1. Introduction
This paper aims to introduce a group of specific contributions presented in the same panel “Diversity management practices addressed to Third Country Nationals [here after TCNs] across EU Countries: Promoting Discussion, Exchanges and a Common Agenda. The panel focuses on the emerging findings of a research conducted within the project “DIVERSE – Diversity Improvement as a Viable Enrichment Resource for Society and Economy”, supported by the European Commission1, coordinated by the research centre WWELL of the Catholic University of Milan and realized in cooperation with 14 partners2.

The papers presented in this panel are part of a multi-situated research, conducted in selected regions of 10 EU countries (Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Italy, The Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Spain and Sweden), which intends to fill the knowledge gaps, provide shared points of reference, and increase awareness of the advantages allowed by Diversity Management [here after DM] practices implemented by profit, public and non-profit organizations.

As we will describe, the overall and long-term aim of the project is to “rejuvenate” the European approach to immigration, resolving the historical paradox generated by the attempt to keep together two contradictory logics3: the “economicistic” logic on which the system of entry (and stay) are regulated and the logic of solidarity and equal opportunities. Actually, on the one hand the European countries approach to the government of migrations is traditionally characterized by an emphasis on the working dimension: this is pivotal for the social acceptance of TCNs presence, nurturing the view of a complementarity between autochthonous and foreign work, and thus favouring migrants’ concentration in low-skilled and low-status jobs. At the same time, European countries –consistently with their historical focus on human rights– have formally extended an
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ample hamper of protections, rights and opportunities to foreign workers and their family members, with the result of transforming “temporary migrant workers” into “semi-citizens” (or denizens4).

For overcoming this paradox, three major changes are necessary, which constitute the challenges addressed by DIVERSE: a) shifting from the perception of migrants as contingently instrumental resources to the conception of their human capital as a structural resource for the economic and social development of European societies; b) promoting a wider awareness, among different types of organisations, of the importance and potentialities of DM strategies; c) improving the social participation and the civic engagement of TCNs (and especially their participation to voluntary non profit organisations) for the construction of an inclusive European society and in order to change their common perception as people who need to be helped and assisted. The basic assumption, which has inspired the complex set of tasks involved by the project is the awareness that a real and sustainable change in the attitudes toward of and TCNs, able to valorize their potential, needs the active involvement of different stakeholders and the implementation of different kinds of action.

In this paper we will present the main theoretical assumptions on which the idea of the project was based [§ 2,3 and 4], and we will provide a brief description of the activities and objectives it envisages [§ 5].

2. The “Unresolved Paradox” of the European Legacy

International migration, as we construct it socially and institutionally5, is a “national” phenomenon, forged by those very ideological representations that have enabled the birth of the nation-state6 and representing the limit of the nation state, which, in order to exist, has surrounded itself with national borders and has adopted the criteria necessary to discriminate between nationals and others. Immigration “disturbs”, in that it unmasks the historical and contingent nature of the fundamental ideas on which the state is founded: borders, citizenship, the cultural homogeneity of the nation, the attachment to a specific territory7. In this light, it is clear that the phenomenon of migration is destined to become an object of “special” attention. Right from the start, the development of legislation regarding citizenship has addressed not only those issues of a practical and symbolic nature associated with the process of nation building, but also that of regulating migratory movement. Above all with the end of free migration at the outbreak of the Second World War and the introduction of new forms of policing of borders, the concept of border took on its present-day meaning: besides delimiting the territory under the authority of the state, it serves as a filter for selecting those who, although not citizens of a given state, aspire to reside and work there. Finally, with the establishment of the differing national variants of the Welfare State, the nationalistic projects reached its zenith and accomplishment: from that moment on, the state boundaries were to mark the limit of access to the privileges guaranteed by appurtenance to this group of solidarity.

The constitution of forms of institutionalized solidarity8 or of collectivity of redistribution9, or else of political mediation of the modalities of inclusion and exclusion10 represents one of the most
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meaningful historical outcomes of the process of nation building: social rights have acted as *institutional stabilizers* that bring together individuals and groups and at the same time the state as a distinct entity. It is in fact precisely the social rights that have revived cultural identity and promoted the citizens’ loyalty to the public institutions, reinforcing political and social cohesion thanks to the promise of substantial equality for all members of a national community. Hence it is certainly not by chance that the welfare systems have developed at the same pace as the process of policing the borders\(^\text{11}\). At the outset, in fact, access to welfare benefits was confined to the citizens and, besides, the *model of temporary work*, typical of the European experience\(^\text{12}\); with its “aversion” to the prospect of a stable settlement of immigrant families and communities, contained within itself the reasons for legitimizing a differential treatment towards the *Gastarbeiter*; specifying, in particular, limited access for them to the social security systems, their exclusion from political rights, their “natural” concentration in the lower ranks of the professional stratification. The rhetorical figure of the guest worker allows European societies to postpone the problem of the inclusion of non-nationals in the community of their citizens; but also the opportunity to take advantage from their contribution to the long-term economic, social and institutional development of the hosting communities\(^\text{13}\). However, with time the need to come to grips with the question of the boundaries of the political community has become a matter of urgency as the latter has lost its congruence with the community of residents (and that of taxpayers). As they have been defined within the nation-state, *these boundaries are no longer capable of giving adequate shape to appurtenance, of functioning as a filter for the allocation of the rights –and duties– traditionally associated with citizenship, of legitimizing the participation in those groups of solidarity that are represented by welfare regimes, of selecting the target of the practices of human capital training, recruitment and development*. Expressed in clearer terms, the aspiration of states to be able to “choose” those belonging to them, excluding foreigners, appears increasingly less legitimate\(^\text{14}\), at the same time as the ethics of systems of redistribution and protection based on the “fiction” of societies surrounded by national “fences” are becoming more and more disputable, and the practices of institutional discrimination more and more disruptive for the competitiveness of European societies. Hence the imposing reflection around the question of *citizenship*\(^\text{15}\), the *borders of membership*\(^\text{16}\) and the *inclusion/exclusion practices* implemented by European education systems\(^\text{17}\) and labor markets\(^\text{18}\).


13 Actually, besides the failed attempt to drastically reduce new entrants, followed by the majority of European countries since the ’1970 and until the end of the 20\(^{th}\) century, in the last years, after the tentative reopening of the borders to an increasingly selective immigration, the solution proposed by the majority of countries is once again the preference for migrations of a seasonal or temporary nature. Underneath the option of temporariness it is therefore easy to espy the attempt to discourage the “sedentarisation” of the immigrant populations and all the problems that this implies, not least of all their strain on the assistance and redistributive apparatus imposed by the regime of *legal embeddedness* [Cornelius W.A., Martin P.L., Hollifield J.F. (1994), “Introduction: The Ambivalent Quest for Immigration Control”, in Cornelius W.A., Martin P.L. and J.F. Hollifield (eds.), *Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, pp. 3-41] within which the European states have to operate, that greatly limits the possibility of modulating the benefits of welfare in order to gratify the wishes of their electorate.


What emerges from this impressive number of contributions is the ineradicable tension between petitions for inclusion and exclusion that characterizes the relationship between immigration, citizenship, welfare regimes and the main institutions of the European societies—a relationship that is today also marked by two fundamental dimensions, that of conflict between foreigners and citizens for access to the various social opportunities and resources, and the symbolic one, where governments use the possibility to modulate levels of access to rights and opportunities as a fundamental strategy to win over the consensus of the electors. In any case, even when the politico-social compromise has arrived at solutions that are apparently more inclusive—for example the incorporation of migrants into the community of the nationals, or the equalization of foreigners and citizens concerning access to social rights and services, or even the recognition of specific needs that require ad hoc solutions—immigrants and those belonging to ethnic minorities are, with few exceptions, overrepresented in the categories at risk of exclusion (from school drop-outs to the unemployed, and including elderly people with no adequate income). Approached in this statistical sense—a systematic disadvantage (aside from the reasons determining this disadvantage), with respect to the natives, regarding access to resources, opportunities and social institutions—the category of discrimination can be very useful for looking into “what is not working” in the policies of inclusion and of individual empowerment, revealing all the ambivalence—that at times borders on hypocrisy—with which the European societies tackle the embarrassing question of inequalities, as well as the counter-intuitive effects often generated by policies designed to promote greater social equity. It would seem that immigration does not cease to exert its function of disturbance, becoming a living metaphor for the broken promises that the European societies had aspired to fulfill. And it is precisely in their witnessing the discrepancy between formal and substantial equality that migrants and their children come to represent an object of study that is particularly productive in the reflection on the present and the future of social cohesion and economic competitiveness. Besides, on account of the demographic weight of the descendants of families immigrating to contemporary Europe, apart from the problem of social equity, their experience evokes a strategic question for the survival of democracy and the development of knowledge economies.

The literature on these themes is so vast that it cannot here even be summarised. We shall limit ourselves to referring to three main aspects, representing the fundamental background of all the activities envisaged by our project. They were particularly inspired by the experience of Italy, whose institutional framework is paradigmatic of the weaknesses and risks of the European approach to immigration.

The first one lies in the above mentioned tension between the principle of equal opportunities—indicated by Europe as being the main way forward to the construction of a cohesive society and a competitive economy—and the philosophy that continues to inspire migratory policies, explicitly or implicitly based on the idea of complementariness between autochthonous and immigrant labour. Here we come to the core of the unresolved paradox of the European experience, the paradox of a population of “guest workers” transformed into denizens, without any significant change in the expectations of Europeans concerning immigration, summed up by the expression “those who have

20 Note that it is the European regulations themselves that embody this type of contradiction, whereby in recognising the unlawfulness of discrimination, they leave unchanged the prerogatives of the member states to define the conditions of entry and access to the labour market for citizens of other countries. Cf. in particular Council Directive 2000/43/CEE.
a job can come in; to be more precise, a job that we don't want to do ourselves”\(^{21}\). In the case of Italy, this paradox is even exacerbated: paradoxically, they are exactly the political and social forces pro-migrants oriented who tend to legitimize the right of foreigners to enter the receiving country or to be regularized, or else to express the wish for a widening of the contingents admitted, with invariable reference to the need for immigrant labor on the part of the domestic economy and society in order to restore the mismatch between supply and demand. An approach that risks thwarting the possibility of an effective government of immigration –that ends up in this way by being consigned to the market and all its shortcomings and failures– and that reveals its limits at the moment in which this need becomes less incontestable and, together with the accusations of social dumping and the probabilities of interethnic conflict, there is a growing resistance to sharing resources and opportunities.

A second aspect is that discriminatory phenomena arise from the “normal” functioning of the institutions much more frequently than when they are the consequence of intentional decisions perhaps inspired by the crude propaganda of xenophobic movements. Within the theoretical picture delineated by the various “post-assimilationist” approaches\(^{22}\), with their insistence on the interactive nature of the integration process, the attention of researchers moves from individual and family deficits to the architecture and functioning of the main social institutions (from school to the labour market and the welfare apparatus itself) which, in operation, tend to reproduce the social inequalities, transforming the privilege of the outset into a merit. In particular, given the growing relevance of school career on professional destiny, great emphasis is placed on the education system, the efficacy—or inefficacy—of which is revealed in a paradigmatic manner in the experience of young people with a migratory background, thus bringing us to the heart of the debate on the future of the welfare systems, where the priority is childhood policies, in accordance with a prevention approach that truly achieves equality of opportunity and individual empowerment. Moreover, practically every institutional system embodies, often unknowingly, cultural practices and models, producing as a consequence phenomena of cultural discrimination\(^{23}\) which are transformed into systematic disadvantages for migrants and those belonging to ethnic minorities; a problem that has been addressed with a variety of laws and measures, not always equally effective, but which have indeed at times ended up by perpetuating the condition of segregation (as in the striking case of the policy of “institutionalisation of minorities”, thus transformed into a sort of “minorisation” of the groups that it was formally intended to support). However, what we consider should be underlined is the tendency to overestimate the significance of ethnic and cultural differences, which ends up by obfuscating the causes of a structural nature consisting in the mechanisms by which inequalities are generated, reinforced and transmitted inter-generationally. Emblematic of this is the labour market, where the category of ethnic discrimination—and of interethnic conflict—may become a far too easy expedient to distract the attention from the transformations that mark the decline of the société salariale, highly jeopardizing not only the workers’ rights, but also the competitive prospective of our economies. Not by chance the tensions
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\(^{21}\) The tension between the logic of the guest worker and that of denizenship can also be seen in the fact that those that on one hand are recognized as universalistic rights, claimable in conditions of equality with the citizens (for example, the right to a job or to housing) are, at the same time, necessary requisites for obtaining the status of regular migrant, exactly the same status that confers the possession of rights.


described in the previous point have become more visible due to the economic crisis. Indeed, at least in some countries (such as Italy), migration seems to reflect the impact of the economic crisis, which, aside from increasing both the number of unemployed workers and the rate of unemployment, ended up in a downward realignment of the employment structure; the deterioration of the overall employment quality; a growth in the incidence of low-paid jobs; the exacerbation of the traditional forms of segregation by gender and nationality. In this case, both the migrants’ resilience at the beginning of the recession and the following deterioration of their occupational status and conditions may be seen as the “mirror” of a low-profile pattern of insertion/model of development that, instead of investing in quality and human capital, has preferred to follow a “myopic” strategy, relying on the reduction of the labor cost. Synthesizing, we are not only dealing with a problem of social equality, but with a crucial wager for the future of our civilization and of our economic competitiveness.

The third aspect refers to the fact that this pattern of occupational incorporation has nurtured mechanisms of both segregation and self-segregation in highly ethnicized environments from the standpoint, on one hand, of work relations, and, on the other hand, generating an imbalanced model of integration. As a consequence migrants have not been stimulated to invest in their human capital with respect, for example, to language learning, professional training, recognition of their education credentials; they have not been encouraged to be involved and engaged in social, cultural, political life of their hosting communities; they have not concerned themselves with the need of being regularly employed in order, among other things, to mature work-related pension benefits. These outcomes inhibit migrants’ potential for a sustainable development of both their hosting and sending communities. In light of these considerations, the capacity to valorize migrants’ potential (and, eventually, to make Europe more attractive for high and medium-skilled migrations) is deeply influenced by the achievable advent of a new model of integration, able to overcome the limits of the present one and to support a major involvement of migrants in the civic and political sphere, through various forms of voluntary work, civic activism and active citizenship.

In the next paragraphs we will describe some implications connected with these three aspects [§ 3 and 4] and we will provide a short description of the DIVERSE project [§ 5].

3. The “Need” of Migrant Workers. Considerations about the Role of Immigration for a Smart and Inclusive Growth

International (labor) migration has acquired greater relevance in the European political agenda in the past decades. Indeed, national governments have been gradually forced to take up a position about rapidly growing inflows of foreign workers, not only to deal with public concern, but also in response to both the ageing of the population and labor as well as skill shortages. Thus, they’ve been displaying more and more interest in managing migration pro-actively and selectively: on one side so as to tighten control over incoming population flows –especially unauthorized ones– thus reassuring public opinion about their mastery of home affairs; on the other side to meet domestic labor requirements. Actually, the economic growth and labor market restructuring, along with demographic changes, have been generating a higher and different labor demand, which could not be entirely filled up by the natives, so paving the way for a structural recourse to migration (although generally limited to the low profile jobs). Finally, during the last years, in front of the worsening of migrants’ employment condition in almost all countries, caused by the dramatic recession that hit the European economy, many governments have decided to stop new laborers entries, or to admit only seasonal/temporary and highly selected migrants. With the consequence of even exacerbating the traditional weaknesses of the European approach, as it is described above.

Indeed, national policies with respect to managing migration are usually studied, according to their nature and objectives, as divided into two main groups, following the traditional distinction between the so called “settlement countries” (Australia, Canada, the United States) and European
countries\textsuperscript{24}. The settlement countries, primarily due to the multiethnic profile of their populations, show a greater openness to migration, especially to high-skilled migration. Coherently with human capital models, they select and admit candidates for immigration on the basis of some traits which are deemed to contribute to social and economic inclusion, such as educational attainment, work experience, language proficiency and so on. Moreover, they mainly have (and particularly had in the past) permanent labor migration schemes which are not set up on prior job offer. This kind of approach is difficult to sustain in the European context, where labor movements from third countries have been normally more limited and strictly managed in response to actual labor market needs. Indeed, the entry of migrants has been traditionally conceived to face specific staff or skills shortages and therefore it has been demand-driven (with employers defining requests) and dependent on a prior job offer. Besides, most of the times migrants have been granted residence permits of limited duration, since migration has rarely been supposed to turn to permanent settlement.

More in detail, in many European countries, the aim of satisfying labor market needs has been achieved through recruitment systems such as labor market tests and occupational shortage lists. These methods have certainly contributed to find out skilled vacancies and professional areas with few or no native-born workers eligible for; above all, they have identified and categorized jobs that natives have not been willing to take up. As a matter of fact, given to the employers the faculty to lay down the rules of the selection and recruitment process, the entries have been largely restricted to specific sectors and occupations, leading to severe phenomena of labor market segregation, with a large concentration of migrants in certain segments. On one hand, though with substantial differences from one country to another, foreign workers are usually over-represented in a few sectors: manufacturing and construction, hotel and restaurant, healthcare and social services, domestic services, care for children and for the aged. On the other hand, because much of the unfilled demand for labor in these same sectors have concentrated in low-skilled occupations, foreign workers largely hold low-wage and low-status jobs; i.e. jobs that, due to their poor (dirty, difficult, dangerous, and demanding) working conditions, the native-born labor force is reluctant to perform\textsuperscript{25}. Anyway, although immigration have been playing a leading role in meeting an otherwise unanswered labor demand, may the role of migration policies be just limited to filling labor market shortages? On the contrary, may we discuss about a genuine “need” for migrants but also for a kind of migration management which could strengthen the social cohesion and competitiveness of the economy of receiving countries?

That is no doubt a strategic issue to deal with. However that needs, as it has been already pointed out in the Green Paper on an EU Approach to Managing Economic Migration [Com (2004) 811 final] «the need to review immigration policies for the longer term», since population movements, together with demographic decline and ageing «will have a huge impact on overall economic growth, the functioning of the internal market and the competitiveness of EU enterprises». Indeed, while appearing useful in the short term, as well as gainful for employers, the recourse to foreign labor could in time result in social and economic costs for receiving countries, if not managed with an eye on the future and on its overall sustainability. Immigrants represent a large proportion of the whole European labor force. Even if there has been, in the years before the beginning of the economic recession, a real improvement in their employment and working condition, they continue to face difficulties in fully integrating into the labor market (difficulties that have been becoming even stronger due to the crisis’ endurance). In particular, they are relatively more exposed than natives to negative occurrences like temporary employment, unemployment, and long-term unemployment. Besides, as in Europe the main political trend has been to resort to foreign workers

\textsuperscript{24}Papademetriou D.G., Hamilton K.A. (1995), Managing Uncertainty... above mentioned.

\textsuperscript{25}See Oecd, International Migration Outlook, Paris, Oecd Publishing, various years.
to respond to temporary and low-skilled labor shortages, immigrants often suffer from over-
qualification, whenever they hold a higher education level in comparison with the occupations
they carry out. These phenomena might be considered an unintended and dysfunctional
consequence of the way labor migration has been predominantly managed (or not managed).
Actually, by insisting mainly on the temporariness of the migration and choosing to read primarily
foreign labor in terms of complementarity with native-born workforce—as somehow the
“Community preference” principle still suggests, and coherently with the public opinion
expectations—the segmentation of the labor markets has further widened, together with all the
associated negative outcomes.

Anyway, the demand for migrant labor and the patterns of occupational inclusion of immigrants
themselves also reflect the features of local economic and productive structure. Indeed, immigration
can be certainly interpreted as the result of specific needs, sometimes contingent ones, caused by
the difficulties of finding native-born workers; but above all, more in depth, as the expression of the
competitive strategies and human capital management practices of the enterprises or even of the
whole local productive system. In truth, what it is habitually defined as the “territorialism” of the
models of immigrants occupational insertion—that is the diversification of labor market entry in
accordance with the characteristics of local contexts—represents an eloquent index not only of the
level of vitality and specialization of the productive system, but even of the choices and of the
policies of positioning, innovation and competitiveness, in the national and international scenario,
of enterprises and territories. More precisely, in front of a more intense competition on a global
scale, as well as of persistent economic cyclical difficulties, two are the options: the first, played
defensively over the cost factor; the second, a way to go on offensive, centered on qualitative
growth. In the first case, enterprises and local territories use immigration to contain or reduce labor
costs, guaranteeing in this way the survival of some productions—labor intensive but with low
technological content—that otherwise would be liable for de-localization. In the second case,
instead, the productive systems choose to bet on the qualitative and innovative growth and therefore
they mobilize and valorize to this goal all the available resources, including migrant labor that
comes to constitute a structural factor for the functioning of the local economy, not only a means to
relieve pressure on the domestic labor market due to occasional unbalances, and, as we shall see, a
strategic level within the context of competitive strategies based on the valorization of different
kinds of “differences” represented within the personnel.

Besides, if it is true, as many underline, that the current crisis call the whole productive system to
reorganize and renew to face effectively the future challenges, then it becomes crucial, for the same
future of local labor markets and societies, to plan a better human resource allocations and so get
ready to assure the preparation, the experience, the necessary skills so as to hold up the
competition. In this terms, it becomes decisive the role acknowledged to human capital and to the
processes of professional development of the workers, even and above all of migrant workers, given
that while the more dynamic societies will set apart because of their ability to attract and cultivate
human resources able to contribute to the processes of competitive innovation and growth of local
enterprises, other territories will continue instead to make use primarily of workers with medium
and low qualification—with a prevalence of immigrants among them—so becoming more vulnerable
to a bearish competition. The quantity and the profile of migration inflows thus provide a snapshot
of certain societies and labor markets. They are the expression of the choices enterprises and local

26 Huddlestone T., Dag Tjaden J. (2012), Immigrant Citizens Survey, Bruxelles, King Badouin Foundation, Migration
Policy Group.
27 We must consider that a large share of migrants workers have acceded to the European labor market through the “side
doors” of humanitarian and family immigration, or through the “back doors” of irregular and illegal immigration.
28 Zanfrini L. (2001), “Programmare” per competere”. I fabbisogni professionali delle imprese italiane e la politica di
programmazione dei flussi migratori, Unioncamere-Fondazione Cariplo-Ismu, Milan, FrancoAngeli.
systems make about their competitive positioning, their willingness to invest in intangible goods – starting from vocational training and lifelong learning–, their orientation to consider labor the resource for excellence, thus planning coherently with that the processes of selection, recruitment and professional growth. From this point of view, the difficulties and discrimination immigrants face, mainly in terms of over-qualification and segregation, not only jeopardize their own life and work trajectories; they also have a negative impact on the stability and potential of local societies. Consequently, managing migration to keep such issues under control means offering better opportunities to immigrant and to their descendants, while preventing a worsening of the current and future situation of local labor markets. After all, the matter of managing migration is still topical; or rather, the matter of managing migration so as to make it fully functional to the smart and inclusive growth of the European society, not only to its immediate economic needs. Managing labor migration for the purpose of growth, competitiveness, cohesion means, on one side, connecting migration to specific economic and productive requirements and then implementing measures to guarantee that migration itself keep up matching these requirements. That is to say that labor demand and shortages need to be properly monitored and assessed on a regular basis; but they also need to be “oriented” by means of specific initiatives and policies.

Nonetheless, managing migration, with respect to smart and inclusive growth, implies, at the same time, promoting and sustaining migrants’ social and economic integration and holding back risk factors that turn them into a disadvantaged group. Immigrants are clearly at a disadvantage. They frequently suffer, beyond different forms of discrimination, of a lack of human capital (due to poor work experience, low proficiency in the language of the host country, difficulties for the recognition of education acquired in the country of origin) and of social capital (i.e. useful relations and references). Whether or not those and other disadvantages are tackled and solved is a matter of strategic and political choices. The option of the compression of the costs will hardly reserve opportunity of development for the immigrants. Vice versa, if in order to win the challenge of the global market, enterprises and local societies would increase –along with the lines of the European Employment Strategy– the quality and the qualification of labor, foreign-born workers themselves would benefit too, as they are becoming a structural component of the workforce. In this eventuality, indeed, enterprises would consider vocational training and life-long learning policies a strategic lever to enhance immigrant labor and make it more adequate and useful to sustain the consolidation and growth of the economy. On the other hand, the processes of reorganization and the advent of a productive model that set off the contribution, the autonomy of the individual and her/his meta-professional competences (interpersonal and communicative skills, aptitude to cooperate, ability to work in team and so on), underline the issue of vocational training and lifelong learning –targeted to the improvement of professional as well as linguistic and communicative skills– to make labor a factor which could give a further advantage to local economies. That is especially true in the case of migrants, for whom training could be a doubly useful resource: first to enter (or re-enter) the labor market; second to make them overcome all the obstacles that stand in the way of their social and professional upward mobility. The current crisis suggests that migration policies have not been developing along with the second perspective, yet. Indeed, in response to the economic and occupational downturn, several countries have introduced voluntary return programs for unemployed immigrants; others have reduced entries in response to the decline in labor demand. These choices confirm that the role policies attach to migration is mainly that of adjusting labor market to cyclical variations in demand. No reference to other meanings, yet. Foreign-born employment has always been more unstable than native-born employment, as it rapidly boosts during growth but it also declines steeply in consequence of the worsening of the economic cycle. But that indicates that while foreign workers may easily enter the labor market,

they do not necessarily have sufficient guarantees of their long-term employability, because of some negative factors such as their occupational segregation in the sectors with more volatile employment, their over-representation in temporary jobs as well as in occupations with less secure contractual arrangements, their lack in human and social capital specific to the host country. Given these evidences, in order to get the most out of the economic recovery, by the light of the Europe 2020 strategy, migration policies may be based on three keywords: adaptability, employability, transferability/circularity (of qualifications as well as of social rights). In some respect, they are not new in the European political agenda. However, putting them at the core of the future migration management strategy might be decisive so as to successfully act in response to the social and economic changes that have been affecting Europe. As stated before, migration policies have been, and will be, a way to meet labor demand. At the same time, current and previous experience may be helpful to develop a more comprehensive and long-term perspective, intended both to assure that population flows respond to labor shortages and to grant migrants more opportunities, for their own as well host societies’ sake.

Actually, in a broader and more comprehensive sense, managing migrations requires considering all the necessary actions which could grant social cohesion and rights, together with economic competitiveness. Particularly in a period when employment opportunities are limited and when economic restructuring creates new imbalance between labor demand and supply, the primary concerns surely regard the necessity to enhance long-term employability of migrants, many of them being low-skilled, and to give them chances of reconversion (via training opportunities, counseling, skills evaluation, a better access to information and so on), of changing job or employer. The central issue seems therefore to design migration policies not with reference to criteria like temporariness, return, skill profiles, but to the assumption that migrant could be the typical European citizenship who, in his life course, have experience of a “life career” rather than simply of a professional career; that is to say of a composite and versatile biography in which mobility and circularity between different status and conditions would be the norm. That asks for the adoption of a new perspective in the policy making process, which makes profit of some elements of the “Transitional Labour Market” approach (TLM). The TLM approach suggests the redefinition of the borders between the labor market and other institutional spheres. It argues, in particular, that such borders needs to be more permeable so as to facilitate a plurality of transitions –between the different types of employment, employment and education or training, employment and care work, etc.– and make them reversible and promotional, not instead, as they are nowadays, associated to a high risk of precariousness and social exclusion. Thus the focus is on the means which could guarantee the necessary support to the aforesaid transitions and reduce the connected risks. In fact, as the “life career” approach (and migration) teaches, in front of an unequal endowment in the resources (human and social capital, job opportunities, etc.) not anyone success in effectively combining the plurality of life spheres in a coherent biography. There is a lack in the necessary institutional conditions, that is to say in enabling and coordinated (employment, social, care) policies and services which may increase for anyone the options at disposal, reduce the constraints and then allow individuals, independently from gender, family condition, ethnicity or class affiliation, to develop their real capabilities and so to contribute to a more cohesive and prosperous society.

Lastly, in evaluating the role of immigration for the strengthening of the cohesion and competitiveness of European economy, we can’t forget its contribution in stimulating the promotion of companies’ strategies aligned to the perspective of Diversity Management (DM). As it is well
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known, with the expression DM we mean a collection of practices aimed at creating “inclusive organizations”: i.e. workplaces able not only to favor the expressions of those aspects—aptitudes, skills, abilities, needs, cultural norms—that are specific to certain individuals and groups of people, but also to transform these aspects in an added value for the performance of the organization, considering both the internal management and the relations with the external stakeholders. Actually, there are no doubts that the matter of diversity has entered the life and the functioning of organizations as a consequence of globalization dynamics, the labor market feminization, the prolonging of active age (with the coexistence of different generations in the workplaces) and, last but not least, the growing incidence of workers with a migratory background. In this scenario, the DM suggests to interpret and address diversity not as a problem to be solved, but as a resource to be valorized. Going beyond the logic of equal opportunities, the DM approach doesn’t limit to remove discriminatory barriers against minority groups, but entails a positive effort to free the distinctive potential of each individual. Finally, in order to obtain effective results, it needs integrating into organizational strategies and culture, through the direct engagement of the top management, and through specific initiatives intended to mobilize the different components of the organization.33

In a managerial perspective, the DM approach move from the assumption that a “pluralistic” labor force—both in terms of socio-demographic (age, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability and so on) and individual traits (values, family condition, training and professional experience, etc.)—is a crucial opportunity to improve corporate competitiveness and performance in the present scenario. More precisely, according to the findings of the researches carried out in different countries, we can summarize some typical organizational advantages of a coherent DM strategy as follows: i) cost reduction, due to a decrease of employees’ turnover and absenteeism; ii) benefits connected with the recruitment process, stemming from the enlargement of the overall basin from which to draw human capitals and talents; iii) marketing advantages, because the inclusion of employees of different cultural backgrounds improves the ability to understand and satisfy the needs and expectations coming from different categories of customers; iv) strengthening of the organizational skills needed to support company’s internationalizations and partnership building strategies; v) improvement of the quality of problem solving processes, thank to the mutual confrontation of different perspectives and sensibilities which results in benefits for both work teams’ productivity and the organizational capacity of innovation; vi) increasing of the “intangible resources” of the organization with regard to company reputation (openness to diversity is seen as an indicator of social responsibility) as well as human resources’ motivation and fidelity. All these reasons rend DM practices and the degree of their diffusion a strategic indicator of the quality of the integration process.

Finally, we can’t forget the role of migrants as entrepreneurs so significant, in a lot of European countries, to the point that if the migrant factory worker represented the paradigmatic figure of the fordist phase of international migrations, the migrant entrepreneur seems to be one of the typical figures of the post-fordist scenario. This phenomenon, addressed by a large array of researches and studies, is not taken into account in our project; nevertheless, it is has some evident connections

with the envisaged prospect of recognition and valorization of migrants’ role for the development of the European society.

4. From Gastarbeiters to Active Citizens: How Migrants can contribute to the Common Well-being and the European Cohesion

In the present “global” society it is virtually impossible to think about the meaning of the membership to a given society without tackling the migration issue. As it is well known, in the tradition of European democracies, the membership to the national society is based on the status of citizen. But, as foreigners, “temporarily” living in a given state, migrants are partially excluded from citizenship rights (especially from political rights), putting into question the borders of the State, as we have already discussed [§ 2]. Moreover, as belonging to different cultural and religious traditions, migrants and members of ethnic minorities expect to be recognized and respected as “diverse”, and ask for special and differential treatments and rights, putting into question the principle of equality on which European democracies are based. Last but not least, as they are concentrated in the lower ranks of the social stratification, migrants are perceived as “welfare consumers” (or even as parasites), putting into question the systems of social protection and their impact on the public balance. For all these reasons, we have assisted at the proliferation of attempts to redefine the “borders” of the political community and the modality of inclusion of these “new-comers”, going ahead of the traditional nationalistic model. More in detail, the debate of last years have yielded some possible “solutions” to the impasse in which the institution of citizenship finds itself owing to the increase in migration37. In an extremely synthetic manner, we can observe how some of them envisage an enlargement of the category of citizens, facilitating the transformation of foreigners into citizens (through the adoption of legislations based on jus soli’s principles and the facilitation of the naturalization process)38; a disconnection of the nationality from the entitlement of citizenship rights, linking the entitlements of rights to the principle of residence –as it happens in the EU member states after 5 years of legal residence– and enlarging the hamper of rights guaranteed to regularly resident foreigners (according to the denizenship prospect39); the establishment of supranational political communities, giving supplementary rights to the citizens of the adhering States (as realized in the European Union, through the institution of the European Citizenship accorded to all the citizens of the member states); or else the disconnection of the entitlement of rights from the belonging to a specific political community, basing it on the same fact of being a person (through the introduction of a so-called post-national citizenship40, which enriches the rights guaranteed to all human beings independently of their nationality). Some other solutions are even more directly inspired by migrants’ experiences and expectations; they acknowledge a situation of “dual belonging”, admitting the opportunity to enjoy rights (included the political rights) in both the sending and the destination country and the possession of a dual citizenship (according to the prospective of the so called transnational citizenship41) and arriving to recognize on the legislative, political and judicial levels, the “diversity” of individuals with a migratory background, by the introduction of “special” rights and treatments reserved to (national/ethnic) minorities (according to the prospective of the so called multicultural citizenship42).

We shall not enter more in depth in this debate. However, it is important to remark that citizenship is not only an instrument through which individuals can accede to some rights and opportunities – including the right to vote and to take part to the decisional process about all the matters of collective interest–. Citizenship has also a participatory dimension, made by the forms of mobilization and of civic activism emerging from the civil society. It evokes the sense of identity and solidarity experienced by an individual in the public or collective sphere. Finally, it is also a manner through which a national community reasserts the fundamental principles on which is based and express its cultural identity and its values; moreover, it’s a way to assert the citizens’ duty to respect these values and to transmit them to the following generations. For all these reasons, the rules and criteria about the possibility, for the migrants and their children, to become citizens of the residing state, are tremendously relevant. In their relationship with migration, the citizenship and its associated rights have both an integrative value –considering that they seal the achievement of a process of inclusion, while stimulating this same process– and a symbolic value –as a means through which a national society allows the inclusion of new members and welcomes their contribution to the economic, civic and cultural development–. It’s for all these reasons that the European society must assign a particular attention to the process that “transforms” a temporary migrant into a citizen –eventually passing through the status of denizen–. It is not a mere procedural matter, as it is frequently presented by the political and media debate (often focused, for example, on the length of residence needed to become a citizen), but it implies putting emphasis on citizenship rights and especially on citizenship duties and responsibilities, whether or not migrants would acquire the citizenship of the host country, and to the basic issue of the values and principles on which the coexistence must be based43.

In this respect, a first point that must be stressed is that the poor “quality” of democracy in most origin countries, together with the characteristics of the process of incorporation (especially in the case of countries with a weak culture of legality), certainly does not bode well for the maturing of a sense of civic responsibility44. It is precisely for this reason that educational initiatives must be a priority of the actions addressed to the migrants communities with the aim of transmitting the idea that being a citizen of a society should involve a greater awareness both of one’s own rights –starting from the right to be treated as equal–, and of one’s duties, including that of participating in the social, cultural and political life of the country, by contributing ideas, capabilities and projects. In particular, it is of fundamental importance to promote the awareness of the fact that the “social” quality of a country depends on the capacity of the public institutions to support the citizens, but also on the contribution of the latter to the collective wellbeing. Especially in the case of migrants coming from countries that lack a public system of social protection (as that incorporated in the European welfare regimes), it is therefore important to make them conscious of the fact that work is a productive activity aimed at procuring those goods that we need; but our needs –and those of our relatives– will be adequately fulfilled depending also on how much of our income contributes to furthering those institutions set up by the community for the pursuit of these aims. Thus, it is quite relevant to promote migrants’ contribution and belonging, also in terms of “fiscal morality” and fair access to welfare state provision. Especially if we consider that migrants are usually more vulnerable and exposed to the risk of poverty, and they might be driven by the desire of acquiring wellbeing and security levels that can’t be provided in their countries; accordingly, they may display a behavior perceived as “predatory” in claiming social benefits. In this respect actions intended to stimulate public spirit could be beneficial to migrants as well as to the host societies.

Another point that must be highlighted concerns the specific characters of the European approach, and its tendency to legitimate migrants’ presence because of labor shortages, with the inevitable effect of encouraging a conception of citizenship that is only partial. Not by chance, those referring to the economic need for migrants (“to do the jobs that native workers no longer want to do”) in order to justify the request for more open migration policies are often the members of the civil and political society who are the most favorable to immigration. This type of approach evidently contributes, as we have remarked [§ 2], to create “unbalanced” integration models in which the economic (working) dimension is overemphasized compared to the others. Not incidentally, it happens that the more “integrated” migrants communities, characterized by high employability and strong adaptability to the labor shortages, risk, because of these traits, to be relegated to the fringe of public life, confined to ethnically connoted environments that certainly do not sustain their aptitude to be actively involved in the social, cultural and political life. For all these reasons, it is necessary to “rejuvenate” this kind of integration model, by promoting the role of migrants and their associations in the public sphere, and their sense of responsibility towards the society in which they live. This transformation, desirable result of a circular process active both in ethnic communities and in the autochthonous population, could have a twofold value: i) on the one side, it may foster a more “mature” relation of migrant population with the receiving society institutions, so as to lead the former to play an active role in promoting the integration process in the community of residence; ii) secondly, it may enhance, among the natives, an image of immigrants as subjects who do not shirk the duty of participation and undertaking responsibilities also on a collective level. In this perspective, in addition to their participation in the receiving society’s labor market, migrants’ contribution to public life in terms of civic consciousness, social engagement and political activism would be appreciated and encouraged, so as to foster migrants’ role as agents of development in European society. Rather than perceiving them as problematic subjects to be paternalistically supported, they must be considered as proactive individuals, able and willing to participate in the collective effort for the common wellbeing. In particular, it is among the offspring of immigrants, that such an evolution of the integration model appears to be particularly crucial. Beneficiaries of the important investments made by their parents in terms of efforts and sacrifices and entrusted with their hopes of social mobility, they are reluctant to accept the fate of subjugation that they tend to be assigned by receiving society. Hence, the practice of an active citizenship could be encouraged as a constructive reaction: a participatory strategy aimed at transforming their relation with the society of residence.

Obviously, migrant’s capability and motivation to really act as civicly engaged subjects depends on a large variety of factors. For instance, the culture of immigrant groups and their expectations with regard to civic activism, largely influenced by their contexts of origin, are a relevant aspect. Moreover, their personal resources are very influential, in terms of psychological features, and social and human capital. Moreover, it is worth underlining once again the positive impact that training and awareness raising programs on active citizenship and similar initiatives of empowerment addressed to migrants or migrants’ associations may have for unleashing TCNs’ potential in terms of civic involvement. Furthermore, TCNs’ possibility to truly become actors of cultural, social and political change in receiving societies is largely influenced by the participation

47 Kosic A. (2007), Motivation for civic participation of immigrants: the role of personal resources, social identities and personal traits, University of Oldenburg. POLITIS WP No. 11. http://www.politis-europe.uni-oldenburg.de/16082.html
opportunities offered by their context of residence⁴⁸. These are linked, as has already been hinted at, to the discourse on integration, which shapes the expectations addressed to migrants by the majority population component and which are often mirrored in migrants’ behaviors. For this reason it is tremendously important to promote a shift in the common perception of migrants and of their role in the European landscape, also through specific awareness raising initiatives.

In this prospective scenario, it is of great importance to encourage civic involvement also of those migrants who do not plan to settle permanently in the host country. As a matter of fact, in a period so strongly featured by human mobility and by the increasing social relevance of transnational places—and with reference to a population which, through migration, has rendered these elements an essential part of its daily life—, it is crucial to conceive an idea of civic consciousness and participation compatible with plans of temporary stay and anchored to the local society. What is taking shape is a conception of citizenship that is not based on an exclusive sense of belonging to a particular country, but instead that, starting from the adherence to European fundamental values, is rooted in a participatory attitude towards the context of residence. The latter is not conceived as a place where to settle definitively, but instead as the portion of a transnational landscape, populated by actors on a constant move (as suggested by the same rhetoric of the “free circulation”). Moreover, in order to give a solid basis to such a citizenship model, a deep and constant debate on those principles which guarantee European society cohesion can’t be avoided. Only by reinforcing the awareness and consensus about the identity aspects to be considered as negotiable or, instead, as non negotiable it is possible to create a common framework of values which can shape individual contributions geared towards the common wellbeing.

The capability of mainstream civic organizations to recruit, motivate and give voice to migrant members is another meaningful aspect. It is interesting to observe, in this concern, that an effort aimed at promoting the inclusion of foreign nationals within mainstream associations might improve these organizations’ capacity to involve those native population groups which are usually under-represented in their bosom, increasing the potential of social activism in society as a whole⁴⁹. But the opportunities offered by migrants to the receiving country’s network of civic engagement go much further. For instance, thank to their presence, traditional trade unions can revitalize and “globalize” their mediation work. Moreover, «the human and gender rights’ questions raised by the presence of foreign workers and immigrants have become the main advocacy of many local NGOs offering new avenues in the dialogue between civil society groups and governments»⁵⁰.

In this perspective, it is worth highlighting the fact that migration has been considered by some scholars a potential resource for inverting the declining trend of civic and political participation in European society, which undermines the quality and legitimacy of its democratic system⁵¹. While the increasing civic apathy and societal fragmentation of advanced, post-industrial societies results in a loss of social capital of social networks which affect the productivity of individuals and groups, migrants are very often involved in networks based on ethnic bonds, which are rich in social capital and which represent a high potential for migrants’ civic participation and for community building in receiving societies. Hence, understanding how to transform the intra-ethnic dimension of these networks into a more bridging one is a matter that deserves a deep study. Working in this direction is an effort that is worth undertaking for unleashing the high potential existing in migrants’

⁴⁹ Vogel D., Cyrus N., “Part III: Civic participation of immigrants…”, above mentioned.
⁵¹ Vogel D., Cyrus N., “Part III: Civic participation of immigrants…”, above mentioned.
networks for a revival of civic activism in European society. Migrants’ associations are important social actors born within the bosom of these ethnic networks. This significant and widespread phenomenon represents a crucial lever for enhancing migrants’ participation to public life. In order to increase the effectiveness of this important means for TCNs’ active citizenship it is of great importance to promote initiatives which are aimed at the empowerment of associations arising from migration. From our standpoint, the evolution to be enhanced in migrants’ associational practice consists of a gradual departure from purely ethnic elements and an exclusive focus on the dimension of the context of origin, moving towards a well developed capacity to interact with the receiving country institutions and to work in synergy with the other realities acting in the territory. It is true that ethnic factors and local identities constitute a formidable means of identity-bonding and as such are able to motivate the participants to collective mobilization for common issues. But it is also true that these end up almost inevitably by leading the associations towards a self-regarding attitude, and by engaging them in activities only focused on the maintenance of cultural roots or on mutual support at the most difficult phases of the migratory experience. If on the one side these objectives are not to be disregarded, migrants’ associations have also to fulfill needs of full integration and participation in the society of residence. To this end, they have to offer an effective contribution to the renewal of the model of integration and the relationship between the Diasporas and receiving societies. Of course, an attitude open to dialogue on the part of receiving societies and their institutions will endeavor this kind of evolution in migrants’ associational life. *Institutions’ will to directly involve these organizations in the management of the issues relating to integration may have a positive influence on their interacting skills and sense of responsibility towards the society in which they reside.* Moreover, it can be noted that the tendency to form associations arising from immigration represents one of the most significant manifestations of the construction of an active, transnational citizenship “from below,” i.e., an initiative by the immigrants themselves. The social capital possessed by migrants, very often of a transnational nature, allows them to build transnational organizations, connecting not only their origin and receiving countries, but also, through diasporic links, many different national realities. Besides, through civically engaged migrants transnational actions, new forms of transcultural social capital can develop, such as several interesting forms of transnationalism among sub Saharan African immigrant activists in Europe.

In this concern, it is worth observing that the role of transformation played by migrants’ could be of crucial importance within the framework of the European integration process. First of all, as has already been hinted at, migrants usually have developed good competences in managing transnational existences, relations and identities. Thus, they might feel as members of a society which goes beyond one single country’s borders. Besides, they are very likely to look at Europe from a more external perspective than native born: less linked to identity aspects associated to a particular country, they tend to feel more detached from the history of past conflicts and the issue of the economic and social imbalances between European nation-states. Instead, they are likely to attach a certain importance to the fact that official discourse at EU level tends to present Europe as a geographical-political unit where the value of diversity is highly appreciated. Subsequently, migrants may be more prone to identify with such a reality than with a specific country, featured by

---

52 Interesting in this concern is the case of Belgium where, in 2006, the enfranchisement of foreign residents at the local level came into force, for the first time, mostly thank to migrants’ associations mobilization. See: Gropas R., Triandafillidou A. (2007), *Results Part I: Migration and Civic participation in Europe – Comparison of 25 country reports on migration and civic participation*, Interdisciplinary Centre for Education and Communication in Migration Processes, Oldenburg Universitat Web Publications, Final Activity Report Politis, pp. 12-24.

53 A good example of such type of initiative is represented by the MAPID (Migrants’ Associations and Philippine Institutions for Development) project. See: Baggio F., ed. (2010), *Brick by Brick...,* above mentioned.

cultural and ethnic peculiarities that they cannot fully acquire\textsuperscript{55}. For all these reasons, \textit{while increasing the diversity in Europe, migrants may also add to European cohesion, building a path towards the consolidation of a European identity and the development of an integrated European society}. In particular, grown up among different linguistic and cultural universes and being used, since their birth, to manage their existence among manifold senses of belonging, migrant second generations condense within their bosom a precious potential, which, apart from allowing them to grasp the opportunities offered by the globalized contemporary world, renders them powerful catalysts of the European integration process. This is even truer if we consider that there are some research works highlighting that people with migration background show a greater interest towards \textit{Europe than autochthonous young population}\textsuperscript{56}. The above written considerations should suggest that, while the discourse in many European countries tends to indicate as a major challenge for developed economies the attraction of highly qualified migrants to be encouraged to settlement, this is not the only way for increasing the European society potential in terms of competitiveness and social cohesion. On the contrary, \textit{promoting a responsible and participatory attitude on the part of all migrant population appears to be another promising strategy, more consistent with the objectives that have always shaped European migration policies.} In this perspective it would then be interesting, for instance, to explore the opportunity of taking advantage of the presence of a minority of high potential migrants (students or high qualified workers) for enhancing migrant population civic consciousness and participation. In this connection, we would like to point out that scientific literature exploring migrant’s social involvement in EU member states is still quite scant. This would then be a greatly interesting issue where to encourage further research, as well as the issue of migrants transnational activism on EU level (given that studies on migrants transnationalism have up to now concentrated mainly on transnational ties between origin and receiving countries)\textsuperscript{57}.

Finally, promoting migrants civic and political involvement within the receiving contexts turns to be an advantageous choice also in terms of impact on their origin countries: reaching a good integration level in the society of residence means acquiring better tools, in terms of economic, human and social capital, in order to positively affect the sending community’s wellbeing. \textit{Through a full participation in host society, migrants can experience new behavioral and thinking schemes, endeavoring a process of cultural, social and political change in their contexts of origin.} In particular, the fact of getting to know the receiving society institutions and their organizational and functioning procedures and of adopting an active and responsible attitude towards the community may lead migrants to spur, in their countries of origin, a process of democratization and renewal of the ruling classes. In some cases, migrants travel home to seek entry into national politics by representing the expatriate community, making use of the substantial financial contributions that it can make to national elections. Exposure to the receiving countries institutions may represent a distinct asset for transnational political activists who choose to return. Thus, migrants and returnees become politicians back in their countries of origin and even founders of new political parties\textsuperscript{58}. Such a renewal on a political and institutional level, as has been previously pointed out, represents a major advance in the sending countries development, which can trigger a virtuous circle able to multiply the positive effects of the migration and development nexus.

\textsuperscript{55} Vogel D., Cyrus N., “Part III: Civic participation of immigrants…”, above mentioned.
\textsuperscript{56} Vogel D., Cyrus N., “Part III: Civic participation of immigrants…”, above mentioned.
In this context, it needs to be highlighted that the integration process in the EU countries would largely benefit from a change in the institutional representation of the emigrant promoted by the authorities of the sending countries, too often crystallized around the idea of a temporary migration committed to producing wealth above all for the families and communities of origin, and whose destiny remains indissolubly tied to the sending society. This representation was consistent with the lay out of the migratory policies both of the receiving and of the sending countries, aimed at encouraging temporary migration. Nevertheless, it was not always able to adjust to the transformations produced by the stabilization of several migrant communities, unforeseen and unintentionally encouraged by the adoption of restrictive migratory policies by immigration countries. To “metabolize” this transformation means, for the authorities of the sending countries, to be open to a more effective dialogue and collaboration with the European countries authorities, in the awareness that the diasporas must enhance their capability of interacting in an effective and reciprocally advantageous manner with the country in which they reside. On this point, it is important to note that the attitude of some sending countries governments has considerably evolved in recent years on the issue of their emigrant’s integration. They started adopting an active role in promoting their nationals’ full incorporation in receiving countries, carrying out several actions on an institutional level and encouraging civil society organizations and academic institutions to work in the same direction. Therefore, there are sending countries which may have the social capital, the experience and the interest to contribute to EU efforts to develop more effective integration policies. Hence, in order to promote a better social cohesion in the EU, it is of fundamental importance to make the most of the contribution that government experts, as well as members of civil society and of academia from sending countries might be able to provide to this aim. Empirical findings suggest that the success of the integration –here interpreted as a multidimensional concept– does not loosen the bonds with the country of origin, but it makes both first and second-generation migrants key players for the modernization of the process of integration itself as well as for the “export” of the European social model in those countries where social risks still have not been institutionalized and tackled collectively. In brief, reaching a good integration level in the host societies means acquiring better tools, in terms of economic, human and social capital, in order to positively affect the wealth and cohesion of sending communities, too.

5. DIVERSE Project

Once came at this point we can proceed with the presentation of DIVERSE project aims and contents. Coherently with the previous considerations, the overall objective of the project is that of promoting a new effective model of integration, overcoming the limits of the present one, characterized by: a) a tendency to collectively represent TCNs’ work and economic role in terms of an asymmetric complementarity with autochthonous labor –a perception which is fuelled by, and simultaneously favors, immigrant concentrations in specific, mainly low qualified, job sectors– and b) an over-emphasis on the economic and working dimension, conceived as the key one justifying TCN workers’ presence in the host countries, which inhibit the development of migrants’ potential and their participation in the public life.

59 The case of Turkey is very interesting in this concern. In this country, several actions have been promoted at governmental and civil society levels, in order to face social problems such as domestic violence against women, forced marriages, honor killings and the need to improve the schooling of girls. We are dealing with issues very similar to the ones which affect Turkish immigrant communities in Europe (and not only Turkish migrants!). The experience of Turkish government and civil society in this field could be put into good use in order to improve the integration conditions of Turkish migrants in the EU. Turkey has been used here as an example, but the same observations could be extended to many other countries of origin (see: Kirisci K. (2008), "Three Way Approach” to Meeting the Challenges of Migrant Incorporation in the European Union: Reflections from a Turkish Perspective, CARIM Research Reports Nr. 3, Florence, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute).
These objectives are achieved through the enhancement of multi-stakeholder practices able at fostering migrants (TCNs) equal treatment and, chiefly, to valorize their skills, knowledges and competences [here after SKC] conceived as a precious resource for the economic, social and institutional development of European communities. The basic assumption is the awareness that a real and sustainable change in the attitudes toward TCNs, able to valorize their potential, needs the active involvement of different stakeholders and the implementation of different kinds of action.

More specifically, the project has identified four main challenges to address: a) the implicit tension, discussed above, between the economicism implied by EU members states’ systems of entry regulation and the principles of solidarity and equal opportunities; b) the need of an evolution of a system based on the depiction of immigrants as contingently instrumental resources by rendering TCNs’ abilities and potential a structural resource for the development of European economies and societies, according to the human capital model; c) the auspice of a more diffuse and more conscious adoption, among different kinds of organization, of diversity management (DM), transforming factors specific to some groups of people into an added value for the organizational performance; d) the necessity of rebalancing an integration model that so far has largely stressed the working dimension, encouraging TCNs’ civic participation and engagement in the construction of an inclusive European society.

Within the structure of the project, three ambits are conceived as pivotal for strengthening European economic competitiveness and social cohesion, reinforcing the cooperation between different stakeholders and generating shared value for all parties involved: a) advancing the valorization of TCNs’ formal, non formal and informal SKC, with particular reference to those linked to their migratory background; b) increasing awareness of the advantages provided by DM practices in different kinds of organization; c) supporting TCNs’ role as proactive individuals, favoring the expression of their potential in both the economic and the civil spheres, with a particular emphasis on their contribution to voluntary non-profit organizations. Throughout the project, a special focus is put on the relationship, in TCNs’ experience, of ethno-national diversity with other differences, particularly those related to gender and age, in order both to monitor the risks of intersectional discrimination and to identify new policies and procedures enabling to activate and enhance TCNs’ involvement and participation.

Three different set of activities have been carrying out, simultaneously, in the countries involved. The first set of activities aims to fill the knowledge gaps and provide some shared points of reference about 3 crucial issues: a) TCNs’ formal, informal and non formal SKC, with a special attention to those linked to their migratory background; b) DM practices implemented by profit, public and non-profit organizations; c) TCNs’ direct involvement in voluntary non-profit organizations. These research activities are implemented through data collection and analysis of practices of TCNs’ SKC recognition, through desk analysis and 50-100 interviews (5-10 in each country) to leading experts, local actors, representatives of consulates/embassies; data collection and analysis of practices of DM, through 100 case histories (10 for each country); data collection/analysis of experiences of TCNs participation in voluntary organizations, through desk analysis and interviews to leading experts, local actors and TCNs associations.

The second set of activities is aimed at strengthening synergies among different local actors in a common effort to generate and validate an innovative tool for the recognition of TCNs’ SKC, especially those related to their migratory background, drawing on the conception of TCNs as transnational actors who can offer a contribution to the economic and social development. It will encompass the involvement of various key actors (e.g.: public bodies, firms and their representative bodies, unions, non-profit organizations, TCNs’ associations, embassies and consulates representing major TCNs communities, career and employment consultants, intercultural mediators) and the constitution of a work group in each of the five countries involved in this work package, through the identification of the most relevant stakeholders. Through 3/5 work sessions, aimed at sharing
experiences and know-how, each country’s team will design a provisional multi-stakeholder audit scheme for TCNs’ SKC assessment, and will test it through the administration to 10 TCNs and the subsequent collection and evaluation of opinions, judgements and suggestions. At the end of this process, during a special partners meeting aimed at discussing the provisional schemes and at identifying common guidelines, we will construct a common audit scheme virtually applicable in all European countries.

Finally, the third set of activities will be aimed to enhance TCNs’ civic participation by promoting and supporting their activation as providers of services delivered by voluntary non-profit organizations. In explicit accordance with a logic stressing reciprocity, a particular focus has been put on TCNs already assisted by these organizations due to their vulnerable situation. In each of the two countries involved in this work package (Italy and The Netherlands), the project entails the activation of 50 TCNs selected on the basis of their competences, potential and past experiences through an activity of tutorship and verification.

Besides these actions, the project entails a vast plan of awareness-raising and diffusion through a multi-lateral and participatory approach, in order to reinforce the basic assumption underlying the whole project and the actions encompassed by it; i.e., that, in order to trigger a sustainable change oriented to overcome the weaknesses and contradictions of the current European model of integration, we need both to resort to different kinds of action and to activate the interrelated and co-generated contributions of an array of diverse social, institutional and economic stakeholders. This multilateral and participatory approach is inherently consistent with the basic logic of sustainability. On the other hand, it reasonably fuels the expectation that further shared value will be generated after the end of the project, due to the collective learning produced through the incorporation of different resources and perspectives in common action and the pursuit of benefits from it for all the interested parts.

In brief, thanks to this large and extremely innovative complex of actions, the project wants: i) to improve and enrich knowledge available for the main different actors about the above-described crucial issues and about key variables and levers to consider for the planning and implementation of innovative policies and practices; ii) to strength mutual knowledge and synergies among such actors and improving their competences in partnership building; iii) to develop and formalize an innovative participated transferable audit tool for tapping TCNs’ potential, coherent with the idea that the migrant is a sort of archetype of the European citizen, as she/he is depicted in the official documents, and the emblematic target of the policies of individual activation and empowerment [§ 3]; iv) to promote TCNs’ engagement as potential volunteers in non-profit organizations providing public interest services, as well as these organizations’ awareness about their distinctive role and responsibilities in tapping TCNs’ potential.

In any case, the effective impact of the project will be appreciated only in the long term, considered that it aims at promoting and improving integration processes in the EU countries concerned, by stimulating and sustaining both domestic social actors’ engagement in the considered areas of action (organizational practices, partnership building, etc.) and TNCs’ active role in the sphere of citizenship participation; generating multiplier effects in EU Member States other than those concerned, at the level of both analysis tools and indications for intervention; empowering TCNs, such as their leaders and their associations, as a crucial actor in the process of recognition and valorization of TCNs potential for the economic, social and institutional development. That is to say to rejuvenate the European model of integration.