consulta [www](http://www.mtss.es).
- MOORS, H, I ESVELDT y E. VAN DAM (2001, 57, 3-4, 191-213) Opinions on migrants and immigration policy in the Netherlands in a European Perspective.
- PIMENTEL, Manuel (2005) Muros de Vergüenza mutua, en *El Periódico de Catalunya*, Barcelona, 8 de octubre, artículo de opinión.
- RECOLONS ARQUER, Lluís (2001, 56, 224, 679-694) La población de origen extranjero y su impacto en las sociedades europeas, *Revista de Fomento Social*, ETEA, Córdoba.
- SARRIBLE, Graciela (1998, 13, 39, 239-256) Sobre las migraciones comunitarias y extracomunitarias: contra la exclusión como calificativo genérico, *Estudios Migratorios Latinoamericanos*, CEMLA, Buenos Aires.
- (2002 a, 2, 123-146) Definiciones y datos sobre migración internacional y nacionalidad: el caso de España, *Migraciones Internacionales*, El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, Tijuana.
- (2002 b, VIII, 1, 247-274) Latinoamericanos en Barcelona: perfiles y demandas de servicios, *Revista Venezolana de Análisis de Coyuntura*, Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas y Sociales, Universidad Central de Venezuela.
- (2003) Migración: la construcción social de una experiencia, *Papers*, 69, 149-160, UAB, Barcelona.
- (2004 a) Argentinos y Brasileños en España: Perfiles de ciudadanos del MERCOSUR, Proyecto Diáspora, www.centroargentino.org/ecodar/ARGBRAS
- (2004 b) Los latinoamericanos y las instituciones públicas en España:

Percepción social de colectivos extranjeros, Conferencia en la Universidad Joao Pessoa (Brasil)

(2005a) Chapter XIV: Inmigrantes extranjeros, acceso a los servicios e información, in *Integraciones Diferenciadas: migraciones en Cataluña, Galicia y Andalucía*, Carlota Solé and Antonio Izquierdo (edit), Anthropos, Barcelona.

(2005b, 17, 102, 293-303) L'apport des étrangers à l'accroissement de la population en Espagne, *Migrations Société*, CIEMI, París.

(2005, 77, 219-223) Informe sobre el Coloquio: De la emigración a la inmigración en Europa. Encuentro del Grupo de investigaciones sobre Migraciones, ISA, Cerisy-La-Salle, 2-6 de junio de 2005, para *Papers*, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

SARRIBLE, Graciela y Patricia MUSTAFÁ (2004) La ciudadanía de los brasileños en España: los derechos garantizados por ambos Estados, en *Pluriculturalismo y Globalización: producción del conocimiento para la construcción de la ciudadanía en Latinoamérica*, Instituto de Cooperación Iberoamericana, Barcelona, 149-156