

COSPE
National Focal Point - Italy

National Studies on Employment – Italy

Udo C. Enwereuzor



Cooperazione per lo Sviluppo dei Paesi Emergenti

1. Executive summary

A recent poll by Eurostat showed that respondents in Italy were among the least likely to report cases of discrimination on grounds of racial or ethnic origin. This is not because there is no discrimination on such grounds; rather it suggests that there is low public awareness of the problems discrimination causes to victims and society at large. Analysis of both official data on migrant workers, asylum seekers, refugees and Roma populations in the labour market and research at both national and local contexts on the same issues suggest that these groups experience different forms of discrimination in the labour market.

Legislation in itself could be a source of discrimination of migrants and other minorities in the labour market when it puts these groups in a position of weakness with respect to the employers. The current legalization exercise meant to enable about 702,000 working positions to be regularized and the corresponding employees acquire a legal title to stay, has been criticized for creating a situation where unauthorized migrants are completely dependent on prospective employers in order to acquire a “legal existence” given that, before the exercise started, they did not exist for the law. The high number of applications for regularization suggests that entry quotas set for migrant from non-EU countries in the last three years were grossly inadequate and that the 1998 legalization exercise that preceded the current one failed to drain the stock of unauthorized migrants already in the country at the time.

The close link between unauthorized entry and irregular employment in the informal economy is analysed. The study argues that it is partly the size of the informal economy within the Italian labour market that attracts unauthorized migration as such migrants know from friends and relatives that it is possible to survive for a number of years while waiting for the next legalization exercise. Consequently, it is argued that for border control measures to be effective in checking unauthorized entry, they need to be accompanied by internal controls as well on the informal economy. Measures will also have to be taken to check the widespread use of irregular employment in domestic work and care-related segment of the services sector. The increased need for domestic work is put in relation to the Italian welfare system, arguing that recourse to foreign domestic workers is partly demand-induced and partly policy-constructed.

A number of surveys in some local contexts show that migrants and other minorities face discrimination in the labour. Recruitment practices for unskilled labour as well for domestic workers are likely to produce discriminatory effects for people who not have links to those already in the sector. The prevalence of “word of mouth” as a way of advertising vacant posts also leads to people from the same background being concentrated in certain segments of the labour market and this in turn could lead such a group being identified as particularly suited to certain activities and not others. The domestic work segment is used to illustrate this case.

Discrimination is seen also as taking the form of a high concentration of migrant groups in low-paid, dirty, demanding and dangerous jobs irrespective of the average educational and professional qualification they possess. The study identifies the problem of having educational qualifications obtained in the countries of origin evaluated and valued by labour market actors as a major constraint on many migrant workers in such position. Migrants who have obtained their qualifications in Italy have better chances in many respects than those who depend on qualifications obtained outside the country. While the study does not present any comparative information between migrants with higher education qualifications and their Italian counterparts, the difficulties reported by the former in finding jobs that correspond to their qualifications suggest that education may be a competitive advantage between migrants but it has not yet proven to be so between migrants and the host society. Research findings suggest

that the characteristics of migrant labour demand and social network resources migrants can count on appear to be more important as determinants of success in large parts of the Italian labour market.

Recent legislation on the reform of the labour market to make it more flexible by introducing some new contractual forms such as work on call or intermittent work, job sharing, discontinuous job, staff-leasing etc. are likely to increase the precarious status of migrants and other minorities in the labour market where they already account for a high share of temporary jobs. In view of the closed link a new legislation on immigration has introduced recently, the negotiating power of migrants vis-à-vis prospective employers will be very much weakened.

Finally, the study identifies some recommendations aimed at improving equality of opportunity and treatment for migrants and other minorities in the labour market. Such suggestions include both legislative measures that could be taken at the national level and some control measure by the EU to ensure that the two equality directives approved by the Council in 2000 are implemented correctly, in order to guarantee all EU residents a minimum level of protection against discrimination.

2. Table of contents

1.	Executive Summary.....	p. 2
2.	Table of contents.....	p. 4
3.	Glossary of terms and concepts used.....	p. 6
4.	Introduction.....	p. 9
5.	Legislation and policies of relevance for migrants and minorities.....	p. 11
5.1	New immigration Act.....	p. 11
5.2	Regularization.....	p. 12
	Table 1: Italy: Authorized migrant workers and applications for regularization.....	p. 13
5.3	Reform of the labour market (<i>Legge Biagi</i>).....	p. 14
5.4	Anti-discrimination policy: Article 13 related developments.....	p. 16
6.	Description and analysis of existing data and sources.....	p. 18
6.1	Overview of the Italian Labour Market.....	p. 18
	Table 2: Italian labour force: distribution by region.....	p. 18
6.2	Migrants in the labour market.....	p. 18
	Table 3: Residence permits for work purposes and unemployed migrants.....	p. 20
	Table 4: Employment status by gender. Years 2002 and 2001 compared.....	p. 21
	Table 5: Professional condition by stay status, 2002.....	p. 21
	Table 6: Types of occupation by gender 2002.....	p. 22
	Table 7: Types of occupation by region of origin (2002)	p. 23
	Table 8: Principal countries of origin of non-EU domestic workers	p. 24
6.3	Migrants' income levels.....	p. 25
	Table 9: Income classes by gender 2002.....	p. 25
	Table 10: Income classes by educational qualification attained and legally recognized 2002.....	p. 26
6.4	Working conditions.....	p. 26
	Table 11: Italy. Active workers by length of employment.....	p. 27
7.	Analysis of direct and indirect discrimination.....	p. 29
7.1	Patterns of use of migrant labour in Italy.....	p. 29
7.2	Vulnerable groups.....	p. 32
7.3	Roma populations.....	p. 33
8.	Strategies, initiatives and good practices supporting diversity.....	p. 34
9.	Conclusions and recommendations.....	p. 36

10. Bibliography.....p. 38
Statistical appendix.....p. 44
Annex 1 - Industrial accidents in Italyp.44
Annex 2 - Main indicators of labour marketp. 65

3. Glossary of terms and concepts

National minority: the Italian Constitution recognizes national linguistic minorities who form long-standing components of the Italian population and in some cases such as Alto Adige / South Tyrol and Val d'Aosta such minorities have ample autonomy and protection under the law. Italy has no national minorities that are, as minorities, exposed to the risk of discrimination. Though some Roma populations have enjoyed Italian citizenship for generations, they are not recognized neither as a linguistic nor an ethnic minority group.

Principle of reciprocity: it states that a given condition, for example access to self-employment, ownership of houses etc. can be accorded to a non-EU foreigner only if his/her country of origin accords same conditions to Italians or, in general, does not forbid foreigners to have access to such conditions or property.

Integration of migrants: can also be defined in terms of the gap between economic citizenship (their integration into the production system) and social citizenship (their participation in the social rights system); subordinate integration [Ambrosini 2001 – *La fatica di integrarsi*, p.169]

Residence and employment status: throughout this paper, residence status of migrants will be referred to as authorised versus unauthorised or with the expression “having or not having a legal title to stay” or documented versus undocumented while employment status will be referred to as either regular or irregular. The terms legal and illegal will be used only to refer to the migratory process (entry) and not to the status of people involved in it.

Irregular employment or working in the informal economy will be defined as including “all income-earning activities that are not regulated by the state in social environments where similar activities are regulated” [Castels and Portes 1989¹ Reyneri 2001²]. They comprise paid work activities leading to the production of *lawful* goods and services but that violate laws and administrative rules concerning commercial licensing, labour contracts, income taxation and social security systems. Regular workers, too, may also perform irregular activities: moonlighters who have second jobs in the informal economy, self-employed workers who evade taxes, employees who get paid overtime under the table [Reyneri 2001].

New minorities generated by recent migration: this phrase identifies all non-native minorities of immigrant or refugee origin, identified in official documents on the basis of their nationality and not as minorities. The Italian Constitution recognises and protects “linguistic” minorities and does not make any reference to “ethnic” minorities.

Discrimination is defined in general terms as any “behaviour which *directly or indirectly* causes distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, ancestry, national or ethnic origin, religious belief or practice, having the aim or effect of destroying or hindering the recognition or exercise - under equal conditions - of fundamental human rights in the political, economic, social and cultural fields as well as in any other public sector” [Consolidated Act on the status of foreigners, Law nr. 286/1998; article 43.].

¹ Castels, M. and Portes, A. (1989): *World Underneath: The Origins, Dynamics and Effects of the Informal Economy*, in M. Castells, A. Portes, and L. Benton (eds.), *The Informal Economy: Studies in Advanced and Less Developed Countries*, The Johns Hopkins University Press.

² Reyneri E. (2001): *Migrants' involvement in irregular employment in the Mediterranean countries of the European Union*, ILO, IMP – Working Papers.

Direct discrimination: treating someone less favourably than another is, has been or would be treated in comparable circumstances because of the former's real or presumed ethnic, racial, national, religious or cultural belonging.

Indirect discrimination: the adoption of regulations, criteria or practice which, irrespective of intentions, put people belonging to a particular group disproportionately at a disadvantage than another is, has been or would be and where such regulations, criteria or practice can not be objectively justified by a legitimate aim and the means of achieving that aim are proportionate and necessary.

Indirect discrimination in employment: is defined as any "less favourable treatment due to the adoption of criteria that disadvantages in a more than proportionate way, workers belonging to a given race, ethnic or linguistic group, religious group or to a nationality, concerning requisites which are not essential for performing a given work". [Consolidated Act on the status of foreigners, Law nr. 286/1998; article 43.].

Non-EU citizens (*extracomunitari* in Italian): term used in most official documents to identify citizens of countries that are not member states of the European Union; it still includes those of candidate countries except where specifically indicated.

Glossary for reading data from ISTAT – the National Institute of Statistics

Resident population: this includes people of Italian or foreign citizenship, living habitually in the national territory, even if temporarily away. People living in such collective homes as hospitals and barracks are excluded. The source of data for calculating the resident population and its dynamics is the registry of residents of each municipal council and this data is transmitted to Istat on a monthly basis.

Labour force or work force: includes people who are employed and those in search of employment.

Employed: includes people of 15 years and above who replied in one of the following ways when asked about their professional condition:

- to be employed even if they did not work in the week of the survey (declared employment);
- to be in a different condition from that of being employed but to have worked some hours in the week of the survey (others with employment activity).

People in search of work: includes people of 15 years and above who declare:

- a professional condition different from being employed;
- not to have worked some hours in the week of the survey (others with employment activity);
- to be in search of work;
- to have made at least one attempt to find a job in the thirty days preceding the survey;
- to be immediate ready (within two weeks) to accept a job offer in case there's one.

Non-labour force: includes people who declare to be in a condition different from being employed and not to have worked nor searched for work in the week of the survey; or, to have searched for work but not through one of the modalities defined for people in search of work. The category also includes people who are not fit for work, those doing a compulsory military service or civil service in alternative to the former and the population aged 14 downwards.

Activity rate: people belonging to the labour force as a percentage of the population aged 15 and above.

Activity rate of young people: people in the class of age 15 – 24 years belonging to the labour force as a percentage of the entire population in the same class of age.

Employment rate: people who are employed as a percentage of the population aged 15 and above.

Employment rate of young people: people in the class of age 15 – 24 years who are employed as a percentage of the corresponding population in the same class of age.

Unemployment rate: people in search of work as a percentage of the labour force.

Unemployment rate of young people: people in the class of age 15 – 24 years who are in search of work as a percentage of labour force in the same class of age.

4. Introduction

This report, though conceived as independent and self-standing, follows a similar report produced under RAXEN3 on the same topic. Its aim is to highlight developments and updates in the employment sector which are of relevance to the conditions of migrants, refugees and other minorities such as Roma and Sinti populations in the country and to investigate whether such groups suffer direct and indirect discrimination in employment, which sectors are the most affected and what forms such discrimination takes and which policies, including legislation, are in place to promote equality of access and treatment of same minorities in the labour market. In particular, the report looks at the position of such groups in the labour market including conditions of access to employment and self-employment, career progression, training, access to employment related benefits etc.

The report draws on both official data, including statistical information and research findings, project reports and general surveys on immigration in Italy and the experiences of migrants in the employment sector. Information from these sources are assessed both in terms of their contents as well as with regard to their implementation and the documented effects they had or could have in the future.

It has been observed that Italy, like other Southern EU countries, has a qualitatively different experience of racism and discrimination due to the fact that it became a receiving country of migratory flows in recent years (beginning from the early eighties). For a long time, both policy makers and researchers failed to recognize the discriminatory experiences of migrants and other minorities and the disadvantage faced by these groups in, among others, the labour market was predominantly characterized in terms of “super-exploitation of migrant workers” faced with conditions which would not be tolerated by native workers, irrespective of their authorized or unauthorized stay status [Wrench 1996]. By the late 1990’s, sufficient evidence, albeit anecdotal for the most part, suggesting that migrants and new minorities generated by immigration were facing not only exploitation on the part of employers but also racism and discrimination in the labour market had begun to emerge. A recent survey of EU countries [Eurobarometer 2003]³ confirmed that public awareness of discrimination on racial or ethnic grounds has remained low and Italian respondents, together with Irish and German respondents, were found to be the least likely to report having witnessed discrimination on grounds of ethnic origin or minority group background.

Employment, together with housing, has remained a key factor in the integration of migrants and refugees in the receiving country. This is because it is not only a source of much needed income but also a fundamental requirement for access to legal title to stay in the country and the importance of this dimension is likely to increase especially after a recent legislative reform that has linked employment and the residence permit much closer than ever before. This will weaken further their positions in the labour market and increase their precariousness, forcing many to accept jobs and working conditions which many natives of comparable educational or professional level would not accept. As we shall see later, both official statistics and research evidence show that there is a disproportionate representation of migrants in low-skilled, manual, low-paid and often temporary jobs, irrespective of the educational level and professional qualification held [Ambrosini 2001⁴]. Even self-employment has been very low due to institutional barriers in the access to such activities in the form of a strict application of the principle of “reciprocity” and only after a major legislative change in 1998 did the situation begin to change and more migrants are having access to commercial licenses and other

³ Eurobarometer (2003): Eurobarometer 57.0. Discrimination in Europe, May 2003.

⁴ Ambrosini M. (2001): *La Fatica di integrarsi. Immigrati e lavoro in Italia*, il Mulino, Bologna 2001; (*The difficulty of getting integrated. Immigrants and employment in Italy*).

administrative authorizations. Self-employment is one area that may offer an alternative employment opportunity to those migrants with medium to high educational and professional qualifications who are not satisfied with the unskilled jobs in which many are currently involved. Legislation is likely to be as decisive as personal aspirations and availability of capital in determining the extent to which this sector of employment will contribute to bring about more equality in various aspects of the labour market for migrants and minorities.

At the same time, having a job remains essential and central in determining the migrant's legal status as well as the possibility of having access to employment related welfare services.

5. Legislation and policies of relevance for migrants and minorities

There were three major legislative developments during 2002 and the first half of 2003 that are likely to have far-reaching consequences in the employment sector for migrants. Two of the three laws recalled above are on immigration while the third concerns a general reform of the Italian labour market. While the new laws on immigration have been applied and have produced visible and measurable consequences, the effects of the legislation reforming the labour market are yet to be felt partly because it is more recent and the implementation circulars are not yet out and partly because the entire package on labour market reforms has been a major source of controversy between the government and manufacturers organizations on the one hand and trade unions on the other. Regarding the immigration laws, we will examine briefly only the aspects that are relevant to the condition of migrants and refugees in the labour market and their access to employment related welfare benefits. A detailed analysis of both laws will be carried out in the report on developments in the legislation sector due later this year.

5.1. New immigration Act

The latest immigration law⁵, better known as *Bossi-Fini law*, that entered into force in July 2002 and an accompanying measure on the legalization of the status of irregularly employed non-documented immigrants⁶ represent the most important developments of relevance to migrants in the employment sector throughout the period. The two laws mentioned above have been characterized by some as having introduced a model of immigration policy based on the principle that in order to exist legally, an immigrant must be employed [Eurispes 2002]⁷. This portrayal of the above laws is due to the fact that both affirm a strong link between being employed and having a legal title to reside in the country through the introduction of the so-called “stay for work contract” (*contratto di soggiorno*). This marks a sharp departure from the situation before its inception during which the two aspects – possession of a stay permit and being employed – were not so closely linked and one could even be authorized to reside for a maximum period of one year in order to look for a job. All the same, the legal basis for employment and self-employment of migrants remains the possession of a stay permit for work or family reasons and signing a “stay for work contract” is a prerequisite for obtaining a stay permit as an employee.

The new law maintains the distinction between being employed by someone else or a firm and self-employment and both aspects are regulated differently, albeit in a stricter manner. In the first case, an employer who wishes to employ someone who resides outside the country, whether for a definite or an indefinite period of time, is required to submit an application to that effect to the Provincial Immigration Office at the Prefecture of the place of residence. The application is accompanied by relevant information on the prospective employee, evidence of available and suitable accommodation for the same, as well as a stay-for-work contract proposal which includes an undertaking by the employer to accept responsibility for the cost of repatriation of the foreigner at the end of the contract period and if it is not renewed⁸. In case of successful

⁵ Legge 30 luglio 2002, n. 189 - *Modifica alla normativa in materia di immigrazione e di asilo*; (Law of 30th July 2002, nr. 189 – *Changes to the provisions on the subject of immigration and asylum, published in the Official Gazette n. 199 of 26-8-2002, Ordinary Supplement n.173*).

⁶ Decreto legge 9 settembre 2002 n.195 – *Disposizioni urgenti in materia di legalizzazione del lavoro di extracomunitari*; (Urgent provisions on the subject of legalization of the work of non-EU citizens) available at: http://www.mininterno.it/legislazione/pages/1_000000449.htm (30/03/2003)

⁷ Eurispes (2002): *Rapporto Italia 2002, Scheda – Chi non lavora non fa l’immigrato*; p.1. (*Italian Report 2002; Case study – Whoever does not work can not be an immigrant*; p.1)

⁸ Legge 30 luglio 2002, n. 189, *op. cit.*; articles 6(1) lett. a-b and 16(1) lett. a-d.

completion of the *stay for work contract*, the employer is allowed to deduct from the worker's monthly salary an amount not exceeding a third as rent for the accommodation provided.

The authorization to employ is dependent on the unavailability of a national or EU worker of equivalent qualification and/or professional experience willing to accept the vacant post. If there are no national or EU workers ready for the post, subject to approval by the head of Police at provincial level and within the limits set by law annually on the number of foreigners to be granted entry as workers, an authorization to issue a visa is sent to the Italian Consular office in the country of origin and the prospective migrant worker is granted an entry visa. The length of the employment contract determines the duration of the residence permit and the latter can not exceed the former. In case of termination of employment by the employer or resignation by the worker before the time stipulated in the contract, the migrant worker is allowed to stay for the residual period or for a period of six months and to register with a public employment centre in search of a new job⁹.

In the case of return to the country of origin, whether voluntary or forced, the non-EU worker maintains all pension rights already due at the time of departure and can enjoy such rights irrespective of the existence of a bilateral agreement (reciprocity agreement) between Italy and the country of origin. The worker will have access to such pension rights only after turning sixty-five years of age. In case of death before attaining such age, no pension will be due to the worker's heirs¹⁰. The previous legislation allowed returning workers to receive the total amount contributed plus 5% interest.

As mentioned earlier, self-employment is allowed and the conditions and procedure for access remain as provided under the previous legislation. The only addition under the new law is a provision which considers being sentenced for violation of copyright laws as a condition for which the residence permit will be nullified and the offender expelled. This provision seems to target particularly street hawking by some non-EU unauthorized migrants and is probably intended as a way of curbing irregular entry.

5.2. Regularization

The *Bossi-Fini* immigration law contained some provisions for the regularization of certain categories of migrant workers. Initially, it provided for the regularization of only domestic workers and personal assistants or caretakers for people who need constant assistant because of ill-health or disability. Under pressure from a coalition of migrants' rights support organizations and social partners, the regularization exercise was later extended by another law¹¹ to include other categories of migrant workers other than the above and self-employed unauthorized and irregular workers.

The legalization exercise allowed employers who had irregularly employed unauthorized migrants, before the 10th of June 2002, to regularize their position by formalizing the employment and thereby enable the undocumented migrants to acquire a legal title to stay in the country as their employee. The application was accompanied by a sanction equivalent to three months' taxes and social welfare contributions of a regularly employed worker in same position as the one to be legalized. Though the regularization exercise did not provide for unauthorized

⁹ Zincone G. (2003): L'immigrazione in Italia: flussi e consistenza; (*Immigration in Italy: flow and stock*); available at: www.fieri.it

¹⁰ INPS, Direzione Generale delle Prestazioni (2003): Circolare n.45, 28 febbraio 2003 (*INPS – National Institute for Social Welfare, Directorate General for Services, Circular nr.45*), available at: www.fieri.it.

¹¹ Decreto legge 9 settembre 2002 n.195, *op. cit.*

migrants to apply directly on their own for a legal title to stay, a total of 702.156 applications for employment of undocumented migrants were received (Table 1), of which 341.121 as domestic workers and caretakers and 361.035 for work in all other sectors [Caritas 2002, 2003]¹². This shows that the phenomenon of irregular employment of migrants concerns both families and enterprises almost in equal measure. It cuts across Italian society and the economy and matches the needs and conveniences of many.

Table 1: Italy: Authorized migrant workers and applications for regularization (2002)

Macro regions	Application for regularization 2002	Migrant workers from non-EU countries as at 31.12.2001	Applications as a percentage of authorized migrant workers as at 31.12.2001
North-west	233,943	242,016	96.7
North-east	132,291	177,874	74.4
Centre	203,852	191,451	106.5
South	111,216	64,223	173.2
Islands	20,854	30,765	67.8
Italia	702,156	706,329	99.4

Source: Caritas statistical Report, based on data from the Ministry of the Interior

Another aspect worthy of note is that in terms of territorial distribution, irregular employment follows the regular one closely, with the central and northern regions, where migrant workers have become important components of the local labour market, recording the highest numbers of applications [Ambrosini 2003]¹³. About 52.2% of all applications were submitted in the North, 29.0% in the Centre and 18.8% in the South and the Islands. While the territorial distribution should be weighed though against the possibility that a high number of applications for regularization indicate partly a higher opportunity of finding an employer who was ready to undertake the process, given that migrants could not apply directly on their own, it confirms that irregular employment of migrants is most where regular employment is highest. The total number of applications for the whole country turned out to be well above all expectations, involving more undocumented migrants than the last three preceding regularization exercises (1990, 1995 and 1998) considered collectively (649,100 regularized¹⁴).

The size of the regularization exercise that emerged has some implications for current knowledge of the demography of migration in the country. Firstly, it contradicts not only all previous estimates of the size of illegal migration into the country but also most of the estimates of the need of migrants by the national labour market and the rate of growth of the migrant population in the country. In its first report on the integration of migrants in Italy in 1999, the *Commissione per le politiche di Integrazione* estimated that the migrant population will grow by about a minimum of 50,000 migrants and a maximum of 80,000 per year. On the basis of this estimate, it calculated that by the year 2007, there will be between 1.9 and 2.5 million foreigners, equivalent to 3.2% - 4.2% of the total population and by 2017, there will be between 2.6 and 3.5 million foreigners, amounting to about 4.5% - 6.2% of the total population.

¹² Caritas (2002): *Immigrazione Dossier Statistico 2002: XII Rapporto sull'immigrazione Caritas – Migrantes*, Nuovo Anterem, Roma, p.9 (*Immigration Statistical Report 2002: XII Report on immigration*). See also "Anticipazioni Dossier 2003: Il punto sulla regolarizzazione" at:

www.caritasroma.it/immigrazione/dossier2003/anticipazioni%20dossier%202003.pdf (30/03/2003)

¹³ Ambrosini M. (2003): *Il lavoro (Employment)*, in: Fondazione ISMU: *Ottavo Rapporto sulle migrazioni*, FrancoAngeli 2003 (ISMU Foundation: *Eighth Report on migrations*).

¹⁴ Reyneri E. (2001): *op. cit.*, p.3

Using data from the ministry of the Interior, INPS and INAIL, Caritas has estimated that the little more than seven hundred thousand applications for regularization do not correspond to the same number of people because of the fact that, especially in the domestic sector, more than one employer may have filed application for the same worker covering only the hours the migrant does for him/her. On the basis of this, it estimates that the real number of migrant workers involved is about 600,000. When added to the number of authorized immigrants resident at the beginning of 2003, the migrant population rises to 2,395,000 people, with an incidence of about 4% on total resident population in the country. In the Integration Commission's estimate, this size of the migrant population was to be attained between the years 2007 and 2017.

A second implication is that the mechanism for legal entry put in place in 1998 (programmed flow, definition of an annual quota of migrants authorized to enter for work purposes and the sponsorship system) was probably not used to full potential because of the low numbers defined for each year beginning from the year 2000; it is interesting to note that the 20,000 quota set-out for 2002, excluding seasonal workers, was not released until the end of the year and so is only being used in 2003 [Caritas 2003¹⁵].

The regularization procedure which required employers rather than unauthorized migrant workers to file application put many migrants at a disadvantage as some employers did not want to do so; instead, they chose to dismiss these workers. In reaction to this development, the Government issued a circular authorizing the acceptance of denouncement of renitent employers by migrants irregular employed prior to the exercise and who had either dismissed or refused application in their favour, as valid applications for regularization, pending Police and judiciary enquiry¹⁶. Another form of abuse generated by the procedure involves the migrant worker paying the sanctions amounting to three months equivalent of taxes and social welfare contributions the employer should have paid in case of a regular employment in same position. Similarly, the requirements that employers provide housing for their employees and take responsibility for their repatriation appear to have acted as strong disincentives, particularly in the domestic work sector, to regularize undocumented migrants [Istituto IARD Franco Brambilla 2003, 139]. These conditions put additional burden on the employers which would not be the case if the workers were nationals or citizens of EU member States. In the final analysis, they make employing migrants less convenient compared to nationals and EU citizens and in this sense, constitute an indirect discriminatory practice.

At the moment, there is no information regarding a breakdown by nationality of the beneficiaries of the applications for regularization. Even so, bearing in mind the procedure outlined above, it seems likely that non-Italian Roma have once again been excluded from the exercise to acquire a legal title to stay. Past regularization exercises have systematically excluded such populations, albeit indirectly, by applying employment and / or housing related criteria which most Roma can hardly meet.

5.3. Reform of the labour market (*Legge Biagi*)

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, another major legislative development in the area of employment and which is relevant to migrants and minorities is a law aiming at reforming the Italian labour market. This law is directly linked to a Government White Paper on employment

¹⁵ Caritas (2003): *Anticipazioni Dossier 2003*, op. cit. 1

¹⁶ Zincone G. (2003): op. cit.

and the labour market¹⁷ released in October 2001 and which has caused much controversy between the Government and some of the trade unions. The White Paper outlined policies aimed at making the labour market more flexible and dynamic and with reference to immigration and employment, the document states that in the nineties, migration to Italy took place independently from demand for workers and such flows ended up filling low quality jobs, thereby fuelling the informal economy and irregular work. It notes that though the influx of migrants in the nineties did not produce conflicts between native workers and migrants because the latter filled jobs considered as not attractive by the former, the influx had been no less damaging to the economy as it contributed to the failure, by the Italian economy, to modernise and by so doing, slowed down demand for quality jobs that match the aspirations of national workers¹⁸. These policies have now been translated into law¹⁹.

In general terms, the new legislation will introduce new types of contracts and organization of work between employer and employees such as: work on call or intermittent job, job sharing between two or more workers, discontinuous job, staff-leasing, part-time, temporary or provisional contract etc. Besides, the law deregulates the activities of employment offices that were predominantly public and encourages the setting-up of private job centres. The increase in “atypical” work deriving from the above law is likely to affect the position of migrants in the labour market where they are already highly represented in precarious e temporary jobs. The increase in fixed-term employment contracts is known to be common among Italian nationals as well, with full-time and permanent employment contracts steadily on the decrease, especially in the service sector. What makes the difference between migrants and nationals however is that these factors increase the risk for immigrants of entering a vicious circle in which they end up once again in an unauthorized stay status or position. For documented migrants, the combination of employment in the informal economy and short-term contracts is dangerous, because it prevents them from meeting the requisites to have their residence permits renewed and entering into a lower status of undocumented reinforces the chances of turning to the informal economy for work [Reyneri 1999]²⁰.

Regarding discrimination in employment, a recently approved implementation decree of the above law prohibits discrimination by employment agencies based on personal conviction, membership of a trade union or political party, religious belief, gender, sexual orientation, marital status, family or pregnancy, age, disability, race, ethnic origin, colour, national origin, language, medical record or past labour disputes with former employer.

There is a gap between these policies meant to render the Italian labour market as a whole more flexible and the employment related conditions required of migrants in order for them to obtain and renew their residence permits, as well as have access to certain social rights. One outcome is that while migrant workers have become important components of the workforce in many regions and sectors in particular, progress in access to social rights and mobility is much slower,

¹⁷ Italy, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (2001): *Libro Bianco sul mercato del Lavoro in Italia. Proposte per una società attiva e per un lavoro di qualità*, Roma, October 2001 (*White paper on the labour market in Italy. Proposals for an active society and for quality employment*). Available at:

<http://www.welfare.gov.it/NR/rdonlyres/ey4sfbx6oosg4e7ckw4pxxx13hhvkhxv63crpm7zero6iljro46iv3lhgm3znnpo4la4vmr5ns7b4lk3q3khkretzg/librobianco.pdf>

See also EUMC (2002): *Equality and diversity for Europe. Annual Report 2001*, p.52.

¹⁸ Italy, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, *ibid*, p.80.

¹⁹ Law 14th February 2003, no. 30: “Delega la Governo in materia di occupazione and mercato di lavoro”, Official Gazette no.47 of 26th February 2003.

²⁰ Reyneri E. (1999): *Integration in the labour market*, in: Commissione per le politiche di Integrazione (1999): *First report on the integration of Immigrants in Italy. Summary report*, Rome, p. 25.

leading to a situation of inclusion in society some authors have defined as “subordinate integration” [Ambrosini 2003].

5.4. Anti-discrimination policy: Article 13 related developments

Anti-discrimination legislation remains that introduced by the Consolidated Act nr.286/98 which in articles 43 and 44, provides for anti-discrimination measures²¹. This is because EU Directives 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC have not been completely transposed into national legislation. At the time of writing this report, the transposition instrument, a delegated decree of the President of the Council of ministers, was still under discussion in Parliament and due for approval by early July. The decrees implementing the provisions of the above EU directives are expected to improve the existing legal provisions by introducing the reversal of the burden of proof in civil proceedings against discrimination and set-up an equality body or authority while maintaining nationality as a ground of discrimination forbidden by law except in cases of unfavourable differential treatment prescribed by law.

The 1998 Act defines discrimination in general terms as any “behaviour which *directly or indirectly* causes distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, ancestry, national or ethnic origin, religious belief or practice, having the aim or effect of destroying or hindering the recognition or exercise - under equal conditions – of fundamental human rights in the political, economic, social and cultural fields as well as in any other public sector”.

The above general definition is followed by a non-exhaustive lists of acts or omissions which “in any case” constitute unlawful discrimination. The list includes the acts of:

- a) a civil servant who, in carrying out his/her functions does or fails to perform a certain action in favour of a foreign citizen simply because of his/her condition or because he/she is of a certain race, religion, ethnic group or nationality;
- b) anyone who imposes less favourable conditions or refuses to provide a foreign citizen with goods and services otherwise offered to the public, simply because of one or more of the above mentioned reasons;
- c) anyone who unlawfully imposes less favourable conditions or refuses to provide work, housing, schooling, training or access to social services to a foreign citizen legally residing in Italy simply because of one or more of the above mentioned reasons;
- d) anyone who, through action or omission, prevents a foreign citizen legally residing in Italy from carrying out an economic activity;
- e) an employer or those acting on his/her behalf performing any kind of action that discriminates, even indirectly, against a worker because of his/her race, ethnic or linguistic group, religious belief or citizenship.

This provision is connected to the anti-discrimination clauses of Article 15 of the Workers' Act²², thereby extending its scope of application to include, among other things, a duty on the employer to comply with the wage and insurance terms established by the current laws and the applicable national employment contract for the relevant category; recruitment of workers under terms that are not below those defined by the national collective contracts for a given category.

Besides, letter (e) above goes on to define indirect discrimination as any “less favourable treatment due to the adoption of criteria that disadvantages in a more than proportionate way, workers belonging to a given race, ethnic or linguistic group, religious group or to a nationality, concerning requisites which are not essential for performing a given work”.

²¹ See also Niessen J, Chopin I. (2002): Anti-discrimination Legislation in EU Member States. A comparison of national anti-discrimination legislation on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief with the Council Directives, EUMC, Vienna 2002. Available at: www.eumc.eu.int

²² http://www.minlavoro.it/norme/L_200570_300.htm (22/08/02)

In case of violation of the above provisions, protection and / or remedy is accorded under the civil code and in this respect, there are three other interesting features of the above law which are relevant to employment and the labour market. These features include provisions that:

- the plaintiff may, in order to establish that he / she has been discriminated against on grounds of race, ethnic or linguistic group, geographical origin, religious group or citizenship, cite factual elements, including statistical data on recruitments, contributions, distribution of tasks and posts, transfers, career progression and dismissals of the enterprise;
- in case of discrimination against a group on the part of an employer and even if it is not immediately and directly possible to identify the workers who have been damaged by the discriminatory act, the local branch of one of the major trade unions at national level can stand in litigation on behalf of the discriminated workers;
- if an enterprise, which has been accorded benefits of any kind by law or has won a contract for public procurement, is found guilty of violating the provisions of article 41, the judicial authorities are required to inform immediately the public administration or authority which has granted the benefits including loans and insurance facilities or awarded the contract; these authorities revoke the benefit or cancel the contract and in the very serious cases, they declared that enterprise as not eligible for benefits including credit facilities or to take part in calls for tender.

With specific regard to work, article 2 of the Consolidated Act n.286/98 re-calls explicitly the ILO Convention n.143 of 24th June 1975 on the protection of migrant workers²³, which accords such workers and their families equality of treatment and rights on the same footing as Italian workers.

The 1998 Act mentioned above provided, among other things, for regional anti-discrimination centres charged with monitoring, providing information and legal support for victims of discrimination on grounds of race, ethnic and national origin, religion, language and belief. No such structure was foreseen at the national level and so far, none of the regions has set-up the above centre. Consequently, there is no official and formal body nor a system of monitoring discrimination in different spheres of life. The draft of the transposition decree²⁴ of Directive 2000/43/EC mentioned above provides for an “Equality Office” located within the ministry for Equal Opportunities, the powers of which are not mentioned nor will it have its own budget and this has led to expressions of concern on the part stakeholders as to how independent and effective such a body will be in promoting equality for victims of discrimination.

Even the trade unions do not specifically monitor discrimination in the workplace on grounds of race, ethnic and national origin, religion, language and belief. While they take initiatives aimed at promoting the rights of all workers including migrants and activities that focus on protecting individual rights through a range of measures and ad hoc services, they do not have a specific focus on anti-discrimination but some of the measures taken in some collective contracts at local level can help reduce or prevent discriminatory acts in the sector. Such initiatives include clauses in collective contracts regarding the need for Italian language courses and/or vocational training for migrant workers, arrangements meant to grant longer holidays to allow workers sufficient time to return to countries of origin, negotiating for permissions to celebrate religious festivities not observed by ethnic majority workers and promotion of social integration in general, facing such problems as housing.

²³ <http://ilolex.ilo.ch:1567/scripts/convde.pl?query=C143&query0=143> (22/08/02)

²⁴ The decree has formally been approved by the Council of Ministers on the 3rd of July and is now waiting to be published in the official gazette.

6. Description and analysis of existing data and sources in the employment sector

6.1. Overview of the Italian Labour Market

According to ISTAT²⁵, the national institute of statistics, Italy's labour force²⁶ stood at 23.993 million in 2002, of which 21.829 million were employed and 2.163 million unemployed. Male workers represented 60.9% of the workforce. Overall unemployment rate²⁷ was 9% and the unemployment rate for women was 12.2% against 7% for men. Significant differences between the central and Northern regions on the one hand and the South on the other remained with regard to unemployment: the average unemployment rate for the South was twice the national rate while the central and northern regions had averages below the national rate. The distribution of the workforce by sector of activity was as follows: 63% in services, 32% in industry and 5% in agriculture. People in the age group 15-24 years were the most likely to be unemployed with an unemployment rate of 27.2%.

Istat collects data on various aspects of the work force through quarterly labour force surveys carried out in January, April, July and October and at the end of the year, it calculates the averages of the four surveys for all variables to obtain the annual data. The survey is based on interviews with about two hundred thousand people drawn from the registry of residents of 1,400 municipalities. People living in such collective homes as convents, home for the elderly, military barracks etc. are excluded from the sample.

This source of information does not provide data broken down by nationality which could enable one to obtain same information about migrants as those it provides for the entire work force. As a result, data concerning various aspects of migrants' participation in the labour market is derived from other sources such as the national institute for insurance against incidents in the workplace (INAIL), the ministry of the Interior, the national institute for social welfare (INPS) or from research in local contexts.

Table 2 - Italian labour force: distribution by region (in thousands)

Regions	People in search of work						Employed by sector			
	Total – Abs. value	%	Male	%	Female	%	Total – Abs. value	Agric	Ind	Serv
North	462	4.0	181	2.7	280	5.8	11,213	391	4,179	6,643
North West	299	4.4	119	3.0	180	6.4	6,481	164	2,449	3,868
North East	163	3.3	62	2.2	100	4.9	4,733	228	1,730	2,775
Centre	313	6.6	131	4.7	181	9.4	4,424	163	1,243	3,019
South and Islands	1,389	18.3	703	14.1	686	26.4	6,192	541	1,510	4,141
Italy	2,163	9.0	1,016	7.0	1,147	12.2	21,829	1,096	6,932	13,802

SOURCE: Istat. Quarterly labour survey (December 2002)

6.2. Migrants in the labour market

It has often been argued in recent years that Italy needs migrant labour because of its low population growth rate and an aging population that will need more workers to pay for the increased welfare needs of such a population. There is however evidence from various researches that changes in the production structure of the country such the stronger role played by small and medium sized firms may be a more important reason for introducing more migrant

²⁵ Istat (2003): Indagine sulle forze lavoro. Serie storica, Aprile 2003; tabelle 12 e 15 (*Labour force survey. Historical series, April 2003, tables 12 and 15*).

²⁶ The labour force is made up of people who are employed and all those in search of a job (Istat).

²⁷ Unemployment is calculated as the ratio of people in search of a job to the work force (Istat).

workers into the labour market. Besides, even the country's welfare model may lead to an increase in the structural pressure for more migrant workers.

The need for migrant workers is not much as a result of low population growth rate as often assumed. Qualitative aspects of labour market dynamics in recent years have been far more important determinants than quantitative ones. The increased participation of women in extra-domestic workforce (which is still below the average of other EU countries) and the transfer of many unemployed workers from the South to the North or the creation of new jobs in the South are sufficient per sé to compensate for the effects of the decrease in population growth rate for many years to come. A qualitative aspect that has turned-out to be of particular importance in the segmentation of the labour market, both in territorial and professional terms, is the entrance of a large number of women into the labour market but this increased participation of highly educated women does not solve the problem of finding workers to fill vacant posts in the tanneries or in the construction sector in the North or Central regions.

The same is true for the domestic work sector because the number of young native women willing to accept being classified as domestic workers or cleaners has decreased reasonably. One effect of this process is that while large numbers of workers apply for white-collar jobs as teachers, clerical clerks in banks and public administration, manual job offers remain vacant²⁸. Vacancies as factory workers in the Northern regions no longer attracts young native workers from the South or from other economically less active parts of the North because the idea of a good job includes its proximity to the place of residence. As a result, to have to transfer to another region nor city for a job which is dirty, demanding and dangerous and not prestigious socially, makes such jobs less attractive in view also of the additional costs of living far from home. As we shall see later, in the presence of a family-based welfare system which enables many young natives to remain with their families and wait for better employment opportunities of their preference, migrant workers become essential actors in many local economies [Sciortino 2002].

Caritas Rome, publisher of a statistical report on immigration which has now reached its twelfth edition, calculates the unemployment rate for migrants as a ratio of unemployed migrants with residence permit for work purposes to the total number of holders of residence permits for same purposes. This approach is likely to under estimate the unemployment rate as it does not take into account that holders of residence permits for family reasons for example can and do take-up jobs without having to change the reason for their stay in the country. As we shall see later, an estimate made on the basis of findings by a survey carried in Lombardy region puts the proportion of people who have residence permit for family reasons but are working at about a third of the total of migrants having such a status in the region. Using the above definition and data from the ministry of the Interior referring to residence permits as at 1st January 2002, Caritas²⁹ calculated national and regional unemployment rates for migrants as in Table 3 below. Research in some local contexts appears to offer a more reliable information on the characteristics of migrant labour force, including employment and unemployment rates.

The ISMU Foundation, through its regional observatory on integration and multiethnicity (*Osservatorio Regionale per l'integrazione e la multiethnicità*), carried out in mid 2002 the second general survey on immigration in Lombardy region³⁰. The region has the largest population of immigrants throughout the country which was estimated at the time of the survey

²⁸ Ambrosini, M. (2001): Ibid, p.52

²⁹ Caritas (2002): Dossier Statistico Immigrazione 2002, XII Rapporto sull'immigrazione Caritas – Migrantes; Anterem, Roma (*Statistical Report on Immigration 2002. XII Report on Immigration Caritas – Migrantes*).

³⁰ Blangiardo G.C. (ed) 2003): L'immigrazione straniera in Lombardia. La seconda indagine regionale: rapporto 2002, ISMU, Milano 2003 (*Foreign immigration in Lombardy. Second regional survey: report 2002*).

to be between 432,000 and 502,700 people and Milan, its capital metropolitan city, remains one of the mainly economic engines of the country. We have seen earlier that the region recorded the largest number of applications for regularization of working status of migrant employees. The survey interviewed 8,000 migrants drawn from 12 provinces and 346 municipalities. The sample was defined in such a way as to ensure that each territorial unit (province) had 400-500 interviews as the minimum and a maximum of 1,000. The sample of migrant population interviewed was drawn from the resident foreign population from the developing world and Eastern Europe aged above fourteen [Blangiardo 2003]³¹.

Table 3 - Residence permits for work purposes and unemployed migrants (01.01.2002)

Regions	Migrant labour force	Unemployed	Unemployment rate (%)
Piedmont	57,695	4,841	8.4
Valley of Aosta	1,548	168	10.9
Lombardy	202,895	9,537	4.7
Liguria	17,535	1,199	6.8
North West	279,673	15,745	5.6
Trentino- South Tyrol	20,995	949	4.5
Veneto	78,406	4,064	5.2
Friuli-V. Giulia	19,495	1,065	5.5
Emilia-Romagna	78,232	6,072	7.8
North East	197,128	12,150	6.2
Tuscany	54,055	2,858	5.3
Umbria	15,045	857	5.7
Marche	21,417	846	4.0
Lazio	130,098	13,346	10.3
Centre	220,615	17,907	8.1
Abruzzo	9,012	500	5.5
Molise	923	79	8.6
Campania	33,961	4,893	14.4
Puglia	16,735	1,189	7.1
Basilicata	1,740	218	12.5
Calabria	7,970	1,970	24.7
South	70,341	8,849	12.6
Sicily	27,432	3,829	14.0
Sardinia	5,491	638	11.6
Islands	32,923	4,467	13.6
ITALY	800,680	59,118	7.4

SOURCE: Caritas/Dossier Statistico Immigrazione 2002.

With regard to the employment sector, the survey by ISMU provides ample information on the participation of migrants in the labour, much of which completes data that is available from some official sources on some of the aspects considered. According to the survey³², the unemployment rate of migrants in the region was 13.4% and this was almost ten percentage points higher than the rate for the entire workforce in the region (4%) and 4.4% higher than the national unemployment in the same period. A break down by sex shows that female unemployment rate (12.8%) was about one percentage point lower than that for males (Table 4).

³¹ Blangiardo G.C. (ed) 2003): op. cit. Vol. I, pp. 50-53. For more on the methodology for choosing single interviewees, see Blangiardo G.C.: *Il campionamento per centri o ambienti di aggregazione nelle indagini sulla presenza straniera*, in *Studi in onore di G.Landenna*, Giuffrè, Milano, 1996.

³² Zanfrini L (2003): *Il lavoro (Employment)*, in: Blangiardo G.C. (ed) 2003): op. cit. Vol. I

Though women have a lesser activity rate, are employed in a limited number of occupations and are engaged at a lesser rate in self-employment, it seems that they have less difficulties in finding jobs than men in those areas where they are present. This finding is confirmed by a qualitative research carried out in the North-East region [Fondazione Corazzin 2003, p.71³³]. With regard to length of stay and employment status, the survey founded that unemployment was highest among those who entered the country in 2002 (56.6%) while for those who entered in 2001 the percentage was much lower (21.1%). This confirms that employment is most favoured by a direct contact between demand and supply and that few employers are willing to choose a prospective employee from the lists drawn-up by Italian consulates in countries of origin of migrants.

Table 4 – Employment status by gender. Years 2002 and 2001 compared (%)

<i>Professional Condition</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Total 2002</i>	<i>Total 2001</i>
Unemployed	13.7	12.8	13.4	13.2
Student	2.5	3.7	2.9	2.9
Housewife	0.1	21.6	8.4	10.6
Regularly employed	52.2	36.1	45.9	45.3
Irregularly employed	21.5	20.4	21.1	17.2
Self-employed	10.2	5.4	8.3	8.9
Did not respond	-	-	-	1.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: ISMU: *Second Regional survey on immigration (2003); op. cit.*

In Lombardy, the majority of the sample, 54.2% were regularly employed, with male migrants recording a higher percentage (62.4%) than female ones. About 8.3% were self-employed while irregular employment was significantly high involving about 21.1% of the sample. Further analysis of those who declared to be irregularly employed shows that the percentage of migrants with stay permits is low among this group (4.5%) and this confirms that having legal title to stay is a strong incentive to seek for regular employment and keep-away from employment in the informal sector. Some of the regularly employed, about 1.4% of the entire sample, declared having a second jobs which are, for the most part, irregular.

The level of education was found to be a determining factor only for self-employment while for work as an employee, other factors seem to be more important. For all types of employment, the length of stay and the authorized or unauthorized status seem be the most important variables. We have seen earlier the close link between legal status and regular employment (Table 5): the latter is a prerequisite to obtain the former and having a legal title to stay is necessary to avoid ending-up in the informal sector.

Table 5 – Professional condition by stay status, 2002 (%)

<i>Professional Condition</i>	<i>Residence card</i>	<i>Stay permit</i>	<i>Expired stay permit</i>	<i>Never had a stay permit</i>	<i>Did not respond</i>
Unemployed	2.8	9.0	18.3	28.5	20.7
Student	1.7	4.0	0.4	0.3	7.8
Housewife	12.7	10.9	2.7	0.7	8.6
Regularly employed	64.0	61.5	14.7	0.1	24.1
Irregularly	4.2	6.5	55.4	64.4	24.1

³³ Bonifacio Vitale et al. (eds) (2001): *Nella Terra del lavoro. L'inserimento sociale e lavorativo degli immigrati nel Nordest*, Fondazione Corazzin, Venezia (*In the land of labour. Social and employment integration of immigrants in the Northeast*).

employed					
Self-employed	14.5	8.1	8.5	6.1	14.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: ISMU: *Second Regional survey on immigration (2003)*; *op. cit.*

Regarding the sectors where migrant labour is predominantly used, the data from the Lombardy survey confirms what is known about the participation of migrant in the labour market throughout the entire national territory from sources such as INPS and INAIL. Non-EU migrant workers are over-represented in services (49%), followed by industry (36%) and agriculture (15%) and they have gained a strong foothold in small and medium-sized enterprises, with over 58% employed in such firms (7 percentage points higher than the Italian rate). Non-EU migrant workers are, on the average, younger than their Italians counterparts in the same types of jobs³⁴. Within the industrial sector, migrants are employed for the most part as unskilled workers either in small and medium-sized manufacturing industry or in the construction industry and as Table 6 below shows, this is particularly true for men (30.2% against 8.5%). Similarly, men represent the bulk of migrant workers in the agricultural sector where, unlike the situation in the Southern regions of the country and in Trentino and Alto Adige-South Tyrol, migrants workers have replaced local labour as unskilled workers in animal husbandry in the plains of Padania.

In the services sector, we find migrant workers employed as cleaners, warehouse keepers, transporters, restaurant and catering services workers, housemaids etc. The occupation that stands above all others here is that of the housemaid or servant, either fixed (in which case the worker may live with the family) or by the hour. Contrary to what happens in the industrial sector, women prevail in domestic work (27.5% against 2.6% for men). A significant percentage of women work as domestic assistants for the elderly and the remaining are distributed among activities like cleaning, unskilled factory work and catering services. Equally important is the percentage of migrant workers who own commercial activities or exercise crafts as mechanics, panel beaters, painters, carpenters, electricians, plumbers, tailors etc.

With reference to areas of origin of migrants and the largest eight national groups in the region, we find that these groups tend to be concentrated in some occupations more than in others, a situation which has led some authors to speak of “*ethnicization*” of certain sectors of the labour market [Ambrosini 2001; Zanfrini 2003]. This situation has emerged from the fact that small and medium-sized enterprises as well as families that need housemaids hardly have the resources and time to undertake sophisticated personnel selection procedures such as advertising available posts, carrying out interviews of prospective employees etc. Instead, the search for someone to employ is carried out by word of mouth within a circle of friends and relatives or, in the case of enterprises, amongst employees who have proven to be trust-worthy and hard working and whose recommendations of people to be employed are considered sufficient and reliable credentials and guarantee of seriousness.

Table 6 – Types of occupation by gender 2002 (%)

Occupations	Male	Female	Total
Unskilled workers	30.2	8.5	23.2
Skilled workers	4.6	0.2	3.2
Construction workers	14.5	0.3	9.9
Farm workers	3.2	0.1	2.2
Cleaners	5.6	9.2	6.8
Warehouse keepers	6.1	1.5	4.6
Clerical clerks	1.8	4.4	2.6
Sales men and women	2.4	2.6	2.4

³⁴ Caritas (2002): *Immigrazione Dossier Statistico 2002*

Self-employed in commerce	7.1	2.0	5.4
Catering workers	7.4	7.5	7.5
Artisans	8.4	1.9	6.3
Transporters	3.3	0.1	2.3
Personal caretakers	0.1	0.8	0.3
Fixed housemaids or servants	2.6	27.5	10.6
Housemaids by the hour	0.1	3.4	1.1
Domestic assistants for the elderly	0.6	19.8	6.8
Baby sitter	0.1	4.4	1.5
Social assistants	0.1	0.5	0.2
Doctors and paramedical staff	0.4	1.9	0.9
Intellectuals	0.9	2.7	1.4
Other	0.5	0.8	0.7
Totale	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: ISMU: *Second Regional survey on immigration (2003); op. cit.*

At the same time, networks of groups of migrants from the same or neighbouring countries provide those who participate in them valuable resources such as information and inter-personal relationships useful in finding jobs. The outcome of these processes is that an increasing number of people from a given national group ends-up being concentrated in one or two niches of the labour market and over time, this leads some to explain the situation as being a consequence of common characteristics of members of that national group. The findings of the Lombardy survey illustrate the phenomenon quite well as Table 7 below shows.

The largest national groups in the region that are found concentrated in certain areas of activity are: the Philipinos who are employed mainly as domestic workers or servants (46.7%); the Senegalese as unskilled workers in industries (45.9%) and as traders (19.8%); the Chinese found in restaurants (40.9%) and commerce as store-keepers (18.7%); the Albanians as unskilled workers in industries (34.9%) and in the construction sector (31.8%); Rumanians who, like the Albanians, have significant presence as unskilled workers both in industries in general (21.2%) and in the construction industry in particular (20.7%). The last two groups - Peruvians and Egyptians - are employed in a significant part as domestic servants (20.9%) and in restaurants respectively (20.6%). Available data at national level confirms the predominance of Philipinos and Peruvians in the domestic work sector (Table 8).

Table 7 – Types of occupation by region of origin (2002) (%)

Occupations	Eastern Europe	Asia	North Africa	Rest of Africa	Latina America	Total
Unskilled workers	18.0	18.3	29.2	37.5	9.2	23.2
Skilled workers	1.7	2.9	4.5	5.2	0.7	3.2
Construction workers	24.2	1.6	17.5	2.6	2.4	9.9
Farm workers	2.6	3.9	2.0	1.0	0.5	2.2
Cleaners	4.6	5.8	6.1	6.4	13.1	6.8
Warehouse keepers	2.9	4.7	4.3	5.6	5.6	4.6
Clerical clerks	2.6	2.8	2.0	1.8	4.5	2.6
Sales men and women	3.1	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.4
Self-employed in commerce	0.4	7.2	5.8	10.3	1.9	5.4
Catering workers / waiters	6.0	12.4	7.6	3.6	6.2	7.5

Artisans	7.0	4.3	10.4	5.2	4.2	6.3
Transporters	2.6	1.1	1.5	3.9	3.0	2.3
Personal care workers	0.4	0.2	-	0.1	1.4	0.3
Fixed housemaids or servants	7.8	20.3	3.3	6.7	15.5	10.6
Housemaids by the hour	1.8	0.4	0.7	1.2	2.2	1.1
Domestic assistants of the elderly	9.2	7.1	0.6	2.7	19.0	6.8
Baby sitter	1.5	1.6	0.4	1.5	3.1	1.5
Social assistants	0.4	-	-	0.2	0.7	0.2
Doctors and paramedical staff	1.1	1.3	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.9
Intellectuals	1.9	1.4	0.9	0.9	2.6	1.4
Other	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.4	1.2	0.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: ISMU: Second Regional survey on immigration (2003); op. cit.

Table 8 - Principal countries of origin of non-EU domestic workers (1999)

Continents	Number	%	Country	Number	%	Country	Number	%
Europe	21,997	19.3	Philippines	36,606	32.1	Somalia	2,771	2.4
<i>East Europe</i>	<i>19,051</i>	<i>16.7</i>	Peru	11,847	10.4	Cape Verde	2,216	1.9
America	23,279	20.4	Sri Lanka	9,791	8.6	Brazil	1,424	1.2
<i>Latin America</i>	<i>21,774</i>	<i>19.1</i>	Rumania	5,591	4.9	Nigeria	1,309	1.1
Asia	49,214	43.1	Poland	4,533	4.0	Mauritius	1,235	1.1
<i>Philippines</i>	<i>36,606</i>	<i>32.1</i>	Albania	4,530	4.0	El Salvador	1,196	1.0
Africa	19,669	17.2	Morocco	4,292	3.8			
<i>Sub-S. Africa</i>	<i>11,470</i>	<i>1.0</i>	Ethiopia	3,204	2.8			
Oceania	43	-	Dom. Republic	2,985	2.6			
Total	114,182	100.0	Ecuador	2,887	2.5	Total	114,182	100.0

Source: Caritas/Dossier Statistico Immigrazione2002

The ISMU survey found that concentration of national groups in segments of the labour market is often accompanied by a de-qualification of migrant workers. In other words, these workers are frequently employed for occupations below those which they would be expected to be in on the basis of the educational or professional levels they have attained. As Ambrosini³⁵ puts it, migrants who find jobs have often higher educational levels and professional competences compared to their Italian counterparts in the same jobs. Researchers in at the Corazzin Foundation in Venice arrived at the same conclusion while analysing the position of migrants in the small and medium-sized enterprises in the Northeast.

In Lombardy region, it was found that de-qualification affects to a greater extent those migrants who have neither obtained their educational qualifications in Italy nor had the diplomas they brought with them evaluated and recognised by Italian authorities. Only about 18.2% of people in this group who have university degrees obtained outside Italy declared having white-collar jobs or an intellectual professions (mainly as interpreters, cultural mediators, artists etc.) or as medical or paramedical staff while 17.4% of declared being employed as unskilled workers, 11.2% as fixed housemaids, 6.9% as waiters, 5.8% as cleaners. On the contrary, about 42.5% of migrants who obtained their university degrees in Italy declared having a white-collar job, an

³⁵ Ambrosini M (2001): op. cit, p.138

intellectual or medical profession. For both groups, the share of high school diploma holders who have white-collar jobs or do intellectual professions is much lower: less than 5% for those with foreign diplomas and 12.2% for those with Italian diplomas. This aspect highlights the need for defining a clear procedure through which migrants could have their educational and professional qualifications evaluated and recognised in a much faster way than is the case presently.

6.3. Migrants' income levels

This is an aspect of migrants participation in the Italian labour market that has rarely been investigated by researchers. Venturini and Villosio³⁶ using data from INPS to investigate possible competition between migrants and natives for jobs, also tried to find out if there were significant wage differences between migrant workers and their native counterparts. They concluded that there were no significant differences on grounds of place of birth and that gender was a more significant variable in determining wage differences than ethnicity or national origin. There were a number of problems with this research. Firstly, data from the national institute for social welfare does not provide any clue as to the nationality nor ethnicity of workers registered with it as contributors. As a result, the authors of the research had to refer simply to "place of birth" which includes Italians and descendants born outside the country. Secondly, it enquired into discrimination among the regularly employed who are registered with INPS and for whom regular social welfare contributions as well as taxes are paid by the employers. A number of researches have suggested that discrimination on grounds of ethnicity or national origin may occur all along the line leading to regular employment as well as in such other aspects of the migrant worker's life as training and promotion, being employed for occupations that value educational or professional qualifications possessed by migrants etc. Besides, this research does not highlight any possible differences between the level of discrimination faced by migrant women and that faced by the natives.

The survey in Lombardy looked at income levels of migrant workers and the authors conclude that, in line with the general situation of female workers, migrant women receive, on the average, salary levels that are lower than those of their male counterparts from same countries. The table below shows that they are concentrated around low to medium wages: taking into consideration only those who earn at least a minimum wage, male migrant workers earn 989 Euro per month on the average while women earn 820 Euro, with the median values at Euro 900 and 750 respectively.

Table 9 – Income classes by gender 2002 (%)

	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Total</i>
No income	17.2	39.6	26.0
< 250 €	0.9	1.3	1.1
250-500 €	5.8	10.2	7.6
500-750 €	12.9	21.2	16.1
750-1000 €	41.2	23.3	34.2
1000-1500 €	16.7	3.5	11.5
1500-2500 €	4.5	0.7	3.0
> 2500 €	0.8	0.1	0.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: ISMU: *Second Regional survey on immigration (2003)*; *op. cit.*

³⁶ Venturini A, Villosio C. (2002): Are Immigrants Competing with Natives in the Italian Labour Market?. The Employment Effect, IZA DP no.467, April 2002.

The research found that income earning capacity is positively correlated to having a regular and stable status both in employment and in terms of being authorized to stay. Migrant workers who have permanent residence card were found to have higher incomes partly due also to their length of stay in the country. Self-employed workers who are regular declared an average income of Euro 1,160 monthly (the median value is Euro 1.427), followed by regularly and full-time workers who earn Euro 994 or Euro 885 for regularly employed fixed-time workers. Irregularly employed workers, including self-employment, earn between Euro 828 and 807 and those working part-time earn Euro 631. While in general people with higher educational or professional qualifications are concentrated around medium to high income classes more than those who do not have such titles, the level of education seemed to be a determining factor in order to accede to higher income levels mainly for those who obtained their qualifications in the country or have had such qualifications legally recognized (Table 9).

Table 10 – Income classes by educational qualification attained and legally recognised 2002 (%)

	<i>No qualification</i>		<i>Compulsory school</i>		<i>Secondary school</i>		<i>University Degree/diploma</i>	
	<i>attained</i>	<i>recogn</i>	<i>attained</i>	<i>recogn</i>	<i>attained</i>	<i>recogn</i>	<i>attained</i>	<i>recogn</i>
No income	29,5	22,9	26,5	27,7	25,8	26,1	21,5	18,8
< 250 €	1,0	0,7	0,7	1,4	1,3	1,3	1,4	1,3
250-500 €	7,4	9,6	6,3	5,7	8,2	9,6	8,6	4,7
500-750 €	14,8	20,2	15,3	13,2	17,3	14,4	15,6	11,4
750-1000 €	28,6	31,6	35,8	36,3	34,1	31,8	35,1	32,3
1000-1500 €	15,7	11,9	12,0	12,8	10,1	12,0	12,2	17,4
1500-2500 €	1,9	2,6	3,2	2,8	2,6	3,8	4,8	10,7
> 2500 €	1,0	0,6	0,2	0,1	0,6	1,0	0,7	3,4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: ISMU: *Second Regional survey on immigration (2003); op. cit.*

6.4. Working conditions

We have earlier noted that migrants are frequently employed for dirty, dangerous and demanding jobs³⁷. This is confirmed by the high incidence of accidents in the workplace recorded in recent years. In 2002, there were 1,093,304 accidents in the workplace and 26,3764 industrial diseases giving a total of 1,119,678 accidents (INAIL³⁸, Tables 1 and 2 in Annex 1). A breakdown by “area of origin” of the injured shows that EU workers were involved in 7,689 cases, non-EU workers 74,543 cases or 6.6% of the total and in 218,153 cases, the area of origin was not specified. In the first half of this year (2003), a total of 515,276 accidents have been recorded already and non-EU migrant workers account for 6.9% of the total. In terms of territorial distribution, the Northern regions led by Lombardy, have the highest level of accidents in the workplace, followed by the central regions with Tuscany leading and the Southern regions and the Island record the lowest levels of accidents. Throughout the country, high rates of activity are accompanied by high levels of accidents in the workplace. The industrial sector registered the highest number of cases even though there are regional differences. The situation is particularly serious in the construction industry which registers also the highest number of fatal accidents. The agriculture sector though employing lesser number of

³⁷ Ambrosini defines these types of jobs in Italian as 5-P jobs, to indicate that they are: *pesanti* (heavy), *pericolosi* (dangerous), *poco pagati* (low-paid), *precari* (precarious) and *penalizzati socialmente* (socially penalised).

³⁸ INAIL maintains an archive on accidents in the workplace which is constantly updated as the accident is reported and it is accessible to the public on its web pages. The tables in Annex 1 were indicate the numbers for 2003 recorded as at July 3rd. <http://osservatorio.inail.it>.

migrant workers than industry and services, comes second in terms of the total number of accidents but first in terms of the incidence of fatal [Caritas 2002].

The information provided above refers only to cases that were reported to INAIL, the national institute for insurance against incidents in the workplace and understandably, only in cases of regular employment of migrant workers do employers report accidents that occur within their enterprises. This means that unauthorized migrant workers not only face risks of being exploited more than authorized ones but also do not have any protection against incidents they may incur during work. Some trade union operators have reported cases where injured migrants have been left close to the hospital by their former irregular employers, for fear of being discovered. In some cases, injured workers try to protect their former employers by finding alternative explanations for how they got injured [Ambrosini; Boccagni 2002³⁹].

At the same time, migrants have been shown to have a very high mobility rate from one employment to another. This aspect is well documented by INAIL through its records of job-starts, terminations and changes from one job to another. In 2001, it recorded 4,743,650 job-starts and 4,297,205 terminations, with a net positive balance of 446,445 jobs. Job-starts by non-EU workers numbered 467,304 against 378,856 terminations giving a balance of 88,448 jobs still in place at the end of the year. In percentage terms, non-EU workers made up 9.9% of total job-starts, 8.8% of terminations and 19.8% of all new jobs still in existence at the end of the year even though – as is frequently the case - they were probably temporary.

In terms of territorial distribution, migrant labour accounted for 4% of new jobs in the South and Islands, 10-11% in the Central regions and in the North West and a significantly high 15% in the North East. In all areas, the balance between job-starts and terminations is more favourable of migrants than Italians: on average, one post remains at the end of the year for every five new starts. According to data released by INAIL covering the period 16.3.2000-27.6.2002, immigrants accounted for 16% of job changes, a percentage which is 4 to 5 times higher than their share of the labour force (Table 11 below).

Non-EU workers make up between 3% and 4%⁴⁰ of the total labour force but represent three times that proportion of job starts and six times of contracts lasting more than a year. One in ten new starts involves a non-EU worker, but this rises to one in five for posts lasting more than a year. In other words, in the occupations for which migrant workers are mostly requested, are more likely to remain in their jobs.

Table 11 - Italy. Active workers by length of employment (16.3.2000-27.6.2002)

	Italians		EU workers		Non-EU workers		Totals	
1 month	280,738	7.0	4,288	7.3	35,864	8.2	320,890	7.1
2 months	277,751	6.9	4,564	7.8	39,078	8.9	321,393	7.1
3 months	234,329	5.8	3,644	6.2	30,361	6.9	268,334	5.9
4 months	203,16	5.1	3,372	5.8	26,924	6.2	233,912	5.2
5 months	199,132	4.9	2,976	5.1	24,090	5.5	226,198	5.0
6 months	239,462	5.9	3,358	5.7	25,337	5.8	268,157	5.9
Over 6 months	2,592,863	64.4	36,325	62.1	256,001	58.5	2,885,159	63.8
Total	4,027,891	100.0	58,527	100.0	437,665	100.0	4,524,073	100.0

Source: Caritas/Dossier Statistico Immigrazione based on INAIL/DNA data

³⁹ Ambrosini M., Boccagli P. (eds) (2002): Provincia Autonoma di Trento: L'immigrazione in Trentino. Rapporto annuale 2002 (Autonomous Province of Trento: *Immigration in Trentino. Annual report 2002*)

⁴⁰ This depends on whether only migrants with residence permits for work purposes are considered as constituting the labour force (Caritas' approach) or if a part of those aged 15 years and above with residence permits for family reasons should be considered as part of the workforce given that they are permitted to work and many do work, without having to change the reason for their stay written on the residence permit (ISMU's approach).

Similarly, many migrants are employed in seasonal jobs in agriculture or in the tourist sector. A quota of 39,400 foreign seasonal workers was set for 2001 and a greater part of this number was assigned to Trentino Alto-Adige / South Tyrol, Veneto and Emilia Romagna. This type of work is being increasingly undertaken by migrants, either those already resident in Italy or those who come specifically for it. INAIL records also show that seasonal work is 15 points higher among immigrants than Italians and 11 points higher for women than men.

7. Analysis of direct and indirect discrimination

7.1. Patterns of use of migrant labour in Italy

The inclusion of migrants in the labour market reflects in many aspects the structural differences between different parts of the country, particularly between the Central and Northern regions on the one hand and the Southern regions and the Islands on the other. But even within single regions, different models of inclusion have emerged in line with the structure of the local economy. In the industrial sector in the North and central regions, where the productive system is dominated by small and medium-sized enterprises and unemployment is quite low, migrant workers are requested mainly as unskilled labour in manufacturing industries and such demand is mainly satisfied by male migrants regularly employed at the lowest contractual levels.

In metropolitan areas in the above regions, in particular in Rome and Milan, migrant labour is concentrated mainly in the services sector and female migrant workers prevail here as domestic servants or personal assistants for the elderly who can not cater directly for themselves. The extent of domestic work is under-estimated by official records because it features only partially in the new jobs archive maintained by INPS, as the employment procedure is simplified and does not necessarily give rise to a registration in the above archive. This situation is gradually changing under pressure from the immigration law which has established a very close link between being employed and having a legal title to stay.

In the South and the Islands, migrant labour is needed in response to high seasonal demand for manual labour for harvesting tomatoes and other vegetables or in the tourist industry and employment is mainly precarious and irregular. There are though cases of stable and regular employments for high-sea fishing, in green houses and in the construction sector. Seasonal demand for migrant labour in the North and central regions follow the same patterns as in the South and Islands. Migrants workers are employed temporarily for work in agriculture, to harvest apples as in Trentino Alto Adige – South Tyrol or for work in hotels and other tourist services; employment is more regular here than in the South [Ambrosini 2001, 74:77].

An element that is common to all sectors is that migrant workers tend to be employed mainly as unskilled labour even though many have high educational and professional qualifications. The the professional competences acquired before entering Italy may not match those mostly requested by the labour market and this may explain part of the excessive presence of migrants with high educational levels in unskilled jobs as well as the higher unemployment rate recorded for migrants. Similarly, inadequate command of Italian language probably accounts for part of the poor start many migrant workers encounter [Wrench 1996; Ambrosini 2001]. But we have also seen that even migrants who obtained their educational or professional qualifications in Italy and who are less likely to have problems with the language, face conditions in the labour that are worse than those encountered by their native peers. In these as in the case of those who have obtained a formal recognition of diplomas attained in the countries of origin, discrimination may be at work. Most experts and researcher seem to identify the major obstacle to migrants' qualifications being valued in the difficulty of having diplomas obtained outside the country evaluated and recognized. We have seen above from the survey in Lombardy region that there are significant differences between the income levels of migrant workers with university degrees either obtained in Italy or legally recognized and those whose degrees and professional qualifications are not recognized. The complexity and lack of clarity of the procedure to obtain formal recognition of foreign diplomas has thus produced discriminatory effects on some migrant workers. Zanfrini (2003) has argued that these discriminatory effects in the forms of high concentration in unskilled jobs and e-qualification, are much more due to the

characteristics of the productive system at this stage of migration to Italy than to those of migrant workers.

Official and formal recognition of diplomas obtained overseas may be only one part of the problem: In a survey of employers carried out by Ires Tuscany, it was found that less than 5% declared valuing previous professional experiences and competences of migrants they employed. Particularly for non-EU migrants, stereotyped images of their countries or origin seem to be transferred to the individual worker even by employers.

Discrimination of migrant workers in the Italian labour market also occurs through informal selection procedures. Research in different local contexts have shown that in all sectors, migrants find jobs mainly by either approaching enterprises (industry and agriculture) directly or through relatives and friends (from same country or Italians) and only a small fraction find jobs through employment offices, even after the reform of such agencies in recent years. Even the role of NGOs and migrant support associations has been re-evaluated by research in local contexts. These organisations account for a small percentage as a channel of finding a job. The prevalent way through which migrants find jobs is through relatives and friends of the same country or ethnic networks as some authors describe them. These networks are particularly important in the case of the various forms of domestic work, either as servants or personal assistants of the elderly. The case of the Philippino in Lombardy is quite illustrative. About 70% of domestic workers from this group interviewed in the survey by ISMU declared having found jobs through a network of friends and relatives.

In other words, recruitment is very much based on “word of mouth” which implies that only those who have contacts as friends or relatives with people in a given sector are more likely to learn about job opportunities in those areas. We have seen earlier that this system of recruitment has been used also to explain the emergence of the “ethnicization” of some sectors and that this high concentration of some national groups in certain niches of the labour market later reinforces stereotypes about the characteristics of such groups assumed to be particularly suited to do certain jobs and not others.

Another element that has been to contribute to discrimination of migrants in the labour market is the attitude of native workers towards their migrant counterparts. An employer interviewed about his recruitment and dismissal practices said: “I have an Egyptian employee at the yard whom I have to dismiss because the other employees do not want him on the same bus and the lady at the catering service has threatened to call all of them away. I will have to leave him at home; I do not select them; I take as I find ...”⁴¹. Interviews of migrants suggest that such cases of discrimination by delegation are not rare even in white-collar jobs such as sales agents of insurance policies, financial investments or ordinary consumer goods. In these cases, employers are said to express fear that prospective clients may not like dealing with a non-national.

The *Fondazione Nord Est* (North East Foundation) in a European-wide survey⁴² carried out between the months of January and February 2002 involving a statistically representative sample of the population of seven European countries including Italy⁴³, found that the perception of immigrants “did not differ much” when compared to the situation in the previous year. According to this report, 29.2% of the Italian sample in 2002 agreed *much or very much*

⁴¹ Marini D., (2002), Formare una professione o educare al lavoro? I fabbisogni professionali degli immigrati secondo gli imprenditori del Nord Est, in Quaderni FNE, Collana Osservatori No.4, p.91

⁴² Diamanti I., Bordignon F., (2002), Immigrazione e cittadinanza in Europa: Terza indagine sugli atteggiamenti dei cittadini in sette Paesi Europei. Primi appunti sui risultati dell’indagine, in Quaderni FNE, Collana Osservatori No.5, pp. 8-13

⁴³ European countries covered were France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Poland, Spain and Hungary.

with the statement that *immigrants represent a threat to employment* for nationals as against 32.3% the year before.

In a different survey targeting employers in three north east regions, the *Venice-based Foundation* researchers found a similar pattern of negative perceptions of immigrants and possible signs of hostility, albeit potential. They interviewed about 950 entrepreneurs about their perceptions of migration and immigrant workers in their areas. About 56.2% of the sample agreed with the statement that *there are too many immigrants and that it is not possible to allow more to come in*; 46.8% agreed that *immigrants constitute a threat to public order and personal security* and 30.8% said that *immigrants represent a threat to their culture and identity*⁴⁴. The research indicates that medium-sized and big firms showed a more open attitude towards migrant workers while less open and somewhat hostile attitude prevailed among small and very small firms, particularly those that do not have an immigrant employee, in the regions considered⁴⁵.

However recent data on the lack of labour in some industrial areas of the country (Piemonte, Lombardia, Nord Est⁴⁶) indicates that the presence of immigrant workers is necessary for the socio-economic development in such areas in the near future. About 40.4% of the sample interviewed by the Venice based foundation said that the number of immigrants will have to increase in order to meet local labour demands in the coming years⁴⁷. Similar opinions have been expressed by employers representatives at national level⁴⁸.

The simplified procedure for employing domestic workers and also the different and somewhat simplified fiscal regime applied to this category of workers, while making things easier for the employer, has some negative consequences for the migrant workers involved. Access to citizenship through naturalization requires proving that the applicant has paid taxes regularly in the five preceding years and income declaration made by or for each worker is required as proof. Here lies the problem for some domestic workers: the fiscal regime domestic work is subjected to does not make it obligatory, unlike in other areas of activity, for the worker to present to the tax authorities a declaration on the year's income. In other sectors of activity, the employer is required by law to deduct from the employee's salary the amount due as taxes and pay it directly to the State and at the end of the year, employees receive from their employers income declarations stating how much they earn the previous and how much was paid as taxes to the State. Employers of domestic workers are exempted from all these and an employee is allowed to either choose the forfeitary regime as regards income declaration or present one to the authorities when due. Many domestic workers do not have the necessary information for a correct appraisal of the advantages and disadvantages of choosing one fiscal regime or the other. As a result, many tend to follow what is convenient for the employer, only to discover, when they apply for citizenship, that they were not properly informed and had taken the wrong decisions.

We have seen earlier that self-employment is quite high among migrants who have high educational qualifications, who may see it as a better way out of the circle of unskilled jobs and the consequent de-qualification many undergo. But even here, there are administrative barriers of which the new immigration law stands above all. One example of such barrier to access to

⁴⁴ Marini D., (2002), op.cit, p. 39.

⁴⁵ Marini D. (2002): ibidem, p. 42

⁴⁶ Osservatorio IRES – CGIL: II° Rapporto Immigrazione, Scenari, mercato del lavoro e contrattazione, 2002, p.10

⁴⁷ Marini D. (2002): op. cit. p.37

⁴⁸ Guido B. (2002): Uno, nessuno, centomila. Due conti sull'immigrazione (One, none, a hundred thousand. Few considerations on immigration), in: ISFOL, Area Mercato del Lavoro: Il lavoro degli immigrati: programmazione dei flussi e politiche d'inserimento (The work of immigrants: programming influx and integration policy); eds.: Guido B., Carbone A. E.; Franco Angeli Milan 2002; p.89.

self-employment for those who are already legally resident in the country but who do not have the permanent residence card, is the abolition of the possibility of using a residence permit issued for work purposes as an employee to go into self-employment. This measure restricts the chances of being employed of people in the above category by forcing them to remain in the condition for which they were first issued a residence permit, that is, as employees. The strict conditions of access to the permanent residence card and discretionary interpretation of the procedures by competent authorities in different provinces, all compound the situation. These limitations have consequences not only on those who would want to start their own economic activities but also on the overall well-being of segments of the migrant populations who are thereby deprived of certain group-specific services currently not offered by the local market.

7.2. Vulnerable groups

Female migrant workers experience multiple discrimination on grounds of gender and national, ethnic or racial origin. They are more easily accepted and they encounter lesser problems in finding jobs than male immigrants but they remain confined to domestic work as housemaids or servants or other care-related occupations (personal assistants for the sick and elderly, waiters, cleaners etc.). The easy access to this kind of jobs, in many cases even without a stay permit, is accompanied by difficulties to leave such jobs for more qualified ones in other sectors. Educational qualifications, competences and professional skills are not valued⁴⁹.

The emancipation of many Italian women from unpaid domestic work, their entry into the labour market in the absence of adequate public services and a re-distribution of work within the family, has been obtained in many cases by delegating part of the above tasks to other women, quite often immigrant women from non-EU countries⁵⁰. Some consequences of this situation are often low salaries and the difficulties to cope with this type of work and family life. In many cases, these women leave the rest of their families in their countries of origin leading to a situation whereby labour demands by Italian families deprive others - immigrant women - of the possibility to have a regular family life. Another important effect of the prevalence of domestic work for immigrant women is that some tend to adapt to the situation and renounce looking for positions of a higher social status. Over the years, some national groups that have a high presence in the domestic work sector tend to adjust to the situation by encouraging less educated people to come and take up jobs as domestic workers. This in turn leads to ethnic and / or national characterization of the sector for which some groups are considered as being particularly good at such jobs. In the final analysis, immigrant women encounter multiple discrimination both on national and/or ethnic grounds and on grounds of gender.

Another vulnerable group amongst migrants and other minorities are young people. We have seen that unemployment rate for the entire population in the class of age 15 – 24 years was about 27% in 2002. No data is available on the specific unemployment rate for migrant youth of working age who are out of the school system. Some conclusions can be drawn on the basis of some local experiences and circumstantial evidence. Reports by the Ministry of Education indicates that drop-out rate by migrant pupils is higher than for the natives and this mainly occurs within the ages of 14 and 18 years or after completing compulsory schooling, to put it differently. Besides, the number of non-Italian pupils in schools has grown considerably in the last decade and so has the proportion of those who leave school after the compulsory level. Native adolescents in such conditions often go into alternative professional education in

⁴⁹ Istituto IARD Franco Brambilla, Politiche sociali e politiche del lavoro: l'integrazione socio-lavorativa degli stranieri in Lombardia, Report finale, (2002), pp.80-83

⁵⁰ Istituto IARD Franco Brambilla (2002): op. cit p. 81. See also Provincia Autonoma di Trento (2002): *L'immigrazione in Trentino, rapporto annuale 2002*, p.27.

vocational training or are taken as apprentices in various crafts. In many cases, such children work with their parents or relatives who have their own activities.

While vocational training is open to all, migrant and native youth, access to work as an apprentice is not easy as it follows what we have seen to be the most common way of recruiting workers for unskilled labour: word or mouth and search of workers within family or friendly circles. Young migrants are sure disadvantaged here than the native peers. It seems likely that young migrants in the above age group contribute substantially to the high unemployment rate of the same age group.

7.3. Roma populations

Roma populations represent the group that is hardest hit by unemployment. Officially, there is no statistics on employment and unemployment of the Roma and even the organisations working closely with them do not have such information. All estimates though indicate that unemployment is highest in Roma communities than in any other segments of the resident population. The European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC) wrote in its country report⁵¹ on Italy that “a few formal employment opportunities are available in the camp system. Some Roma are engaged in traditional crafts. Others perform seasonal agricultural or fishing work. Some engage in very rudimentary entrepreneurial work. Others beg. Many are simply idle”. The situation is seriously compounded by the particular places where probably most Roma (both Italian and foreign) live in Italy, a situation the ERRC aptly characterised as “campland” in reference to the fact that Roma populations are forced by circumstances to live predominantly in camps.

There is a deeply rooted popular conviction in Italy that the Roma are “nomads” and do not like living in fixed homes. This negative categorization of all Roma has, for decades, found its way into public policies towards this group. The most outstanding example of this is the generalized approach to accommodation for the Roma. Almost all regions and autonomous provinces have laws providing for “transit” camps for Roma travellers. This in itself constitutes a discriminatory practice from which other abuses descend.

⁵¹ Campland. Racial segregation of Roma in Italy, ERRC, Budapest; available at: www.errc.org. See also Commissione per le Politiche di Integrazione (2000): Rom e Sinti. Integrazione possibile. Italia ed Europa a confronto, Atti di Convegno internazionale, Giugno 2000.

8. Strategies, initiatives and good practices supporting diversity

There is hardly any systematically collected data on court cases for discrimination in the employment sector. The anti-discrimination legislation has been used so far mostly to enforce equality of treatment in access to goods and services. The absence of case law for discrimination in employment on grounds of race and/or ethnicity is consistent with the non-existence of a monitoring system. Anecdotal evidence from lawyers working with migrants suggests that there are cases of discrimination on grounds of racial origin that could go to the courts but migrant workers are said not to be often willing to pursue such cases for fear of damaging their chances of finding alternative employment in the area.

All the major trade unions provide information services targeting migrant workers specifically and aimed at giving necessary information useful in defending their rights as workers. While such initiatives do not focus on issues of discrimination, they still contribute to promoting better awareness of rights both as workers in general and as foreign ones in particular. Other initiatives promoted by unions and many NGOs as well concern Italian language courses for adults. The objective is to overcome disadvantage due to inadequate command of the language which could hinder getting a job or affect negatively the possibilities of interaction with co-workers. Such courses are financially supported in many cases by local government authorities or through projects supported by the central government.

One such language teaching initiative is run by a department of the public radio and television called RAI Educational. This programme called "*Io parlo italiano*" (I speak Italian) was set-up in cooperation with the Ministry of Education. Language lessons are transmitted on the satellite-based RAI Educational channel and interested foreigners can have access to such lessons through the Centri Territoriali di educazione Permanente [CTP] –territorial centres for permanent education – owned by the Ministry of Education.

The debate on corporate responsibility is becoming increasingly popular amongst public authorities, big and medium-sized firms and NGOs and there are pioneer attempts to include race and ethnicity-based equality in the debate on corporate responsibility. Big transnational firms operating in Italy are beginning to introduce the diversity management practices as part of their global strategy to consolidate their positions in various markets. So far, the examples of equality initiatives by these firms are so few and the organisations themselves too far from the sectors of employment most migrant workers can have access to, that these initiatives will not have a direct effect on the working life of most migrant and minority workers we have so far discussed in this paper. All the same, here are a few examples.

The Swedish transnational company Ikea has opened a number of new shopping centres in Italy in the last year and in a series of seminars organised by the School of Business Administration L. Bocconi in Milan, the organisation's management made presentations about initiatives it had taken to ensure that its workforce reflects, in composition, that of the local context where it is located. When it opened a centre in Florence, in an area with high presence of Chinese migrants, it made attempts to reach this community and to encourage them to apply for posts at the shopping centre. Details of the specific measures taken to disseminate information in pursuit of stimulating participation by the Chinese community in Florence are not available yet. The relevance of this short remark in this context is that it could trigger an emulative effect on other firms and this could lead to new opportunities of employment for migrants and minorities.

NGOs are also promoting initiatives aimed at improving employment opportunities for discriminated groups. One such initiative is run by ENAIP Emilia Romagna in cooperation with

COSPE and the financial support of the European Commission. The programme is called M.A.CON.D.O, acronym for “*Mainstreaming Azioni per contrastare la discriminazione nelle organizzazioni*” (Mainstreaming Actions to counter discrimination within organisations) and it essentially aims to train “equality officers” within business organisations as well as NGOs and public administrations.

Many other organisations, public and private, are promoting courses for so-called “cultural and linguistic mediators”. These are normally migrants or people of migrant origin who are trained to work as community interpreter in public services that have high numbers of migrant and ethnic minority users. In spite of the controversy surrounding the validity of this figure as a professional, public authorities have financially supported or promoted directly a number of courses. Some, like the regional government of Tuscany and the Autonomous Province of Bolzano – South Tyrol, have instituted a specific professional qualification for cultural and linguistic mediators.

The work of cultural or intercultural mediators as they are called, is becoming increasingly popular with many migrants who have from high school to university education and who until recently, have had to accept a manual and heavy occupation in order to earn their living. Though the profession offers less income compared to working in a manufacturing industry, many find it more prestigious and as a result, are investing much of their resources and time to make it a success. Public service operators on the other hand are eager to be supported in their dealing with migrants who may not have adequate command of the language. At the moment, there is room for improvement of cultural and linguistic mediation both as an opportunity for work for some migrants and for the provision of better services to ethnic minority users who have difficulties with Italian language. At the same time, there are risks of confining once again migrants into an area of activity that is limited both in terms of the resources it mobilizes and its impact on public decision making processes. In other words, while it could improve the conditions of some, it is likely not to be the challenge to discrimination that is required to improve the situation of migrants and minorities in the labour market.

9. Conclusions and Recommendations

The study has highlighted, on the basis of both official data and research findings that there is discrimination against migrant workers and those from other minorities in the labour market, even though there may be little public awareness of the problem as a recent Eurostat survey has found. Discussions of issues relating to discrimination is constantly intertwined with those concerning immigration and the study has drawn from statistical and descriptive information on migrants to show where and how discrimination operates against such groups. Public and academic discourse is gradually moving from describing the disadvantage and discrimination faced by many migrant groups in the labour market solely in terms of “super-exploitation” of these workers to acknowledging that there is a problem of discrimination.

This new awareness is yet to be translated into measures to monitor, analyse and understand the nature and dynamics of discrimination against minorities in the labour market. The study has highlighted the need to improve the quality of data on the subject as a necessary step towards the identification of effective control measures. A number of researches in some regional contexts reviewed in the study show that migrants face discrimination in the labour market in a similar way as other minorities in most EU member States. Yet, there are important differences. In Italy migrant workers are over-represented in heavy, low-paid jobs in small to medium-sized firms and in the domestic work segment of the services sector. In this latter area, the position of migrant women appears to be particularly disadvantaged. They are mainly employed as housemaids or in care-related occupations and the specific conditions of work, often in irregular status, affects their family lives as well.

Another peculiarity of immigration in Italy is the high percentage of unauthorized immigrants who have entered the country beginning from the early '80s and which has led to four legalization or regularization exercises to enable them to acquire legal title to stay. The latest of such exercises, currently being processed, has brought to light the existence of little more than 702,000 working positions previously unknown to policy makers and researchers alike. Unauthorized migrants are usually employed irregularly and the study has shown that the use of irregular migrant labour cuts across Italian society involving both enterprises and families. Some argue that it is the size of the informal economy within the Italian labour market that has attracted large numbers of unauthorized migrants [Reyneri 2001]. A second element used to explain the phenomenon is the de-centralised (*policentrismo*), with respect to large industrial metropolis, structure of the productive system; in other words, the prevalence of small and medium-sized enterprises and the emergence of the so-called “industrial districts” capable of participating in the global economy in spite of their sizes have changed the structure of labour demand [Ambrosini 2001]. Others have pointed to the nature of the Italian welfare system to explain the need for and consequent attraction of domestic workers. The increase in recourse to foreign domestic workers is said to be both demand-induced and policy-constructed [Sciortino 2002].

In order to check unauthorized entry and irregular work, the presently strict border control measures should be accompanied by research-informed legal entry policies. The last regularization has shown that entry quotas set for the last three years were grossly inadequate and future policy should strive to drain unauthorized entry and part of the associated trafficking in human beings, not by allowing all those who want to come in but by giving prospective immigrant a reasonable hope that there is an established and fair procedure which would in a few years give them the opportunity of a legal entry. Alongside these measures, controls should be intensified within the country to check the informal economy both in industry and in

domestic work. A policy constructed recourse to foreign domestic workers as a welfare support policy should also provide for the protection of the rights of people recruited.

Unauthorized status aggravates problems of discrimination for victims because it makes it impossible to use legal measures of protection against discrimination even where they are available. Research findings show that unauthorized migrants are in a worse position than legally resident ones on all variables considered in the study and that if there are any advantages in living as an unauthorized migrant, they accrue to the employers who can use their labour at very low costs both in terms of remuneration and social protection.

The on-going legalization exercise needs to be quickened to reduce the tensions generated in unauthorized migrants by the uncertainty as to when the process will be completed. Currently, these people are in a sort of “legal vacuum” due to the fact that formally, they can not start work until they have signed a contract with the employer before the Unified Immigration Office in each province. Regarding cases of discrimination or worse, of racial violence of which someone in such a position may fall victim to, it is essential that such acts be persecuted and prosecuted irrespective of the legal stay status of the victim. Protection from racism and discrimination should be treated as a basic human right that deserves protection in all circumstances.

For authorized migrants who have medium to high educational and professional qualifications, the study highlighted problems encountered in having such qualifications recognised and valued. For those who obtained their qualifications in Italy or have had qualifications obtained outside Italy recognised by competent authorities, there are no significant difficulties of having their qualifications valued but problems of discrimination may still persist. The exclusion from employment in the public sector as non-citizens or such administrative barriers as the “principle of reciprocity”⁵² that bars people from starting-up activity in a given sector, clearly imply less employment opportunities for this category of migrants who, in many cases, have lived and worked in Italy for many years.

There is great need to clarify procedure for evaluating diplomas and university degrees obtained in other countries, in particular those from which major migratory flows to Italy originate, in order to improve the chances of workers from these countries and use to full potential the professional competences these workers can bring to their work. Where necessary, bilateral agreements could be reached with such sending countries with which similar agreements already exist on repatriation and re-admission.

We have noted earlier that the transposition process of the two EU directives on equal treatment has not yet ended. It is important that the EU examines closely the contents of the transposition instruments in order to avoid Italy formally complying with certain provisions of these directives while substantially emptying them of any degree of effectiveness. Particular important is that pressure is brought on the government to ensure that it does not lower existing standards such as the inclusion of nationality as a ground of discrimination forbidden by law. Another aspect concerns the implementation of the reversal of the burden of proof. The draft decree released by Government so far falls short of the formula used in the 1991 gender equality legislation. The draft applies to the need for an independent equality body with the necessary powers and resources to counter racism and discrimination even within the State apparatus.

⁵² See glossary for definition

9. Bibliography

Ambrosini, M. et. al. (2002), *Con-vivere la città. Il lavoro degli immigrati: dall'analisi all'azione (Living the city. Immigrant's work: from analysis to action)*, Bologna: Edizioni Nautilus.

Ambrosini, M. (2001), *La fatica di integrarsi. Immigrati e lavoro in Italia (The difficulty of getting integrated. Immigrants and employment in Italy)*, Bologna: Il Mulino.

Ambrosini, M. et. al. (2002), *Politiche sociali e politiche del lavoro: l'integrazione socio-lavorativa degli stranieri in Lombardia (Social policies and labour policies: social and working integration of foreigners in Lombardy)*, Milano: Istituto Iard Franco Brambrilla.

Baronio, G., Carbone, A. (2001) *Il lavoro degli immigrati: programmazione dei flussi e politiche di inserimento (Immigrants' work: flows planning and integration policies)*, available at: www.isfol.it.

Blangiardo, G.C. (ed) (2003), *L'immigrazione straniera in Lombardia. La seconda indagine regionale (Foreign immigration in Lombardy. Second regional survey: report 2002)*, Milano: Fondazione Ismu.

Boccagni, P. (2002), *Cooperazione e immigrati. Una leva per l'integrazione sociale a livello locale (Cooperation and immigrants. An incentive for integration at local level)*, available at: www.immigra.org.

Bonifacio Vitale, T., Fava, T., Ghigi, A. (2002), *Nella terra del lavoro. L'inserimento sociale e lavorativo degli immigrati nel Nordest (In the land of labour. Social and employment integration of immigrants in the NorthEast)*, Roma: Cnel.

Brucker, H., et. al. (2001) *Managing Migration in the European Welfare State*, Fondazione Debenedetti.

Caritas (2002): *Immigrazione Dossier Statistico 2002: XII Rapporto sull'immigrazione Caritas – Migrantes*, Roma: Nuova Anterem (*Immigration Statistical Report 2002: XII Report on immigration*).

Caritas (2003), *Anticipazioni Dossier 2003: Il punto sulla regolarizzazione*, available at: www.caritasroma.it/immigrazione/dossier2003/anticipazioni%20dossier%202003.pdf

Castels, M., Portes, A. (1989): *World Underneath: The Origins, Dynamics and Effects of the Informal Economy*, in Castels, M., Portes, A., Benton, L. (eds.), *The Informal Economy: Studies in Advanced and Less Developed Countries*, The Johns Hopkins University Press

Censis (2002), *Rapporto. I lavoratori stagionali immigrati in Italia (Report. Seasonal migrant workers in Italy)*, Roma: Cnel.

Censis (2003), *Tendenze generali e recenti dinamiche dell'economia sommersa in Italia fra il 1998 ed il 2002 (General trends and recent developments of shadow economy in Italy between 1998 and 2002)*, Roma: Censis.

Colasanto, M., Zanfrini, L. (eds), Sostenere il lavoro. Le attività dei Centri per l'Impiego a favore dei lavoratori extracomunitari (*Supporting employment. The activities of "Centri per l'Impiego" for non-eu workers*), in: Osservatorio Regionale per l'integrazione e la multietnicità, Regione Lombardia, Rapporto 2001, Milano: Franco Angeli.

Commissione per le politiche di Integrazione degli immigrati (1999): *First report on the integration of Immigrants in Italy*, Bologna: Il Mulino.

Commissione per le politiche di Integrazione degli immigrati (2001): *Second report on the integration of Immigrants in Italy*, Bologna: Il Mulino.

Commissione per le Politiche di Integrazione (2000): Rom e Sinti. Integrazione possibile. Italia ed Europa a confronto (*Roma and Sinti. Possible integration. A comparison between Italy and Europe*), International conference proceedings, June 2000.

Conforti, D., Blangiardo, M. (2003), L'immigrazione straniera nella provincia di Lodi (*Foreign immigration in Lodi Province*), Milano: Fondazione Ismu.

Consiglio Nazionale dell'Economia e del Lavoro – Cnel (2003), Secondo rapporto. Indici di inserimento degli immigrati in Italia: analisi territoriale all'inizio del 2001 (*Second report. Integration's index of immigrants in Italy: territorial analysis at the beginning of 2001*), Roma: Cnel.

Consiglio Nazionale dell'Economia e del Lavoro - Cnel (2001), L'impegno per contrastare il razzismo, l'intolleranza e la discriminazione nel mondo del lavoro (*The commitment for combatting racism, intolerance and discrimination in the labour market*), Roma: Cnel.

Diamanti, I. (2001) Immigrazione e Cittadinanza in Europa (*Immigration and citizenship in Europe*) Venezia: Quaderni Fondazione Nord-Est.

Diamanti, I. (2002) Immigrazione e Cittadinanza in Europa (*Immigration and citizenship in Europe*) Venezia: Quaderni Fondazione Nord-Est.

Errc (2000), Campland. Racial segregation of Roma in Italy, Budapest: Errc.

Eumc (2002), Equality and diversity for Europe. Annual Report 2001, Luxembourg: UE Publications' Office.

Eurispes (2002): Rapporto Italia 2002, Roma: Eurispes.

Eurobarometer (2003): Eurobarometer 57.0. Discrimination in Europe, May 2003.

Farina, P. (ed) (2003), Viste da vicino. L'immigrazione femminile nella provincia di Mantova (*Seen from close up. Women's immigration in Mantova province*), Milano: Fondazione Ismu.

Fondazione Ismu (ed) (2003), Ottavo rapporto sulle migrazioni 2002 (*8th report on migrations – 2002*), Milano: Franco Angeli.

Fondazione Ismu (ed) (2003), Rapporto 2002. Voll. 1 e 2 (*Report 2002*), Milano: Fondazione Ismu.

Fondazione Ismu (ed) (2003), L'immigrazione straniera nella provincia di Sondrio. Primo rapporto statistico dell'Osservatorio Fondazione Ismu – Provincia di Sondrio Anno 2002 (*Foreign immigration in Sondrio Province. First statistical report of Ismu Foundation Observatory - Province of Sondrio. Year 2002*), Milano: Fondazione Ismu.

Fondazione Labos (2003), Per il lavoro. Network per l'inserimento di soggetti deboli (*For the employment. Network for weak subjects' integration*), Milano: Franco Angeli.

Inail – Istituto Nazionale per l'Assicurazione contro gli infortuni sul lavoro (2003), Rapporto annuale 2002 (*Annual Report 2002*), Milano: Inail.

Ires Piemonte (2003), I lavoratori dipendenti stranieri in Piemonte nei dati Inps (*Foreign subordinate workers in Piemonte Region in Inps' data*), in: Contributi di ricerca no. 169/2003, Torino: Ires Piemonte.

Ires (2002), II Rapporto sull'immigrazione: scenari, mercato del lavoro, contrattazione (*Report on immigration: scenarios, labour market and bargaining*), Roma: Ires.

Istat (2003), Rilevazione trimestrale sulle forze di lavoro (*Three-monthly survey on labour force*), available at: www.istat.it.

Istat (2003): Indagine sulle forze lavoro. Serie storica, Aprile 2003 (*Labour force survey. Historical series, April 2003*), available at: www.istat.it.

Italy, Law no. 30 – Delega al governo in materia di occupazione e mercato del lavoro (*Delegation to the government in employment and labour market matters*) (14/02/2003)

Italy, Law no. 189 30th July 2002 - Modifica alla normativa in materia di immigrazione e di asilo; (*Changes to the provisions on the subject of immigration and asylum*) (30/07/02).

Italy, Decreto Legislativo da emanarsi ai sensi degli articoli da 1 a 7 della legge 23 febbraio 2003, n.30 recante delega al Governo in materia di occupazione e mercato del lavoro (*Legislative decree to be issued in accordance with articles from 1 to 7 of law no. 30 23rd February 2003*) (31/07/2003)

Italy, Ministry of Interior, Circular no. 2 (3/04/2003)

Italy, Decree Law no. 195 - Disposizioni urgenti in materia di legalizzazione del lavoro di extracomunitari (*Urgent provisions on the subject of legalization of the work of non-EU citizens*) (09/09/2002)

Italy, Law no. 222 (09/10/2002)

Italy, Prime Minister's Decree (20/12/2002)

Italy, Prime Minister's Decree (06/06/2003)

Italy, Ministry of Labour and Social Policies, Circular no. 3 (12/02/2003)

Italy, Inail – Istituto Nazionale per l'Assicurazione contro gli infortuni sul lavoro, Circular no. 58 (10/09/2002)

Italy, Inps – Istituto Nazionale di Previdenza Sociale, Circular no. 45 (28/02/2003)

Italy, Ministry of Labour and Social Policies, Circular no. 50 (20/09/2002)

Italy, Ministry of Labour and Social Policies, Circular no. 51 (08/10/2002)

Italy, Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (2001): Libro Bianco sul mercato del Lavoro in Italia. Proposte per una società attiva e per un lavoro di qualità, Roma, October 2001 (*White paper on the labour market in Italy. Proposals for an active society and for quality employment*).

Lanzani, A. (ed) (2003), Dare spazio alle differenze. Insediamento e presenza straniera nella provincia di Lecco (*To give space to differences. Foreign settlement and presence in the Province of Lecco*), Milano: Fondazione Ismu.

Leonardi, S., Mottura, G. (eds) (2003), Immigrazione e sindacato. Lavoro, contrattazione, rappresentanza (*Immigration and Trade-union. Work, bargaining and representation*), Roma: Ediesse.

Marini, D. (ed) (2002), Il lavoro come integrazione possibile: gli imprenditori, i lavoratori immigrati e alcune storie di lavoratori autonomi immigrati in Provincia di Vicenza (*Employment as possible integration: entrepreneurs, migrant workers and some stories of migrant self-employed workers in Vicenza Province*), in: Quaderni FNE Collana Ricerche no. 6 – May 2002, Venezia: Fondazione NordEst.

Melchionda, U. (ed) (2002), Gli albanesi in Italia. Inserimento lavorativo e sociale (*Albanians in Italy. Social and working integration*), Roma: OIM.

Migliore, M. C. et. al. (2002), Scenari demografici ed alternative economiche. La popolazione piemontese d'origine italiana e straniera fra 2000 e 2050 (*Demographic scenarios and economic options. Population of italian and foreign origin in Piemonte region between 2000 and 2050*), in: Ires Piemonte – Working Paper no. 165 August 2002, Torino: Ires Piemonte.

Ministero del lavoro e delle politiche sociali (2003), Monitoraggio delle politiche occupazionali e del lavoro 2003 (*Monitoring of employment and working policies 2003*), available at: www.welfare.gov.it.

Mottura, G. (2002) Non solo braccia. Condizioni di lavoro e percorsi di inserimento sociale degli immigrati in un'area ad economia diffusa (*Not only arms. Work conditions and social integration of immigrants in a diffused economy area*), Modena: Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia – Dipartimento di Economia Politica.

Mottura G., Pinto, P., Bruni M. (eds) La risorsa sottoutilizzata: immigrati e work experience in Emilia Romagna (*The underutilized resource: immigrants and work experience in Emilia Romagna*), available at: www.immigra.org.

Niessen, J., Chopin, I. (2002): Anti-discrimination Legislation in EU Member States. A comparison of national anti-discrimination legislation on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief with the Council Directives, Vienna: EUMC.

Osservatorio regionale sul lavoro nero, elusione e evasione contributiva nella Regione Piemonte (2003), Indagine sul lavoro sommerso in Piemonte (*Survey on concealed labour in Piemonte Region*), available at: www.inps.it.

Provincia Autonoma di Trento (2002), L'immigrazione in Trentino, rapporto annuale 2002 (*Immigration in Trentino, annual report 2002*).

Reyneri, E. (2001), Migrants' involvement in irregular employment in the mediterranean countries of the European Union, International Labour Organization, IMP Working Papers.

Sciarrone, R., Santi, R. (2000), Immigrazione e lavoro: i punti di vista delle Associazioni Territoriali degli Industriali (*Immigration and labour: local associations of entrepreneurs' point of view*), available at: www.fga.it.

Unioncamere (2003), Previsioni assunzioni 2003 (*Employment estimates 2003*), available at: <http://www.starnet.unioncamere.it>.

Veneto Lavoro (2003), Attorno al lavoro sommerso in Veneto. Una ricognizione (*About concealed labour in Veneto Region. A research*), Venezia: Inps.

Veneto Lavoro (2003), Il mercato del lavoro nel Veneto. Tendenze e politiche. Rapporto 2003 (*Labour market in Veneto Region. Trends and policies. Report 2003*), Milano: Franco Angeli.

Veneto Lavoro (2002), Lavoratori extracomunitari in Veneto. Un quadro aggiornato (*Non-eu workers in Veneto Region. An updated picture*), Mestre: Veneto Lavoro.

Venturini, A., Villosio, C. (2002), Are immigrants competing with natives in the italian labour market? The employment effects, in: IZA Discussion Paper no. 467 April 2002, Bonn: IZA.

Zincone G. (2003): L'immigrazione in Italia: flussi e consistenza; (*Immigration in Italy: flow and stock*); available at: www.fieri.it

Organisations

Censis - Centro Studi Investimenti Sociali - Social Investments Studies Centre

Cnel - Consiglio Nazionale dell'Economia e del Lavoro – National Council for Economy and Labour

Commissione per le politiche di Integrazione degli immigrati – Commission for integration policies for immigrants.

Errc – European Roma Rights Centre

Eumc – European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia

Fondazione Ismu – Ismu Foundation

Fondazione Labos - Laboratorio per le politiche sociali – Labos Foundation - Workshop for social policies

Fondazione NordEst – North-East Foundation

Inail - Istituto Nazionale per l'Assicurazione contro gli Infortuni sul lavoro - Italian Workers' Compensation Authority

Inps - Istituto Nazionale della Previdenza Sociale - National Institute for social welfare

Ires – Istituto per le Ricerche Economiche e Sociali – Institute for Economic and Social Research

Istat - Istituto Nazionale di Statistica - National Institute of Statistics

Iza – Institute for the Study of Labour

Ministero del lavoro e delle politiche sociali – Ministry of Labour and Social Policies

Oim – Organizzazione Internazionale per le Migrazioni - International Organization for Migration

Osservatorio regionale sul lavoro nero, elusione e evasione contributiva nella Regione Piemonte – Observatory on concealed labour, contributive elusion and evasion in Piemonte Region.

Provincia Autonoma di Trento – Autonomous Province of Trento

Unioncamere – Unione Italiana delle Camere di Commercio – Italian Union of Chambers of Commerce

Veneto lavoro - Osservatorio veneto sul lavoro nero, elusione ed evasione contributiva - Observatory of Veneto Region on concealed labour, contributive elusion and evasion

Statistical appendix

Annex 1 - Industrial accidents in Italy

Tab . 1 – Industrial accidents in Italy. Distribution by type of event – Year 2002

Accidents at work
1.093.304
Professional diseases
26.374
Total
1.119.678

Tab. 2 – Industrial accidents in Italy. Distribution by seriousness of the accident – Year 2002

Industrial accidents in total
1.093.304
Industrial accidents followed by death(*)
1.249
Industrial accidents with danger list or prognosis of more than 39 days.
12.877

(*)Industrial accidents followed by death by 24 hours.

Tab . 3 – Industrial accidents in Italy. Distribution by type of event – Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Accidents at work
504.437
Professional diseases
10.839
Total
515.276

Tab. 4 – Industrial accidents in Italy. Distribution by seriousness of the accident – Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Industrial accidents in total
504.437
Industrial accidents followed by death(*)
593
Industrial accidents with danger list or prognosis of more than 39 days
14

(*)Industrial accidents followed by death by 24 hours.

Tab. 5 - – Industrial accidents in Italy. Distribution by area of origin of the injured – Year 2002.

Italians
819.293
Eu citizens
7.689
Non-eu citizens
74.543
Not specified
218.153

Tab. 6 - – Industrial accidents in Italy. Distribution by area of origin of the injured – Year 2003
(until 03/07/03)

Italians
370.021
Eu citizens
3.252
Non-eu citizens
35.812
Not specified
106.191

Tab. 7 – Industrial accidents in Italy. Distribution by region and by area of origin of the injured – Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Region	Italians	Eu citizens	Non-eu citizens	Not specified
Abruzzo	9.879	92	318	2.282
Basilicata	3.363	27	51	801
Calabria	5.537	29	112	2.349
Campania	16.685	61	182	3.638
Emilia-Romagna	43.921	528	6.400	20.622
Friuli Venezia Giulia	11.180	186	2.050	3.251
Lazio	18.294	119	782	5.151
Liguria	14.333	123	634	3.236
Lombardia	64.986	503	8.957	15.071
Marche	14.180	133	1.527	4.380
Molise	2.207	23	37	547
Piemonte	34.334	268	2.679	8.509
Puglia	20.648	130	217	4.142
Sardegna	7.592	70	76	1.491
Sicilia	15.607	132	333	4.128
Toscana	30.126	240	2.619	8.302
Trentino Alto Adige	8.558	134	1.017	3.786
Umbria	8.258	79	509	2.488
Valle d'Aosta	894	17	80	380
Veneto	39.435	358	7.231	11.037

Tab. 8 – Industrial accidents in Abruzzo Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
CHIETI	3.104	38	82	1.102	4.326
L'AQUILA	1.985	11	47	722	2.765
PESCARA	2.255	18	50	442	2.765
TERAMO	2.535	25	139	616	3.315
TOTAL	9.879	92	318	2.882	13.171

Tab. 9 – Industrial accidents in Abruzzo Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	7.370	75	268	2.015	9.728
Female	2.509	17	50	867	3.443
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	9.879	92	318	2.882	13.171

Tab. 10 – Industrial accidents in Abruzzo Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	605	2	5	169	781
18 - 34	3.215	48	139	976	4.378
35 - 49	3.487	39	160	1.060	4.746
50 - 64	2.321	3	14	611	2.949
65 and more	251	0	0	60	311
Not specified	0	0	0	6	6
TOTAL	9.879	92	318	2.882	13.171

Tab. 11 – Industrial accidents in Basilicata Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
MATERA	1.240	8	23	351	1.622
POTENZA	2.123	19	28	450	2.620
TOTAL	3.363	27	51	801	4.242

Tab. 12 – Industrial accidents in Basilicata Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	2.449	20	44	596	3.109
Female	914	7	7	205	1.133
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	3.363	27	51	801	4.242

Tab. 13 – Industrial accidents in Basilicata Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	422	3	3	56	484
18 - 34	1.134	13	32	226	1.405
35 - 49	1.160	10	15	312	1.497
50 - 64	604	1	1	187	793

65 and more	43	0	0	20	63
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	3.363	27	51	801	4.242

Tab. 14 – Industrial accidents in Calabria Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
CATANZARO	1.569	7	27	362	1.965
VIBO VALENTIA	271	2	4	637	914
COSENZA	1.847	7	17	729	2.600
REGGIO CALABRIA	1.412	9	57	468	1.946
CROTONE	438	4	7	153	602
TOTAL	5.537	29	112	2.349	8.027

Tab. 15 – Industrial accidents in Calabria Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	4.092	25	86	1.697	5.900
Female	1.445	4	26	652	2.127
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	5.537	29	112	2.349	8.027

Tab. 16 – Industrial accidents in Calabria Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	1.998	10	47	876	2.931
18 - 34	1.668	14	59	522	2.263
35 - 49	641	4	4	304	953
50 - 64	0	0	0	3	3
65 and more	49	0	0	21	70
Not specified	1.181	1	2	623	1.807
TOTAL	5.537	29	112	2.349	8.027

Tab. 17 – Industrial accidents in Campania Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
-----------------	-----------------	--------------------	------------------------	----------------------	--------------

AVELLINO	1.592	13	40	314	1.959
BENEVENTO	1.216	3	12	297	1.528
CASERTA	2.825	16	45	564	3.450
NAPOLI	6.979	14	50	1.541	8.584
SALERNO	4.073	15	35	922	5.045
TOTAL	16.685	61	182	3.638	20.566

Tab. 18 – Industrial accidents in Campania Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	12.724	48	148	2.746	15.666
Female	3.961	13	34	892	4.900
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	16.685	61	182	3.638	20.566

Tab. 19 – Industrial accidents in Campania Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	2.775	6	12	320	3.113
18 - 34	4.402	29	80	935	5.446
35 - 49	5.824	25	81	1.398	7.328
50 - 64	3.504	1	9	935	4.449
65 and more	179	0	0	44	223
Not specified	1	0	0	6	7
TOTAL	16.685	61	182	3.638	20.566

Tab. 20 – Industrial accidents in Emilia Romagna Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
BOLOGNA	8.584	74	1.198	4.681	14.537
FERRARA	3.117	15	187	1.847	5.166
FORLI	3.341	41	404	3.359	7.145
RIMINI	2.076	47	275	640	3.038
MODENA	7.398	96	1.180	4.635	13.309
PARMA	4.948	78	847	1.080	6.953
PIACENZA	2.688	34	372	719	3.813

RAVENNA	5.225	40	680	1.118	7.063
REGGIO EMILIA	6.544	103	1.257	2.543	10.447
TOTAL	43.921	528	6.400	20.622	71.471

Tab. 21 – Industrial accidents in Emilia Romagna Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	31.638	378	5.387	13.119	50.522
Female	12.283	150	1.013	7.503	20.949
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	43.921	528	6.400	20.622	71.471

Tab. 22 – Industrial accidents in Emilia Romagna Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	2.808	12	109	1.558	4.487
18 - 34	16.802	288	3.037	8.684	28.811
35 - 49	15.934	185	2.878	7.206	26.203
50 - 64	7.392	40	372	2.879	10.683
65 and more	981	3	3	281	1.268
Not specified	4	0	1	14	19
TOTAL	43.921	528	6.400	20.622	71.471

Tab. 23 – Industrial accidents in Friuli Venezia Giulia Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
GORIZIA	1.983	10	277	489	2.759
TRIESTE	2.137	14	332	593	3.076
UDINE	4.097	84	706	1.471	6.358
PORDENONE	2.963	78	735	698	4.474
TOTAL	11.180	186	2.050	3.251	16.667

Tab. 24 – Industrial accidents in Friuli Venezia Giulia Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
------------	-----------------	--------------------	------------------------	----------------------	--------------

Male	8.135	133	1.596	2.053	11.917
Female	3.045	53	454	1.198	4.750
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	11.180	186	2.050	3.251	16.667

Tab. 25 – Industrial accidents in Friuli Venezia Giulia Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	1.863	20	199	580	2.662
18 - 34	169	0	8	66	243
35 - 49	1	0	0	5	6
50 - 64	730	3	38	139	910
65 and more	4.440	61	957	1.242	6.700
Not specified	3.977	102	848	1.219	6.146
TOTAL	11.180	186	2.050	3.251	16.667

Tab. 26 – Industrial accidents in Lazio Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
FROSINONE	2.716	22	72	582	3.392
LATINA	1.963	24	81	471	2.539
RIETI	883	4	42	240	1.169
ROMA	11.534	67	508	3.607	15.716
VITERBO	1.198	2	79	251	1.530
TOTAL	18.294	119	782	5.151	24.346

Tab. 27 – Industrial accidents in Lazio Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	12.702	80	594	3.495	16.871
Female	5.592	39	188	1.656	7.475
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	18.294	119	782	5.151	24.346

Tab. 28 Industrial accidents in Lazio Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	1.777	5	41	408	2.231
18 - 34	5.979	46	339	1.588	7.952
35 - 49	6.809	57	322	1.892	9.080
50 - 64	3.522	11	75	1.180	4.788
65 and more	207	0	5	76	288
Not specified	0	0	0	7	7
TOTAL	18.294	119	782	5.151	24.346

Tab. 29 – Industrial accidents in Liguria Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
GENOVA	7.947	43	288	1.627	9.905
IMPERIA	2.020	32	165	305	2.522
LA SPEZIA	1.873	23	66	659	2.621
SAVONA	2.493	25	115	645	3.278
TOTAL	14.333	123	634	3.236	18.326

Tab. 30 – Industrial accidents in Liguria Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	10.358	78	527	2.305	13.268
Female	3.975	45	107	931	5.058
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	14.333	123	634	3.236	18.326

Tab. 31 – Industrial accidents in Liguria Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	1.268	2	34	171	1.475
18 - 34	4.851	43	259	1.128	6.281
35 - 49	5.518	63	276	1.247	7.104
50 - 64	2.424	14	61	594	3.093
65 and more	268	1	4	76	349
Not specified	4	0	0	20	24
TOTAL	14.333	123	634	3.236	18.326

Tab. 32 – Industrial accidents in Lombardy Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
BERGAMO	7.641	46	1.268	1.733	10.688
BRESCIA	8.708	41	1.594	3.958	14.301
COMO	4.233	39	514	816	5.602
LECCO	2.391	8	331	547	3.277
CREMONA	3.124	13	428	784	4.349
MANTOVA	3.421	34	615	1.265	5.335
MILANO	23.062	209	2.833	3.283	29.387
LODI	1.577	19	195	197	1.988
PAVIA	3.048	17	327	951	4.343
SONDRIO	1.441	8	81	552	2.082
VARESE	6.340	69	771	985	8.165
TOTAL	64.986	503	8.957	15.071	89.517

Tab. 33 – Industrial accidents in Lombardy Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	48.063	355	7.839	11.056	67.313
Female	16.923	148	1.118	4.015	22.204
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	64.986	503	8.957	15.071	89.517

Tab. 34 – Industrial accidents in Lombardy Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	6.714	25	291	946	7.976
18 - 34	26.926	249	4.574	5.726	37.475
35 - 49	21.829	186	3.716	5.799	31.530
50 - 64	8.869	42	365	2.335	11.611
65 and more	644	1	11	229	885
Not specified	4	0	0	36	40
TOTAL	64.986	503	8.957	15.071	89.517

Tab. 35 – Industrial accidents in Marche Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
ANCONA	5.116	54	569	1.464	7.203
ASCOLI PICENO	2.631	18	177	1.076	3.902
MACERATA	2.674	8	230	777	3.689
PESARO	3.759	53	551	1.063	5.426
TOTAL	14.180	133	1.527	4.380	20.220

Tab. 36 – Industrial accidents in Marche Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	10.521	86	1.304	2.950	14.861
Female	3.659	47	223	1.430	5.359
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	14.180	133	1.527	4.380	20.220

Tab. 37 – Industrial accidents in Marche Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	1.142	2	23	333	1.500
18 - 34	4.870	49	751	1.768	7.438
35 - 49	4.593	72	681	1.518	6.864
50 - 64	2.921	10	68	644	3.643
65 and more	653	0	4	107	764
Not specified	1	0	0	10	11
TOTAL	14.180	133	1.527	4.380	20.220

Tab. 38 – Industrial accidents in Molise Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
CAMPOBASSO	1.570	15	24	400	2.009
ISERNIA	637	8	13	147	805
TOTAL	2.207	23	37	547	2.814

Tab. 39 – Industrial accidents in Molise Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	1.591	18	27	387	2.023
Female	616	5	10	160	791
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	2.207	23	37	547	2.814

Tab. 40 – Industrial accidents in Molise Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	287	0	2	40	329
18 - 34	577	8	18	170	773
35 - 49	746	15	14	209	984
50 - 64	542	0	2	117	661
65 and more	55	0	1	10	66
Not specified	0	0	0	1	1
TOTAL	2.207	23	37	547	2.814

Tab. 41 – Industrial accidents in Piemonte Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
ALESSANDRIA	4.115	27	280	1.218	5.640
ASTI	1.601	17	167	476	2.261
CUNEO	5.188	43	444	1.613	7.288
NOVARA	4.169	23	268	755	5.215
TORINO	16.323	127	1.272	3.670	21.392
VERCELLI	1.763	19	151	485	2.418
BIELLA	1.173	12	97	290	1.572
VERBANIA	2	0	0	2	4
TOTAL	34.334	268	2.679	8.509	45.790

Tab. 42 – Industrial accidents in Piemonte Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	23.940	192	2.309	5.996	32.437
Female	10.394	76	370	2.513	13.353
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	34.334	268	2.679	8.509	45.790

Tab. 43 – Industrial accidents in Piemonte Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	658	2	2	172	834
18 - 34	5.395	22	136	1.480	7.033
35 - 49	11.768	118	1.158	3.265	16.309
50 - 64	12.625	116	1.271	2.990	17.002
65 and more	3.886	10	112	581	4.589
Not specified	2	0	0	21	23
TOTAL	34.334	268	2.679	8.509	45.790

Tab. 44 – Industrial accidents in Puglia Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
BARI	7.269	30	81	1.454	8.834
BRINDISI	2.428	20	13	498	2.959
FOGGIA	3.625	15	21	650	4.311
LECCE	3.334	50	82	886	4.352
TARANTO	3.992	15	20	654	4.681
TOTAL	20.648	130	217	4.142	25.137

Tab. 45 – Industrial accidents in Puglia Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	16.039	104	171	3.162	19.476
Female	4.609	26	46	980	5.661
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0

TOTAL	20.648	130	217	4.142	25.137
--------------	--------	-----	-----	-------	--------

Tab. 46 – Industrial accidents in Puglia Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	3.647	3	14	899	4.563
18 - 34	6.751	51	83	1.551	8.436
35 - 49	6.732	63	101	1.283	8.179
50 - 64	3.325	13	19	355	3.712
65 and more	3	0	0	6	9
Not specified	190	0	0	48	238
TOTAL	20.648	130	217	4.142	25.137

Tab. 47 – Industrial accidents in Sardegna Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
CAGLIARI	3.662	24	28	366	4.080
NUORO	1.326	16	16	515	1.873
SASSARI	1.839	24	26	473	2.362
ORISTANO	765	6	6	137	914
TOTAL	7.592	70	76	1.491	9.229

Tab. 48 – Industrial accidents in Sardegna Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	5.691	57	57	1.077	6.882
Female	1.901	13	19	414	2.347
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	7.592	70	76	1.491	9.229

Tab. 49 – Industrial accidents in Sardegna Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	764	2	1	161	928
18 - 34	2.302	31	34	421	2.788

35 - 49	2.979	34	34	553	3.600
50 - 64	1.451	3	7	322	1.783
65 and more	95	0	0	31	126
Not specified	1	0	0	3	4
TOTAL	7.592	70	76	1.491	9.229

Tab. 50 – Industrial accidents in Sicily Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
AGRIGENTO	1.239	17	10	147	1.413
CALTANISSETTA	710	7	9	195	921
CATANIA	3.092	21	30	774	3.917
<i>ENNA</i>	416	10	1	366	793
MESSINA	1.959	11	36	1.151	3.157
PALERMO	3.383	13	26	715	4.137
RAGUSA	1.950	29	141	273	2.393
SIRACUSA	1.412	13	30	260	1.715
TRAPANI	1.446	11	50	247	1.754
TOTAL	15.607	132	333	4.128	20.200

Tab. 51 – Industrial accidents in Sicily Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	11.952	102	272	3.076	15.402
Female	3.655	30	61	1.052	4.798
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	15.607	132	333	4.128	20.200

Tab. 52 – Industrial accidents in Sicily Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	2	0	0	5	7
18 - 34	186	0	5	61	252
35 - 49	3.374	4	32	975	4.385
50 - 64	5.510	38	134	1.639	7.321
65 and more	4.445	79	145	1.085	5.754

Not specified	2.090	11	17	363	2.481
TOTAL	15.607	132	333	4.128	20.200

Tab. 53 – Industrial accidents in Tuscany Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
AREZZO	3.075	24	390	550	4.039
MASSA CARRARA	1.942	12	68	897	2.919
FIRENZE	7.048	59	717	1.532	9.356
<i>PRATO</i>	1.453	16	187	403	2.059
GROSSETO	1.777	8	113	381	2.279
LIVORNO	3.426	11	109	808	4.354
LUCCA	3.665	40	244	1.401	5.350
PISA	3.072	26	272	860	4.230
PISTOIA	2.322	27	264	843	3.456
SIENA	2.346	17	255	627	3.245
TOTAL	30.126	240	2.619	8.302	41.287

Tab. 54 – Industrial accidents in Tuscany Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	22.005	168	2.238	5.533	29.944
Female	8.121	72	381	2.769	11.343
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	30.126	240	2.619	8.302	41.287

Tab. 55 – Industrial accidents in Tuscany Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	694	2	4	181	881
18 - 34	5.838	20	122	1.474	7.454
35 - 49	10.772	100	1.011	2.954	14.837
50 - 64	10.413	108	1.387	3.100	15.008
65 and more	2.407	10	95	577	3.089
Not specified	2	0	0	16	18
TOTAL	30.126	240	2.619	8.302	41.287

Tab. 56 – Industrial accidents in Trentino Alto Adige Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
BOLZANO	4.478	74	383	2.220	7.155
TRENTO	4.080	60	634	1.566	6.340
TOTAL	8.558	134	1.017	3.786	13.495

Tab. 57 – Industrial accidents in Trentino Alto Adige Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	6.756	103	863	2.565	10.287
Female	1.802	31	154	1.221	3.208
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	8.558	134	1.017	3.786	13.495

Tab. 58 – Industrial accidents in Trentino Alto Adige Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	775	5	36	375	1.191
18 - 34	3.209	52	494	1.522	5.277
35 - 49	2.969	52	434	1.339	4.794
50 - 64	1.423	24	53	496	1.996
65 and more	182	1	0	51	234
Not specified	0	0	0	3	3
TOTAL	8.558	134	1.017	3.786	13.495

Tab. 59 – Industrial accidents in Umbria Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
PERUGIA	6.485	71	414	2.252	9.222
TERNI	1.773	8	95	236	2.112
TOTAL	8.258	79	509	2.488	11.334

Tab. 60 – Industrial accidents in Umbria Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	6.149	60	461	1.708	8.378
Female	2.109	19	48	780	2.956
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	8.258	79	509	2.488	11.334

Tab. 61 – Industrial accidents in Umbria Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	656	2	6	191	855
18 - 34	2.710	26	247	1.044	4.027
35 - 49	2.899	48	230	838	4.015
50 - 64	1.711	3	24	361	2.099
65 and more	281	0	2	53	336
Not specified	1	0	0	1	2
TOTAL	8.258	79	509	2.488	11.334

Tab. 62 – Industrial accidents in Valle d’Aosta Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
AOSTA	894	17	80	380	1.371
TOTAL	894	17	80	380	1.371

Tab. 63 – Industrial accidents in Valle d’Aosta Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

SEX	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	690	12	70	257	1.029
Female	204	5	10	123	342
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	894	17	80	380	1.371

Tab. 64 – Industrial accidents in Valle d’Aosta Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	314	6	40	129	489
18 - 34	325	7	36	150	518
35 - 49	81	0	0	36	117
50 - 64	0	0	0	1	1
65 and more	13	1	0	9	23
Not specified	161	3	4	55	223
TOTAL	894	17	80	380	1.371

Tab. 65 – Industrial accidents in Veneto Region. Distribution by province and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

PROVINCE	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
BELLUNO	1.986	44	250	471	2.751
PADOVA	7.148	42	1.192	1.856	10.238
ROVIGO	1.848	2	99	331	2.280
TREVISO	5.460	82	1.520	1.533	8.595
VENEZIA	6.486	39	669	1.635	8.829
VERONA	8.906	69	1.485	2.871	13.331
VICENZA	7.601	80	2.016	2.340	12.037
TOTAL	39.435	358	7.231	11.037	58.061

Tab. 66 – Industrial accidents in Veneto Region. Distribution by sex and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Sex	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Male	29.618	259	6.252	7.844	43.973
Female	9.817	99	979	3.193	14.088
Not specified	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	39.435	358	7.231	11.037	58.061

Tab. 67 – Industrial accidents in Veneto Region. Distribution by age and by area of origin of the injured– Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Age	Italians	Eu Citizens	Non-Eu Citizens	Not specified	TOTAL
Until 17	13.338	157	2.848	4.249	20.592
18 - 34	15.839	140	3.936	4.514	24.429
35 - 49	3.400	13	159	529	4.101
50 - 64	6.226	48	284	1.580	8.138

65 and more	629	0	4	154	787
Not specified	3	0	0	11	14
TOTAL	39.435	358	7.231	11.037	58.061

Tab. 68 – Industrial accidents in Italy. Distribution by area of origin of non-eu injured – Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Non-eu Europe
13.452
Africa
15.625
Asia
3.267
America
3.343
Oceania
125

Tab. 69 – Industrial accidents in Italy. Distribution by area of origin of non-eu injured – Year 2003 (until 03/07/03)

Region	Non-eu Europe	Africa	Asia	America	Oceania
Abruzzo	186	58	6	64	4
Basilicata	29	10	2	10	0
Calabria	50	30	7	20	5
Campania	102	43	6	29	2
Emilia-Romagna	1.684	3.598	668	441	9
Friuli Venezia Giulia	1.264	441	139	186	20
Lazio	417	168	72	118	7
Liguria	217	249	32	135	1
Lombardia	2.326	4.465	1.136	1.016	14
Marche	679	570	95	176	7
Molise	20	4	0	12	1
Piemonte	972	1.358	88	255	6
Puglia	154	38	4	21	0
Sardegna	34	19	5	17	1
Sicilia	87	184	15	44	3
Toscana	1.428	793	183	210	5
Trentino Alto	484	379	72	79	3

Adige					
Umbria	272	186	16	35	0
Valle d'Aosta	23	53	0	4	0
Veneto	3.024	2.979	721	471	36

Annex 2 - Main indicators of the labour market

Tab. 1 Main indicators of labour market by sex – Men and women
(percentage)

Period	Activity rate		Employment rate		Unemployment rate		
	15-64 years	15-24 years	15-64 years	15-24 years	Total	15-24 years	long period
Year's data							
1997	57,9	37,4	51,0	24,7	11,7	34,0	6,7
1998	58,7	38,0	51,7	25,2	11,8	33,8	6,9
1999	59,3	37,5	52,5	25,2	11,4	32,9	6,9
2000	59,9	37,7	53,5	26,0	10,6	31,1	6,5
2001	60,4	36,0	54,6	25,9	9,5	28,2	5,9
2002	61,0	35,0	55,4	25,5	9,0	27,2	5,3
Three-monthly data							
1997							
January	57,4	37,1	50,5	24,3	12,0	34,4	6,6
April	58,1	37,5	51,1	24,5	12,0	34,6	6,8
July	58,1	37,9	51,5	25,5	11,2	32,6	6,5
October	58,1	37,3	51,1	24,5	11,8	34,5	6,9
1998							
January	57,8	36,6	50,9	24,1	11,9	34,2	6,9
April	58,8	37,7	51,6	24,9	12,1	33,8	7,0
July	59,1	39,0	52,3	26,4	11,4	32,2	6,8
October	59,3	38,9	52,1	25,2	11,9	35,2	7,0
1999							
January	58,8	37,2	51,7	24,3	11,9	34,5	6,9
April	59,3	37,3	52,3	25,0	11,7	32,9	7,0
July	59,6	38,3	53,0	26,5	11,1	30,7	6,8
October	59,6	37,5	52,9	25,0	11,1	33,3	6,7
2000							
January	59,1	36,7	52,3	24,9	11,4	32,3	6,7
April	59,7	37,4	53,2	25,6	10,8	31,5	6,6
July	60,3	38,5	54,1	26,9	10,1	30,3	6,4
October	60,5	38,1	54,4	26,5	10,0	30,5	6,1
2001							
January	60,1	35,9	54,0	25,4	10,1	29,2	6,2
April	60,1	35,7	54,3	25,8	9,6	27,8	6,0
July	60,7	36,6	55,1	26,6	9,2	27,4	5,6
October	60,8	36,1	55,0	25,8	9,3	28,4	5,6
2002							
January	60,5	34,6	54,9	24,8	9,2	28,1	5,5
April	60,9	34,9	55,2	25,4	9,2	27,1	5,4
July	61,2	35,9	55,8	26,5	8,7	26,1	5,2
October	61,2	34,8	55,7	25,2	8,9	27,6	5,2
2003							

January	61,0	34,2	55,4	24,6	9,1	28,2	5,3
April	61,5	34,3	56,0	25,1	8,9	26,8	5,1

Tab. 1 continue Main indicators of labour market by sex – Men
(percentage)

Period	Activity rate		Employment rate		Unemployment rate		
	15-64 years	15-24 years	15-64 years	15-24 years	Total	15-24 years	Long period
Year's data							
1997	72,4	41,2	65,8	29,0	9,0	29,6	5,2
1998	72,9	42,0	66,2	29,5	9,1	29,8	5,4
1999	73,2	41,0	66,7	29,0	8,8	29,2	5,3
2000	73,6	41,0	67,5	29,6	8,1	27,6	5,0
2001	73,6	39,4	68,1	29,5	7,3	25,0	4,5
2002	74,0	39,0	68,8	29,6	7,0	24,0	4,1
Three-monthly data							
1997							
January	72,1	40,9	65,3	28,5	9,3	30,3	5,1
April	72,6	41,0	65,7	28,8	9,4	29,7	5,4
July	72,6	41,9	66,3	30,0	8,6	28,6	5,2
October	72,3	41,0	65,8	28,7	8,9	29,9	5,3
1998							
January	72,2	40,7	65,5	28,5	9,1	30,0	5,5
April	73,1	42,1	66,1	29,3	9,4	30,2	5,5
July	73,3	43,2	66,8	31,0	8,8	28,3	5,3
October	73,1	42,1	66,4	29,1	9,1	30,8	5,3
1999							
January	72,7	40,8	65,9	28,2	9,2	31,0	5,4
April	73,1	40,6	66,5	29,0	8,8	28,6	5,4
July	73,6	42,1	67,3	30,4	8,5	27,8	5,3
October	73,4	40,5	67,0	28,5	8,6	29,6	5,1
2000							
January	73,0	40,2	66,4	28,6	9,0	29,0	5,2
April	73,2	40,7	67,0	29,1	8,3	28,4	5,1
July	73,9	41,8	68,2	30,7	7,7	26,4	4,9
October	74,1	41,3	68,3	30,2	7,6	26,8	4,7
2001							
January	73,5	38,9	67,7	28,8	7,8	26,1	4,8
April	73,2	38,8	67,7	29,2	7,4	24,8	4,7
July	73,9	40,4	68,6	30,8	7,0	23,8	4,3
October	73,8	39,3	68,5	29,3	7,1	25,4	4,2
2002							
January	73,7	38,0	68,3	28,3	7,1	25,4	4,1
April	73,8	38,7	68,6	29,5	7,0	23,7	4,0
July	74,2	40,5	69,1	31,2	6,7	23,0	4,1
October	74,3	38,6	69,1	29,4	6,9	24,0	4,1
2003							
January	74,2	38,4	68,7	28,5	7,3	25,8	4,2

April	74,4	38,3	69,2	29,2	6,9	23,7	3,9
-------	------	------	------	------	-----	------	-----

Tab. 1 continue **Main indicators of labour market by sex – Women (percentage)**

Period	Activity rate		Employment rate		Unemployment rate		
	15-64 years	15-24 years	15-64 years	15-24 years	Total	15-24 years	Long period
Year's data							
1997	43,5	33,6	36,4	20,3	16,2	39,6	9,1
1998	44,6	33,9	37,3	20,7	16,3	39,0	9,5
1999	45,5	34,0	38,3	21,3	15,7	37,4	9,4
2000	46,3	34,3	39,6	22,1	14,5	35,4	8,8
2001	47,3	32,6	41,1	22,1	13,0	32,2	8,0
2002	47,9	31,0	42,0	21,3	12,2	31,4	7,3
Three-monthly data							
1997							
January	42,8	33,2	35,7	20,0	16,5	39,6	9,1
April	43,7	33,9	36,5	20,1	16,4	40,6	9,0
July	43,6	33,7	36,9	21,0	15,4	37,8	8,8
October	43,9	33,5	36,5	20,1	16,6	40,2	9,5
1998							
January	43,5	32,4	36,3	19,5	16,4	39,7	9,3
April	44,5	33,1	37,1	20,4	16,5	38,4	9,5
July	44,9	34,6	37,7	21,7	15,8	37,4	9,3
October	45,4	35,6	37,9	21,1	16,5	40,6	9,6
1999							
January	44,9	33,4	37,5	20,4	16,2	39,0	9,4
April	45,6	33,8	38,1	20,8	16,3	38,3	9,7
July	45,7	34,4	38,7	22,6	15,2	34,4	9,3
October	45,8	34,3	38,8	21,3	15,1	37,8	9,3
2000							
January	45,3	33,2	38,3	21,1	15,3	36,5	9,2
April	46,2	34,0	39,3	22,0	14,9	35,3	9,0
July	46,7	35,2	40,1	22,9	14,1	35,0	8,7
October	47,0	34,8	40,5	22,7	13,8	34,9	8,4
2001							
January	46,8	32,7	40,3	21,9	13,7	32,9	8,5
April	47,1	32,5	40,9	22,2	13,0	31,6	8,2
July	47,5	32,6	41,6	22,2	12,5	32,0	7,8
October	47,7	32,7	41,6	22,2	12,7	32,2	7,7
2002							
January	47,4	31,0	41,5	21,2	12,5	31,5	7,7
April	48,0	30,9	41,9	21,1	12,6	31,5	7,5
July	48,1	31,2	42,4	21,7	11,7	30,3	7,0
October	48,1	30,9	42,3	20,9	12,1	32,3	6,8
2003							
January	47,8	29,9	42,0	20,5	11,9	31,4	6,9
April	48,7	30,1	42,8	20,8	12,0	30,9	7,0

Tab. 2. Labour Force by condition and sex - Men and Women (thousands)

Period	Labour force			Employed			People in search of work		
	Abs. values	Percentage		Abs. values	Percentage		Abs. values	Percentage	
		Compare d with the same period of the previous year	Combine d since the beginning of the year		Compare d with the same period of the previous year	Combine d since the beginning of the year		Compare d with the same period of the previous year	Combine d since the beginning of the year
YEAR'S DATA									
1997	22.895	+0,5		20.207	+0,4		2.688	+1,3	
1998	23.180	+1,2		20.435	+1,1		2.745	+2,1	
1999	23.361	+0,8		20.692	+1,3		2.669	-2,7	
2000	23.575	+0,9		21.080	+1,9		2.495	-6,5	
2001	23.781	+0,9		21.514	+2,1		2.267	-9,1	
2002	23.993	+0,9		21.829	+1,5		2.163	-4,6	
THREE-MONTHLY DATA									
1997									
January	22.655	+0,7	+0,7	19.939	+0,5	+0,5	2.716	+2,5	+2,5
April	22.936	+0,6	+0,6	20.184	+0,4	+0,5	2.752	+1,6	+2,1
July	22.989	+0,3	+0,5	20.425	+0,4	+0,4	2.564	-0,5	+1,2
October	23.001	+0,5	+0,5	20.282	+0,3	+0,4	2.720	+1,5	+1,3
1998									
January	22.868	+0,9	+0,9	20.151	+1,1	+1,1	2.717	0,0	0,0
April	23.165	+1,0	+1,0	20.357	+0,9	+1,0	2.807	+2,0	+1,0
July	23.304	+1,4	+1,1	20.638	+1,0	+1,0	2.666	+4,0	+2,0
October	23.382	+1,7	+1,2	20.595	+1,5	+1,1	2.787	+2,5	+2,1
1999									
January	23.147	+1,2	+1,2	20.395	+1,2	+1,2	2.752	+1,3	+1,3
April	23.347	+0,8	+1,0	20.618	+1,3	+1,2	2.729	-2,8	-0,8
July	23.490	+0,8	+0,9	20.893	+1,2	+1,2	2.597	-2,6	-1,4
October	23.460	+0,3	+0,8	20.861	+1,3	+1,3	2.600	-6,7	-2,7
2000									
January	23.264	+0,5	+0,5	20.617	+1,1	+1,1	2.647	-3,8	-3,8
April	23.475	+0,5	+0,5	20.930	+1,5	+1,3	2.545	-6,7	-5,3
July	23.726	+1,0	+0,7	21.322	+2,0	+1,6	2.404	-7,4	-6,0
October	23.833	+1,6	+0,9	21.450	+2,8	+1,9	2.383	-8,3	-6,5
2001									
January	23.652	+1,7	+1,7	21.273	+3,2	+3,2	2.379	-10,1	-10,1
April	23.644	+0,7	+1,2	21.373	+2,1	+2,6	2.271	-10,8	-10,4
July	23.906	+0,8	+1,0	21.713	+1,8	+2,4	2.193	-8,8	-9,9
October	23.923	+0,4	+0,9	21.698	+1,2	+2,1	2.225	-6,6	-9,1
2002									
January	23.842	+0,8	+0,8	21.644	+1,7	+1,7	2.198	-7,6	-7,6
April	23.966	+1,4	+1,1	21.757	+1,8	+1,8	2.209	-2,7	-5,2
July	24.078	+0,7	+1,0	21.984	+1,2	+1,6	2.094	-4,5	-5,0
October	24.084	+0,7	+0,9	21.932	+1,1	+1,5	2.152	-3,3	-4,6
2003									

January	24.011	+0,7	+0,7	21.824	+0,8	+0,8	2.187	-0,5	-0,5
April	24.205	+1,0	+0,9	22.057	+1,4	+1,1	2.147	-2,8	-1,7

Tab. 2 continue. Labour Force by condition and sex - Men (thousands)

Period	Labour Force			Employed			People in search of work		
	Abs. values	Percentage variations		Abs. values	Percentage variations		Abs. values	Percentage variations	
		Compare d with the same period of the previous year	Combine d since the beginning of the year		Compare d with the same period of the previous year	Combine d since the beginning of the year		Compare d with the same period of the previous year	Combine d since the beginning of the year
YEAR'S DATA									
1997	14.309	+0,1		13.015	+0,1		1.294	+0,6	
1998	14.403	+0,7		13.090	+0,6		1.313	+1,5	
1999	14.424	+0,1		13.158	+0,5		1.266	-3,6	
2000	14.495	+0,5		13.316	+1,2		1.179	-6,9	
2001	14.521	+0,2		13.455	+1,0		1.066	-9,6	
2002	14.609	+0,6		13.593	+1,0		1.016	-4,6	
THREE-MONTHLY DATA									
1997									
January	14.208	+0,3	+0,3	12.883	0,0	0,0	1.325	+3,4	+3,4
April	14.330	+0,3	+0,3	12.989	+0,2	+0,1	1.341	+1,1	+2,2
July	14.375	0,0	+0,2	13.139	+0,1	+0,1	1.236	-1,5	+1,0
October	14.325	-0,1	+0,1	13.050	0,0	+0,1	1.275	-0,6	+0,6
1998									
January	14.275	+0,5	+0,5	12.969	+0,7	+0,7	1.306	-1,4	-1,4
April	14.409	+0,6	+0,5	13.050	+0,5	+0,6	1.359	+1,4	0,0
July	14.481	+0,7	+0,6	13.208	+0,5	+0,6	1.273	+3,0	+0,9
October	14.447	+0,9	+0,7	13.133	+0,6	+0,6	1.314	+3,0	+1,5
1999									
January	14.324	+0,3	+0,3	13.004	+0,3	+0,3	1.320	+1,1	+1,1
April	14.391	-0,1	+0,1	13.119	+0,5	+0,4	1.272	-6,4	-2,8
July	14.509	+0,2	+0,1	13.276	+0,5	+0,4	1.233	-3,2	-2,9
October	14.472	+0,2	+0,1	13.234	+0,8	+0,5	1.238	-5,8	-3,6
2000									
January	14.369	+0,3	+0,3	13.083	+0,6	+0,6	1.287	-2,5	-2,5
April	14.423	+0,2	+0,3	13.223	+0,8	+0,7	1.200	-5,7	-4,1
July	14.579	+0,5	+0,3	13.460	+1,4	+0,9	1.119	-9,3	-5,7
October	14.609	+0,9	+0,5	13.499	+2,0	+1,2	1.111	-10,3	-6,9
2001									
January	14.477	+0,8	+0,8	13.353	+2,1	+2,1	1.124	-12,6	-12,6
April	14.427	0,0	+0,4	13.358	+1,0	+1,5	1.069	-10,9	-11,8
July	14.592	+0,1	+0,3	13.564	+0,8	+1,3	1.027	-8,2	-10,7
October	14.587	-0,2	+0,2	13.544	+0,3	+1,0	1.042	-6,1	-9,6
2002									
January	14.550	+0,5	+0,5	13.510	+1,2	+1,2	1.039	-7,6	-7,6
April	14.582	+1,1	+0,8	13.558	+1,5	+1,3	1.024	-4,2	-5,9

July	14.654	+0,4	+0,7	13.665	+0,7	+1,1	988	-3,8	-5,3
October	14.653	+0,5	+0,6	13.639	+0,7	+1,0	1.013	-2,8	-4,6
2003									
January	14.647	+0,7	+0,7	13.573	+0,5	+0,5	1.074	+3,3	+3,3
April	14.677	+0,7	+0,7	13.668	+0,8	+0,6	1.008	-1,6	+0,9

Tab. 2 continue. Labour Force by condition and sex - Women (thousands)

Period	Labour Force			Employed			People in search of work		
	Abs. values	Percentage variations		Abs. values	Percentage variations		Abs. values	Percentage variations	
		Compare d with the same period of the previous year	Combine d since the beginning of the year		Compare d with the same period of the previous year	Combine d since the beginning of the year		Compare d with the same period of the previous year	Combine d since the beginning of the year
YEAR'S DATA									
1997	8.586	+1,1		7.192	+1,0		1.394	+2,0	
1998	8.777	+2,2		7.345	+2,1		1.431	+2,7	
1999	8.937	+1,8		7.533	+2,6		1.404	-1,9	
2000	9.080	+1,6		7.764	+3,1		1.316	-6,2	
2001	9.261	+2,0		8.060	+3,8		1.201	-8,7	
2002	9.383	+1,3		8.236	+2,2		1.147	-4,5	
THREE-MONTHLY DATA									
1997									
January	8.447	+1,4	+1,4	7.055	+1,3	+1,3	1.391	+1,7	+1,7
April	8.606	+1,0	+1,2	7.195	+0,8	+1,1	1.411	+2,1	+1,9
July	8.614	+0,8	+1,1	7.286	+0,9	+1,0	1.328	+0,5	+1,5
October	8.677	+1,3	+1,1	7.232	+0,9	+1,0	1.445	+3,4	+2,0
1998									
January	8.593	+1,7	+1,7	7.181	+1,8	+1,8	1.411	+1,4	+1,4
April	8.755	+1,7	+1,7	7.308	+1,6	+1,7	1.448	+2,6	+2,0
July	8.823	+2,4	+2,0	7.430	+2,0	+1,8	1.393	+4,9	+2,9
October	8.936	+3,0	+2,2	7.462	+3,2	+2,1	1.473	+2,0	+2,7
1999									
January	8.822	+2,7	+2,7	7.390	+2,9	+2,9	1.432	+1,5	+1,5
April	8.956	+2,3	+2,5	7.499	+2,6	+2,8	1.457	+0,7	+1,1
July	8.981	+1,8	+2,2	7.617	+2,5	+2,7	1.364	-2,1	0,0
October	8.988	+0,6	+1,8	7.627	+2,2	+2,6	1.362	-7,6	-1,9
2000									
January	8.895	+0,8	+0,8	7.534	+1,9	+1,9	1.360	-5,0	-5,0
April	9.053	+1,1	+1,0	7.708	+2,8	+2,4	1.345	-7,7	-6,4
July	9.147	+1,9	+1,3	7.862	+3,2	+2,7	1.286	-5,7	-6,2
October	9.224	+2,6	+1,6	7.951	+4,3	+3,1	1.273	-6,5	-6,2
2001									
January	9.175	+3,1	+3,1	7.920	+5,1	+5,1	1.255	-7,8	-7,8
April	9.217	+1,8	+2,5	8.015	+4,0	+4,5	1.202	-10,6	-9,2
July	9.314	+1,8	+2,3	8.149	+3,7	+4,2	1.165	-9,3	-9,2
October	9.336	+1,2	+2,0	8.154	+2,5	+3,8	1.182	-7,1	-8,7
2002									

January	9.292	+1,3	+1,3	8.134	+2,7	+2,7	1.158	-7,7	-7,7
April	9.384	+1,8	+1,5	8.199	+2,3	+2,5	1.185	-1,4	-4,6
July	9.424	+1,2	+1,4	8.319	+2,1	+2,4	1.106	-5,1	-4,8
October	9.431	+1,0	+1,3	8.293	+1,7	+2,2	1.139	-3,7	-4,5
2003									
January	9.364	+0,8	+0,8	8.251	+1,4	+1,4	1.113	-3,9	-3,9
April	9.528	+1,5	+0,2	8.389	+2,3	+1,9	1.139	-3,9	-3,9

Tab. 3. Subordinate workers by sector (thousands)

Period	Agriculture	Industry	Building	Total industry	Other services	Trade	Total services	Total employed
YEAR'S DATA								
1997	472	4.231	964	5.195	7.342	1.364	8.706	14.372
1998	465	4.317	931	5.247	7.444	1.393	8.837	14.549
1999	449	4.305	948	5.253	7.624	1.498	9.121	14.823
2000	451	4.275	984	5.259	7.828	1.593	9.420	15.131
2001	464	4.271	1.040	5.311	8.106	1.635	9.742	15.517
2002	462	4.310	1.084	5.394	8.270	1.723	9.993	15.849
THREE-MONTHLY DATA								
1997								
January	434	4.181	929	5.110	7.282	1.370	8.652	14.196
April	430	4.233	949	5.183	7.388	1.363	8.752	14.365
July	502	4.253	993	5.246	7.407	1.356	8.763	14.511
October	522	4.255	984	5.240	7.291	1.365	8.656	14.417
1998								
January	451	4.288	935	5.223	7.345	1.372	8.717	14.392
April	443	4.292	926	5.218	7.478	1.376	8.854	14.515
July	481	4.327	922	5.249	7.517	1.402	8.919	14.650
October	483	4.360	939	5.299	7.435	1.422	8.857	14.639
1999								
January	414	4.304	917	5.221	7.490	1.434	8.924	14.559
April	423	4.243	964	5.207	7.666	1.486	9.151	14.782
July	459	4.323	956	5.279	7.688	1.546	9.234	14.972
October	498	4.349	956	5.305	7.651	1.525	9.176	14.980
2000								
January	428	4.236	963	5.199	7.659	1.561	9.220	14.847
April	423	4.201	980	5.181	7.836	1.594	9.430	15.033
July	473	4.333	1.001	5.333	7.888	1.592	9.479	15.285
October	482	4.331	994	5.325	7.927	1.625	9.552	15.359
2001								
January	429	4.297	1.012	5.309	7.989	1.619	9.607	15.346
April	434	4.216	1.028	5.244	8.123	1.610	9.732	15.411
July	491	4.292	1.065	5.357	8.165	1.646	9.811	15.660
October	501	4.278	1.057	5.335	8.149	1.667	9.815	15.651
2002								
January	412	4.280	1.038	5.318	8.215	1.751	9.966	15.696
April	430	4.293	1.044	5.338	8.322	1.695	10.017	15.785
July	515	4.346	1.107	5.453	8.283	1.732	10.015	15.983
October	492	4.322	1.147	5.469	8.259	1.713	9.972	15.934
2003								
January				5.417				15.855

	412	4.298	1.119		8.287	1.739	10.026	
April	423	4.298	1.137	5.434	8.427	1.751	10.179	16.036

Tab. 3 continue. Subordinate workers by sector (percentage variations compared with the same period of the previous year)

Period	Agriculture	Industry	Building	Total industry	Other services	Trade	Total services	Total employed
YEAR'S VARIATIONS								
1997	-5,0	-0,5	-0,2	-0,4	+1,7	+1,9	+1,7	+0,7
1998	-1,5	+2,0	-3,5	+1,0	+1,4	+2,2	+1,5	+1,2
1999	-3,4	-0,3	+1,9	+0,1	+2,4	+7,5	+3,2	+1,9
2000	+0,6	-0,7	+3,8	+0,1	+2,7	+6,4	+3,3	+2,1
2001	+2,7	-0,1	+5,7	+1,0	+3,6	+2,7	+3,4	+2,5
2002	-0,3	+0,9	+4,2	+1,6	+2,0	+5,3	+2,6	+2,1
THREE-MONTHLY VARIATIONS								
1997								
January	-2,4	-1,5	-4,8	-2,1	+2,8	+2,9	+2,9	+0,8
April	-9,9	-1,5	+1,2	-1,0	+3,0	-0,3	+2,5	+0,8
July	-7,0	+0,2	+0,5	+0,2	+1,4	+1,6	+1,4	+0,7
October	-0,6	+0,9	+2,2	+1,1	-0,4	+3,4	+0,2	+0,5
1998								
January	+3,9	+2,5	+0,7	+2,2	+0,9	+0,2	+0,8	+1,4
April	+3,0	+1,4	-2,5	+0,7	+1,2	+0,9	+1,2	+1,0
July	-4,0	+1,7	-7,1	+0,1	+1,5	+3,4	+1,8	+1,0
October	-7,4	+2,5	-4,6	+1,1	+2,0	+4,2	+2,3	+1,5
1999								
January	-8,1	+0,4	-2,0	0,0	+2,0	+4,5	+2,4	+1,2
April	-4,6	-1,1	+4,1	-0,2	+2,5	+8,0	+3,4	+1,8
July	-4,6	-0,1	+3,7	+0,6	+2,3	+10,2	+3,5	+2,2
October	+3,2	-0,3	+1,9	+0,1	+2,9	+7,2	+3,6	+2,3
2000								
January	+3,3	-1,6	+5,1	-0,4	+2,3	+8,8	+3,3	+2,0
April	-0,1	-1,0	+1,6	-0,5	+2,2	+7,3	+3,0	+1,7
July	+2,9	+0,2	+4,7	+1,0	+2,6	+3,0	+2,7	+2,1
October	-3,3	-0,4	+3,9	+0,4	+3,6	+6,6	+4,1	+2,5
2001								
January	+0,2	+1,5	+5,1	+2,1	+4,3	+3,7	+4,2	+3,4
April	+2,7	+0,4	+4,9	+1,2	+3,7	+1,0	+3,2	+2,5
July	+3,9	-0,9	+6,4	+0,4	+3,5	+3,4	+3,5	+2,4
October	+3,9	-1,2	+6,3	+0,2	+2,8	+2,6	+2,8	+1,9
2002								
January	-4,1	-0,4	+2,5	+0,2	+2,8	+8,2	+3,7	+2,3
April	-0,8	+1,8	+1,6	+1,8	+2,5	+5,3	+2,9	+2,4
July	+4,8	+1,2	+4,0	+1,8	+1,4	+5,2	+2,1	+2,1
October	-1,7	+1,0	+8,5	+2,5	+1,4	+2,8	+1,6	+1,8
2003								
January	0,0	+0,4	+7,9	+1,9	+0,9	-0,7	+0,6	+1,0
April	-1,7	+0,1	+8,8	+1,8	+1,3	+3,3	+1,6	+1,6

Tab. 4. Self-employed workers by sector (thousands)

Period	Agriculture	Industry	Building	Total industry	Other services	Trade	Total services	Total employed
YEAR'S DATA								
1997	773	865	600	1.466	1.726	1.870	3.597	5.835
1998	736	870	613	1.483	1.794	1.873	3.667	5.886
1999	686	870	627	1.497	1.876	1.810	3.686	5.869
2000	669	874	634	1.507	1.988	1.784	3.772	5.949
2001	663	862	667	1.529	2.025	1.781	3.806	5.998
2002	634	874	663	1.537	2.076	1.733	3.809	5.980
THREE-MONTHLY DATA								
1997								
January	769	857	582	1.439	1.672	1.862	3.535	5.742
April	757	803	599	1.402	1.771	1.890	3.660	5.819
July	780	879	622	1.501	1.747	1.886	3.633	5.915
October	787	922	598	1.520	1.716	1.842	3.558	5.865
1998								
January	747	860	594	1.454	1.737	1.821	3.558	5.759
April	731	849	596	1.445	1.811	1.856	3.667	5.842
July	737	883	634	1.517	1.810	1.925	3.734	5.988
October	730	887	630	1.517	1.820	1.889	3.709	5.956
1999								
January	681	869	600	1.468	1.841	1.846	3.687	5.836
April	694	866	602	1.468	1.896	1.777	3.674	5.836
July	706	874	652	1.526	1.876	1.813	3.689	5.921
October	661	872	655	1.527	1.888	1.804	3.693	5.881
2000								
January	656	852	610	1.463	1.860	1.792	3.652	5.770
April	672	856	616	1.472	1.995	1.757	3.752	5.897
July	665	882	641	1.523	2.068	1.781	3.849	6.036
October	682	904	668	1.572	2.030	1.808	3.837	6.091
2001								
January	669	867	647	1.514	1.972	1.772	3.744	5.927
April	679	876	662	1.539	2.000	1.745	3.745	5.963
July	653	839	675	1.514	2.068	1.818	3.886	6.053
October	649	867	683	1.550	2.060	1.788	3.849	6.047
2002								
January	650	864	671	1.536	2.005	1.758	3.763	5.949
April	642	867	669	1.536	2.084	1.709	3.793	5.971
July	613	870	672	1.542	2.133	1.714	3.847	6.001
October	630	893	642	1.535	2.084	1.750	3.834	5.998
2003								
January	627	857	663	1.520	2.060	1.762	3.822	5.969
April	617	883	689	1.572	2.096	1.736	3.832	6.021

Tab. 4. continue. Self-employed workers by sector (percentage variations compared with the same period of the previous year)

Period	Agriculture	Industry	Building	Total industry	Other services	Trade	Total services	Total employed
YEAR'S VARIATIONS								
1997	-1,0	-0,9	-0,2	-0,6	+2,1	-1,9	0,0	-0,3
1998	-4,7	+0,5	+2,2	+1,2	+3,9	+0,1	+2,0	+0,9
1999	-6,9	+0,1	+2,2	+1,0	+4,5	-3,3	+0,5	-0,3
2000	-2,5	+0,4	+1,1	+0,7	+6,0	-1,4	+2,4	+1,4
2001	-0,9	-1,3	+5,2	+1,4	+1,9	-0,2	+0,9	+0,8
2002	-4,4	+1,3	-0,5	+0,5	+2,5	-2,7	+0,1	-0,3
THREE-MONTHLY VARIATIONS								
1997								
January	+0,3	-0,6	-2,4	-1,3	+0,6	-0,9	-0,2	-0,4
April	+0,2	-7,3	0,0	-4,3	+5,4	-2,6	+1,1	-0,4
July	-0,1	-1,0	+2,4	+0,4	+1,7	-2,7	-0,6	-0,3
October	-4,2	+5,0	-1,0	+2,6	+0,9	-1,4	-0,3	-0,1
1998								
January	-2,8	+0,4	+2,0	+1,0	+3,9	-2,2	+0,7	+0,3
April	-3,4	+5,7	-0,6	+3,0	+2,3	-1,8	+0,2	+0,4
July	-5,5	+0,4	+1,9	+1,0	+3,6	+2,0	+2,8	+1,2
October	-7,2	-3,8	+5,4	-0,2	+6,1	+2,5	+4,2	+1,6
1999								
January	-8,9	+1,0	+1,0	+1,0	+6,0	+1,4	+3,6	+1,3
April	-5,0	+2,0	+1,0	+1,6	+4,7	-4,2	+0,2	-0,1
July	-4,2	-0,9	+2,8	+0,6	+3,7	-5,8	-1,2	-1,1
October	-9,4	-1,7	+3,9	+0,7	+3,8	-4,5	-0,4	-1,3
2000								
January	-3,7	-1,9	+1,8	-0,4	+1,0	-2,9	-1,0	-1,1
April	-3,2	-1,2	+2,4	+0,3	+5,2	-1,1	+2,1	+1,0
July	-5,8	+0,9	-1,7	-0,2	+10,2	-1,8	+4,3	+1,9
October	+3,1	+3,6	+2,0	+2,9	+7,5	+0,2	+3,9	+3,6
2001								
January	+2,1	+1,7	+6,0	+3,5	+6,0	-1,1	+2,5	+2,7
April	+1,0	+2,4	+7,5	+4,5	+0,3	-0,7	-0,2	+1,1
July	-1,7	-4,8	+5,3	-0,6	0,0	+2,1	+1,0	+0,3
October	-4,9	-4,1	+2,2	-1,4	+1,5	-1,1	+0,3	-0,7
2002								
January	-2,9	-0,3	+3,8	+1,4	+1,7	-0,8	+0,5	+0,4
April	-5,5	-1,0	+1,0	-0,2	+4,2	-2,0	+1,3	+0,1
July	-6,1	+3,7	-0,5	+1,8	+3,1	-5,7	-1,0	-0,9
October	-2,9	+3,0	-6,0	-1,0	+1,1	-2,2	-0,4	-0,8
2003								
January	-3,6	-0,8	-1,2	-1,0	+2,8	+0,2	+1,6	+0,3
April	-3,9	+1,9	+3,0	+2,4	+0,6	+1,5	+1,0	+0,8