Resumen
En este trabajo, que aún se encuentra en un estadio intermedio de su desarrollo, pretendemos analizar, desde una perspectiva comparada, las políticas públicas locales de vivienda para personas refugiadas en España y Noruega a partir de un estudio de caso. Dado que el idioma de comunicación entre los autores es el inglés, este texto está escrito en esta lengua. Hemos de tener en cuenta que países representan paradigmas de sus respectivos Estados de Bienestar, además que el papel desempeñado por sus gobiernos locales es completamente diferente. Mientras que en el país Nórdico, los municipios tienen gran autonomía para gestionar su modelo de Bienestar desde el nivel más próximo a su ciudadanía, esta condición no ocurre en nuestro país que se encuentra centralizado desde el nivel nacional, organizando la gestión a través de programas subvencionando a las ONGs. Por otra parte, consideramos que este tipo de investigaciones que desarrollan modelos teóricos para aproximar el mismo problema desde diferentes contextos son necesarias para las ciencias sociales, a, socialización, sexualidad, género, feminismo.
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1. Introduction

The purpose of this study is to compare municipal housing policies towards refugees in Spain and Norway. Alicante, Spain, and Moss, Norway, are the cases.

The magnitude of refugees to the EU countries (EU 28) and Norway over the last ten years (Eurostat, 2017) and more, challenges these countries in a number of ways. Integration in the society is one of the overarching challenges, within which housing policies are not the least, and the reason why it is the topic of this study.

Housing is a necessary part of the right to an adequate standard of living according to the United Nations’ (UN) Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 (article 25), and its International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 1966 (article 11).

Housing conditions are of great importance during childhood, education, for being active in the labor market (Whitehead, Poval, & Loring, 2014) and for healthy living (Marmot et al., 2008).

Spain and Norway represents different types of welfare state (Belmonte and Tufte, 2016), so their housing policies are put into practice in different social policy traditions, which is connected to welfare regimes.

While Esping-Andersen’s (1990) book on the three worlds of welfare capitalism, by far the most widely cited work in the comparative social policy literature, ignored housing in his classification of welfare regimes (Griggs& Kemp, 2012:393), a number of other academics have done it (Kemeni, 2001; Fahey and Norris, 2010; Olsen, 2013). Olsen argues that welfare states generally encompass three distinct but closely connected networks and instruments for housing policies (Olsen 2013: 338-341);

First, income support programs. The most common are housing allowances, which have become an important part of the “income package” that advanced welfare states provide to low- and moderate-income households (Griggs& Kemp, 2012:393). Usually, income supports are means tested ben-
efits to low-income individuals, and they are often targeted at particular demographic groups, such as young people, families with children, people with disabilities and pensioners. There are also implicit housing allowances such as income-related rents and other forms of rent control and a wide range of tax deductions, exemptions, deferrals and other measures that have been directed at housing consumers. Income support has become the most central housing policy in many nations.

Second, Social services: social/public housing. Social housing is a broad term that refers to rental housing provided by the state, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), or combinations of both. According to Kemeni (2001) forms of rental systems in industrialized societies, could be unitary and dualist. Both Spain and Norway belong to dualistic, which means they have two very distinct rental markets, one that is open another that is protected. In these dualistic, states have typically subsidized the provision of a certain quantity of housing at lower levels of rents than those available on the open market (for example through loan with low interest rates). A Housing First program is a typical instrument of this kind. It is primarily designed for deprived collectives as old people, mental sick, drug abusers and other who are not able to run their life independently in a dwelling. Refugees may be included if they have problems as mentioned. The premise of this model opposes the traditional staircase or linear approach to housing people experiencing homelessness whereby people are progressed through a series of accommodation services until they have proved they are “housing ready” and can access independent housing. The staircase or linear approach works on a ‘treatment first’ philosophy (Padgett et al., 2006), in that clients have to address their problems before progressing to the next stage, with housing as the end goal. In contrast Housing First prioritizes access to an independent tenancy and whilst support is assertively encouraged, related or failure to engage does not result in the tenancy ending (Salyers & Tsemberis, 2007). The guidelines on Housing First associated with this strategy emphasise the
importance of avoiding large clusters of dwellings for former homeless people with multiple problems, and recommend Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) teams as the preferred model of support, although the Danish evidence is valuable in highlighting the merits of also having available and Individual Case Treatment (ICT) and Community Treatment Interventions (CTI).

Third, is social legislation which is based on an understanding that there is a significant power asymmetry between landlords and tenants. It was introduced to make housing more accessible and secure providing some degree of protection from arbitrary and extortionate price-gouging and from unpredicted rent increases. In addition to various legislation, both Spain and Norway practice rent control where they fall between the poles of strict and soft rent controls. Furthermore, some Social Housing Public Agencies can control the level of rent required by landlords and the appropriate standard for living conditions.

The three instruments mentioned can be in the hands of the authorities at the national level as well as at the regional and local (municipal) level, whereas this article focuses on those that are in the hands of the municipal level.

Housing practices towards refugees in the hands of private landlords, private credit institutions, and estate agents are omitted in this study, as are political discourse on refugees.

2. Method and material

Housing policies towards refugees are the topic in this study. Because the term refugee is included in the term immigrants, we consider that the discussion of the meaning of these terms is not an issue here, so we follow the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (1951) and its Protocol (1967). It defines a refugee as any person who:

owning to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religions, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nation-
ality and is unable or, owning to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a results of such events, is unable or, owning to such fear, is unwilling to return it (art. 1).

This paper omits the processes of selection and acceptance of refugee applicants because they belong to the national level in both countries. The study compares one municipality in each of the countries Spain (Alicante) and Norway (Moss); two countries that generally are considered to belong to different welfare regimes.

Alicante in Spain is selected as case because it is one of the 15 out of more than 8,100 Spanish municipalities engaged to Housing First project (http://www.raisfundacion.org/es/que_hacemos/habitat; 28/08/2017). Furthermore, it belongs to International Solidarity Cities Network which recognizes Alicante as a Refugee city¹ in the frame of Welcome Refugees Spain. It means that Alicante is concerned about the Housing.

The municipality Moss in Norway is selected as case because it applies the Housing first program, as does Alicante, and some other programs that are optional for Norwegian municipalities managed by a Social Housing office. These are offered by the Norwegian State Housing Bank.

Most European states have delegated a great part of responsibilities regarding disadvantaged groups to regional and local authorities. We shall focus on how local agencies handle the housing situation for refugees.

We use documents from the European Commission, government documents from Spain and Norway and documents from municipal archives and NGOs in charge. A few interviews with persons from Alicante (Spain) and Moss (Norway) municipalities are used with the purpose of “obtaining unique information or interpretations” (Stake, 2010). In this study, we put forward the interviewee’s information and experiences about the housing policy for refugees in each municipal case.

¹ https://www.google.com/maps/d/viewer?mid=1JmS3vpqKmJQ7RcDOj6m-7k7YJw&hl=en_US&ll=38.35784836285235%2C-0.47252415000002657&z=13; 28/08/2017
3. The role of the national level

While the focus of the study is housing policies for refugees at the municipal level, a description of these policies at the national level is necessary to begin with because they direct what the municipalities do.

Spain and Norway have established different instruments in order to handle the challenges for the housing policies that encompass income support programs, social housing and rent control.

The national level in Spain, particularly the Ministry of Interior, is the legal authority in asylum, relocations and resettlements for refugees. The Spanish system for reception an integration of international protection applicants allows its beneficiaries to be settled in a Refugee Reception Centre (called C.A.R, Centro de Atención al Refugiado) managed by the Employment and Social Security Ministry by a NGO.

In formal terms from the Ministry webpage (http://extranjeros.empleo.gob.es/es/ProteccionAsilo/car/), such centers provide lodging, feeding, living expenses, legal and psychological assistance, and access to education, health and social services. Furthermore, they incorporate programs for learning the language, the culture and developing social and job skills for working insertion plus some economical subsidies (maintenance expenses). The length of the stay cannot be up six months. As far as we know, C.A.Rs are swamped. Each year, Employment and Social Security Ministry opens a process for receiving NGOS applications to managing reception refugees (municipalities are not allowing to compete). In this process, the state offers subsidies for the different NGOs projects selected in a competitive way.

In Norway, the national level represented by the Ministry of Justice and Public Security has the legal authority regarding refugees; while other Ministries partake in the government’s responsibilities regarding how the refugee policy are put into practice. The Norwegian system for reception of refugees starts by settling them in refugee reception
centers. During their stay in these centers, the relevant national authorities (agencies below the Ministries actually) conduct their selection and acceptance evaluations. The relevant Ministries signed a two year contract in 2016 with KS about the centers. The contract states that the government shall cover the expenses that the municipalities have regarding housing of refugees, while the municipalities’ role is to find accommodation for them as soon as possible. Another element in the contract deals with the role of the State Housing Bank, that states its obligation to use its favorable social housing instruments in order to improve the municipalities’ role in this field. This contract signifies the key link between the national and local municipal level in this policy area; Norwegian municipalities act as instruments for the government’s refugee policies. The municipalities’ role of being instruments is, however, most visible when it comes to how integration of refugees is put into practice.

In Norway, national legislation includes housing as formulated in the Tenancy Act and the Housing Cooperative Act. Discrimination based on gender, ethnicity, religion or belief, sexual orientation or disability is prohibited according to these acts. Applicants who are accepted as refugees are encompassed by this legislation, but to what degree this is followed up is outside the purpose of this study.

National housing initiatives in Norway have stimulated a move from ‘staircase’ models to more housing led approaches that led to the foundation for a Housing First-based programme in 2014.

This section has established that the national authorities in Spain and Norway have the responsibilities of selection and acceptance of refugees, while the process of integration of refugees is transferred to the municipalities, accompanied by legislation, and support by different programs that include transfer of money. The table below summarizes how the main responsibilities for refugees are distributed between the levels of government in Spain and Norway.
4. Housing Policies in Local Level

4.1 Norway, case of Moss municipality

Norwegian municipalities define regularly refugees as one group among others such as drug and alcohol addicts, people with psychiatric diagnoses, handicapped people and young people on their way to establish themselves outside their parental homes, who need support to get access to the housing market (Hanche-Olsen, Bergem, Aarflot, & Møreforsking, 2009, p. 10).

Housing first in Norway is hitherto implemented in only a few municipalities. They are the main responsible agents for offering a flat and recovery assistance to people with physic problems and/or who are addicted to drugs and alcohol abuse. Housing first projects in Norway are parts of its welfare state system, which means that only public authorities are agents in those pro-
Financing is offered by three sources: The Norwegian State Housing Bank (state owned, it gives cheap loans to persons and municipalities), the county governor (a state office) and the municipality (who shall run the project). Voluntary organizations are invited by a municipality to participate, most often to do visitor services and daytime services.

For the time being 12 municipalities out of 427 are running Housing first projects. Multidisciplinary teams, with two-four members consisting of various professionals from social work, nurses, child welfare workers etc. work with recovery of the person once he or she has been offered a place to live. The professionals are all employed by the municipality or by the government’s unemployment office. English documents that describe the idea behind Housing first mention two types of teams: Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) and Individual Case Management (ICM). None of the Norwegian municipalities can boast of having ACT teams on the ground that they lack medical doctors and/or psychiatrists. Most of them work with Individual Case Management methods, which means that the team tries to customize the assistance to each person’s individual need.

Some municipalities have a team working 24 hours, while others have established telephone connection between the flat where the person in need lives and the municipality’s emergency phone. In the latter case, the person in need can get help although not from the team.

Some municipalities (for example Sandefjord, ca 60.000 inhabitants) have connected its Housing first project to its home-help organization. By this connection its experienced staff of nurses, assistant nurses and home care workers is able to assist in such project also.

One of the 12 municipalities that are dealing with Housing first includes refugees (Snertingdal, 2014, p. 29) (Til Discussion: Strange that only one of the 12 municipalities includes refugees considering the obligation municipalities have to offer permanent housing for refugees who have been granted permanent residence in Norway).
Moss municipality offers favourable mortgage to refugees in order to make them owner-occupiers, and housing allowance as rent subsidy. These are offered on the same conditions as for ordinary citizens. The municipality acknowledges that it is not easy to getting refugees scattered around the whole area of the municipality, which is its aim. Some refugees are not accustomed to the habits of living in a Norwegian flat and it causes damages to the flat. Because of that, janitors are employed to assist the newcomers during their first time in Moss. Some ordinary citizens feel that the municipality prioritizes the housing need of refugees more than its own citizens.

Table 2 Moss municipality: Main instruments and challenges

Source: Self elaboration
4.2 Spain, case of Alicante municipality

In Spain, the program of Housing First started with 28 houses in Malaga, Barcelona and Madrid in 2014. In 2017, 12 more municipalities have joined (Alicante, Arona, Avilés, Córdoba, Coslada, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Móstoles, San Sebastián, Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Sevilla, Valencia and Zaragoza) adding 161 houses. Note that all cities have more than 80,000 inhabitants. We should remark that only 15 municipalities out of more than 8,100. As far as we know, none refugee has been accommodated in this project so we think that they tend to stay in shelter placements according to the staircase model or living with their families settle in the country (it would be familiar ensemble policies). This issue is a public-private partnership.

Otherwise, the programs for refugees are totally controlled by the state. Each year, Central Government opens a process for receiving NGOS applications for managing reception refugees (municipalities are not allowing to compete). In this process, the state offers subsidies for the NGOs projects selected. In Alicante the most important one is Red Cross but also in the last call in July 2017, CEPAIM (foundation called Coexistence and Social action) applied for taking care of refugees.

This national program lasts 18 months and it is divided into three stages. First stage: 6 months. It implies the reception of refugees and providing tutelary housing. Second stage: It is time for renting. Refugees will receive a financial help and also support for getting the dwelling. The last one and third has the goal to get the autonomy. In all the stages the refugees receive the advice of Red Cross personal and volunteers. Red Cross organizes the volunteer’s activities. These activities go to picking them up at the Airport from advises about the national spainish culture. The objective is to empower the refugee in all the stage. Red Cross volunteers and workers accompany the refugee in all the process. According to Red Cross Alicante report, in 2016, 517 people were attended.

If after this process, the refugee social situation is as a national person.

On the other hand, Alicante municipality has some programs for homeless. For all the people in need (nationals, immigrants and /
or refugees). So, if refugees are in need after the specific program they will be treated as any other person with social problems in the Action social area of the municipality. Also, according to the interview, the municipality is promoting actions for sensitization and awareness of this situation.

Table 3. Alicante municipality: Main instruments and challenges
Source: Self elaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main instruments</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross experience</td>
<td>It necessary coordination among central, regional and local public authorities and rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers job</td>
<td>Private initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer of public dwellings</td>
<td>They aren’t enough. When a place is free immediately is occupied again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees shall be located in houses all around in the municipality in order to hinder ghettos.</td>
<td>Not always successful. Too many flats for refugees concentrated in certain areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing allowance (a subsidy for rent).</td>
<td>No substantial challenge identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of rent.</td>
<td>No substantial challenge identified because it is controlled by Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of rent.</td>
<td>Don’t know.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Conclusion

Our findings show us/teach us that integration of refugees are dependent of policies and implementation of policies at both the national and local level. Spain and Norway cope with this in different ways because their welfare regimes serve as hardware for how housing policies for refugees are put into practice; they directly influence how municipalities do it.

In this way, the familiaristic regime of Spain leaves more to NGOs and individuals (volunteers) than to the municipality, while the Nordic regime in Norway leaves more to the municipality and (much) less to NGOs and individuals.
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