

Fieldwork in Portugal – ICS

- **Description of sampling methodology (details of how sample designed) - Any problems encountered in design and actions taken**

Acknowledging the lack of data about immigrant population that would allow a random sample in Portuguese cities (e.g. based on home addresses of immigrants); in Portugal the sampling methodology was defined based on ‘centre of aggregation’ (fully incorporating the method of Blangiardo, 1996; Blangiardo, et al, 2011).

Following this option the questionnaire was applied in Portugal to 1260 immigrants in the three selected metropolitan areas with higher rates of immigrant population (according to official data of the border control police – SEF): Lisbon ($n=451$), Faro ($n=406$) and Setúbal ($n=403$). After the data has been analyzed it was eliminated 1 case in Lisbon.

Following again Giancarlo Blangiardo’ model in the three metropolitan areas we identified several centres to inquiry immigrants (17 in Lisbon, 15 in Faro and 14 in Setubal) under the 12 types of centres of aggregation earlier underlined in the project. The centres selected in Portugal were identified according to the immigrants fluctuation and diversity (normally) found in each location. The number of questionnaires applied in each centre was established earlier according to the foreseen intensity of immigrants in each location – e.g. to public service provision spaces to immigrants was foreseen a higher number of questionnaires to be done than in mainstream shopping areas. However this was not a passive decision due to the fact that in some of the centres (e.g. public spaces, shopping areas) we did not knew for sure the exact figure or expected number of immigrants that could be found. As a consequence, in some of the centres of aggregation the fieldwork and/or the attempts of survey an expected number of immigrants was more difficult than earlier foreseen.

After the fieldwork was concluded the 12 types of centres of aggregation were summed into 8, as some of the locations identified in fact were not exclusive to one type – e.g. it was impossible to individualize the One-stop-shops (centres of integration) from the border control police offices (as the one-stop-shop also have branches of that service there) and/or the entertainment centres from the shopping areas. The following table clarifies the centres identified in each metropolitan area of Portugal in which questionnaires were applied to and the number of locations that were chosen.

Centres of aggregation		Lisbon	Faro	Setúbal
1	Centres offering services and integration assistance + Population registry	2	3	2
2	Development centres (e.g. language schools, professional development institutions, schools, university)		2	
3	Places of worship (e.g. churches, mosques, temples)	3		
4	Ethnic shops + Workplaces or job centres + Service centres	2	3	1

5	Entertainment places (e.g. cinemas, clubs, gyms, bars, restaurants) + Shopping centres	3	2	
6	Open areas / meeting points (e.g. stations, squares, parks, lakes)	7	4	8
7	Markets (e.g. local markets, flower markets, farmers' markets)			1
8	Associations/Cultural and social clubs	1	2	2
Total number of locations/centres in which the questionnaires were applied to		17	15	14

Following the project instructions, in the questionnaire applied in Portugal it was also included an earlier set of questions about the potential presence of the inquired immigrant in the different centres of aggregation (beyond the one in which he/she was identified in), allowing later on to calculate weights of each centre (Blangiardo, 1996; Blangiardo, et al, 2011).

To further guarantying a diversity in nationality and gender in our sample (and not only the representation of the more visible immigrant communities in Portugal that frequent more often public spaces) the sampling methodology in Portugal also included the definition of quotas – based on official data of the border control police (SEF 2009). The quotas according to nationality and gender that were created to each metropolitan area described in the table below:

	Lisbon		
	Expected total	Expected Men	Expected Women
Brazil	31%	44%	56%
Cape Verde	18%	46%	54%
Angola	10%	50%	50%
Guinea Bissau	10%	60%	40%
Ukraine	8%	53%	47%
São Tomé e Príncipe	4%	44%	56%
Moldavia	4%	56%	44%
China	3%	52%	48%
India	2%	77%	23%
Pakistan	1%	78%	22%
Russia	1%	40%	60%
Mozambique	1%	44%	56%
Guinea	1%	83%	17%
Senegal	1%	82%	18%
Others	5%	56%	44%

	Faro		
	Expected total	Expected Men	Expected Women
Brazil	29%	47%	53%
Ukraine	24%	55%	45%
Moldavia	15%	57%	43%
Cape Verde	8%	54%	46%
Guinea Bissau	4%	72%	28%
China	3%	54%	46%
Russia	3%	43%	57%
Angola	2%	48%	52%
India	2%	76%	24%
Morocco	1%	55%	45%
Guinea	1%	77%	23%
Switzerland	1%	51%	49%
United States of America	1%	49%	51%
Senegal	1%	78%	22%
Others	7%	54%	46%

	Setúbal		
	Expected total	Expected Men	Expected Women
Brazil	33%	47%	53%
Cape Verde	21%	48%	52%
Angola	10%	49%	51%
Ukraine	7%	54%	46%
Moldavia	7%	55%	45%
São Tomé e Príncipe	6%	45%	55%
Guinea Bissau	6%	56%	44%
China	3%	52%	48%
Russia	1%	45%	55%
Mozambique	1%	43%	57%
India	1%	71%	29%
Others	4%	56%	44%

- **Description of sampling frame - Any problems encountered in completing sampling frame and actions taken**

One difficulty that we found was to reach the number of questionnaires earlier planned to some of the centres of aggregation. As underlined before, the importance of each centre of aggregation (and consequently, the number of questionnaires to be applied in each location) was defined based either on detailed knowledge of the immigrant regular presence (e.g. statistics about the clients of national and local support centres for immigrant integration) or, in some other cases, on expectations about immigrants that potentially would be found in the centres of aggregation (e.g. case of train stations, shopping areas,

religious centres). Hence, in some situations of centers target based on expectations it was not entirely possible to capture the total number of questionnaires earlier planned, being some revisions necessary.

Another difficulty was that not all the nationalities of immigrants that are numerous in Portugal (according to official data) were easily identified in public spaces or services. It became clear that there are nationalities that because several reasons (including cultural ones) are not so exposed or not frequent so much certain centres of aggregation (e.g. shopping areas, public transportations). This situation happens, for example, with Chinese or Eastern Europeans. Hence, even we identified quotas by nationality to each metropolitan area (has described before) that were respected as close as possible; it was not entirely possible to reach the quotas for all nationalities in certain centres of aggregation.

Another difficulty that we felt with the centres of aggregation' method was that the results are dependent on the locations and its specificities that justify the presence of certain immigrants. Accordingly, in the end of the fieldwork we identified that the diversity of academic profiles of immigrants in Portugal, for example, was not integrally reached. Being more precise, immigrants with higher education are not as present in the sample as could be if we would include, for example, a university as a centre of aggregation.

- **Description of how fieldwork done (including list of all the specific centres of aggregation for those countries) - Any problems encountered in fieldwork and actions taken**

The fieldwork was undertaken by 7 interviewers with experience in this type of research that worked in fulltime from the end of September till the middle of December. The team of interviewers went always together to each centre of aggregation in the three metropolitan areas.

CESOP guaranteed a closure coordination of the work done by this team of interviewers, controlling the quality of the work done. As an evidence of this closure quality control, in total were done 1273 questionnaires, being 13 rejected by the fieldwork coordinator because some answers were not coherent or clear. Furthermore 25% of the questionnaires were validated by phone afterwards by the fieldwork coordinator.

The complete list of all centres of aggregation of the three metropolitan areas is in the Excel file attached.

- **Description of your sampling methodology weightings - Any problems encountered in designing the weightings and actions taken**

The centres of aggregation weightings were calculated following integrally the method of Giancarlo – described in the paper Blangiardo (2011).

The difficulties that we found in the application of this method was in the earlier definition of the importance given to each centre of aggregation (as underlined before) and in guaranteeing that the

centres identified were effectively exclusive. The case of Martim Moniz square (known by its higher concentration of immigrant entrepreneurs, immigrant clients and immigrant users of the public space) heightened these difficulties as this square was considered to be a centre of aggregation by its high presence of immigrants but could be catalogued in the different types of centres. Accordingly we opt to aggregate some of the centres of aggregation that were earlier provided (as highlighted in the first table of this report).

- **Your calculations of non-response rates and composition of reasons for non-response (based on contact form)**

The non-response rate is globally 53% = [1421 rejections / (1260+1421)].

Globally, immigrants accepted well the interviewers, especially in the centres of aggregation that had integration service provision to immigrants (e.g. the national and local centres of integration, associations, population registries). The higher rates of refusal happened in residential areas and public spaces (e.g. squares, train stations). In some cases the interviewers felt that immigrants thought that they were social workers or border control police and avoid them. In one social neighbourhood the interviewers also declare to feel insecure and they were even threatened, being forced to abandon the area.

The train stations also prove to be very difficult to reach potential surveyed immigrants. Although we confirmed that immigrants use public transportation and the stations have higher concentration of potential people to interview; because immigrants are normally in a hurry to go to work they frequently refused to answer such a long questionnaire. The table below highlight the refusal rates in each type of centre of aggregation:

		LIS	ALG	SET	TOTAL
1	Centres offering services and integration assistance + Population registry	66	26	17	109
		10%	11%	3%	8%
2	Development centres (e.g. language schools, professional development institutions, schools, university)		2		2
			1%		0%
3	Places of worship (e.g. churches, mosques, temples)	48			48
		7%			3%
4	Ethnic shops + Workplaces or job centres + Service centres	49	111	2	162
		7%	45%	0%	11%
5	Entertainment places (e.g. cinemas, clubs, gyms, bars, restaurants) + Shopping centres	40	24		64
		6%	10%		5%
6	Open areas / meeting points (e.g. stations, squares, parks, lakes)	432	72	439	943
		64%	29%	88%	66%
7	Markets (e.g. local markets, flower markets, farmers' markets)			8	8
				2%	1%

8	Associations/Cultural and social clubs	40	10	35	85
		6%	4%	7%	6%
TOTAL		675	245	501	1421
		48%	17%	35%	100%

- **List of specific questions where there may be problems of comparability with other countries (please specify which and why)**

We believe all the questions can be comparable with the other countries. However, as reported before, we acknowledge that:

- in **P8** some immigrants might be illegal at entrance in Portugal, although they did not reported that and were included as “others”. Accordingly it might be mixed in the ‘others’ category both illegal immigrants and immigrants that get in Portugal an “autorização de permanência”. These “autorizações de permanência” were one year permits renewed until 5 years for equal periods of 1 year (in 2001 were provided 126.901 reaching 183.833 in 2004). The holders of these permits were inhibiting of several rights (e.g. family reunification, create a business...) and seen as temporary immigrants. This was mainly a strategy to answer quickly to the labor demand on those years especially in the construction sector (construction of bridges, subways, railroads, roads, football stadiums related to the EUcup2004 ...);

- **P34-P35**: This group of questions did not work very well in the field. We had a misleading indication after P32 that not all interviewers understood it. So we believe that might exist immigrants that might had applied to family reunification also for their children that were not asked about. We tried to complete those inquiries after by phone but we were not succeeding in all of them because we did not have the phone number in all cases.