CHAPTER 11
DEVELOPING FORMS OF AGENCY: HOW DO NEWCOMERS DEAL WITH SOCIAL SERVICES

JÉRÉMY MANDIN

The previous chapters have shown that the relationship between newly arrived immigrants and the PCSWs' social workers is 'structurally asymmetrical' (Demazière, 1996, p. 7) in the sense that:

> Even if the protagonists are both assigned to a face-to-face [interaction], the professional seems to occupy a position of power and to have a capacity of intervention on the situation of the unemployed [beneficiary] that are not reciprocal […]. (Demazière, 1996, our translation)

Social workers are central interlocutors of the beneficiary in the access to social aid functioning as gatekeeper to social assistance. Indeed, as seen in previous chapters, not only is he/she responsible for informing the beneficiary about their rights, social workers are also in charge of collecting the information to decide on the allocation (or not) of a social benefit, proposing a response to the hierarchy and following up cases. Social workers can also apply sanctions to the beneficiary (Chapter 8). Social workers also have room for discretion in applying the PCSW's guidelines and – as Chapter 8 has shown – are often trusted by their hierarchical superiors.

However, despite the unbalanced power relation, the bureaucratic encounter between social workers of the PCSW and the newcomers can still be considered a two-sided interaction. If social workers are in a position of power when compared with the position of the beneficiary, a part of their work is dependent on the level of collaboration of the beneficiary in – for example – providing relevant and correct information. As Chapter 8 has shown, social workers adapt their work and their decisions to how they perceive their interlocutor and their situation. For example, a newcomer showing 'active' and 'collaborating' attitudes is likely to be perceived more positively, which can make the interaction with social workers easier and facilitate the access to certain benefits. These different elements then raise the question of the

agency that newcomers have (or not) in their interactions with social workers. In other words, while Chapter 8 demonstrated that the way in which social workers use their discretionary power can have an impact on the assistance that beneficiaries receive, we now examine the capacity (or lack of capacity) from the perspective of newcomer beneficiaries to influence the relationship with social workers, to have their needs met, and to develop their autonomy.

1. FROM COMPLIANCE AND COLLABORATION TO ASSERTIVENESS

A crucial aspect of the relation between newcomers and PCSWs' social workers is that newcomers – at least when they arrive at the PCSW – largely depend on PCSWs' financial aid or non-financial services and support to fulfil basic necessities such as housing or food (see Chapter 7). Services such as the integration income are indeed designed as a last resort safety net for people who do not have access to other forms of income. In this sense, the participation of the newcomer in the relation with the PCSW is largely 'non-voluntary' (Lipsky, 2010, p. 54; see also Wright, 2003, p. 256) as beneficiaries do not have alternative solutions. Because they do not have alternative solutions, beneficiaries have little choice but to comply with the administrative process and with the requirement of social workers. For example, if – as described in Chapter 12 – newcomers can be critical towards the practices of control from the PCSW's social workers, they nevertheless have little choice but to submit to it. In the quote below, a newcomer describes how – while finding them useless – he had to answer the questions of his social worker during his first meeting.

> [I ask BF if he had to give some information for the integration income application. He says yes and starts enumerating the questions he had to answer during his first meeting with the PCSW social worker]
> In [your country of origin], do you have an apartment or a house? No.
> *Do you have money? No.*
> *Can't your family help you? No.*
> [When I ask him his opinion about these question he answers that he found them useless]: 'I come to the PCSW because I don't have money!'
> (Wallonia, L, beneficiary, 07/06/2021)

This echoes the observation from Howe (1990, p. 141) about the claimants of unemployment benefits in Northern Ireland:

> Basically, they cannot withdraw from the service should the costs become too high, for they have no other recourse. Trapped in this way, claimants must sustain the relationship with the SSO [SLB] even if the costs become very high. (Howe, 1990, p. 141)

One of the results of the necessity to sustain the relationship with their social worker in order to be able to keep a secure access to the PCSW's services is that the large majority of beneficiaries adopt a compliant attitude when interacting with social workers.

The compliance with the administrative process and with the demands of social workers can, however, be performed in different ways. Variations are present in the forms that collaboration with social workers can take.[1] Newcomers can develop 'active' forms of collaboration with their social worker by trying to anticipate – or better, exceed – a social worker's expectations. Some expectations can be explicitly expressed by social workers and formalised in the ISIP (such as learning the language or finding a job) but other expectations (such as showing a positive and active attitude) are more subtle and need to be interpreted by beneficiaries who know that they have to perform in specific ways when interacting with social workers. Showing willingness and commitment in the search for a job, for example, can help newcomers to demonstrate to social workers their 'good faith' as well as to reassure them on the fact that the newcomer shares the same sets of expectations (such as a rapid integration on the job market or a willingness to learn a national language). By presenting themselves as 'collaborating' beneficiaries and by being recognised as such, newcomers are aware that this can contribute to establish good relations with social workers and facilitate interactions.

> Yes, of course he agreed [moving to another city to try to find a job]. Because he likes when I am searching for something. When I don't stay at home. He likes when someone is positive. They don't like when someone is always negative. (Wallonia, O, beneficiary, 05/06/2021)

For newcomers, putting forward a 'determined' and 'trustworthy' attitude can also help opening new possibilities of negotiation with social workers. This is illustrated by the quote below where a respondent explains how he obtained from his social worker to have more time between his convocations to the PCSW.

> I had meetings every week with the social worker when I arrived here in the PCSW. Every Wednesday morning, at ten. First, she helped me for the

> money. [I had to meet her] every week like that. I said to her 'Wait Madame, I have to work!' [...] I said, 'Not every week! Every Wednesday, I have to take time to come here but I have to work!' She said 'No problem, A. I understand. [your previous employer] explained to me that you are a good worker, you don't need any translator to speak French ... Go to work, go to work ok!' With me, she was very nice. (Wallonia, N, beneficiary, 14/10/2021)

Engaging in proactive forms of collaboration with social workers and anticipating their expectations can then be a way to obtain more autonomy from the institution and more space to make their own choices in terms of socio-economic integration.

Newcomer beneficiaries can also engage in more 'limited' or 'minimal' forms of collaboration with their social worker. This means only fulfilling administrative requirements or sending documents and information that are directly required by social workers.

> [About an amount of money he received from the Walloon Family Allowance Fund]
> My social worker did not see it [the money] because she said nothing. I have the money and I use it as I want as far as the money goes [...] She did not tell me anything [about the possibility to have the allowance or the incompatibility with PCSW income]. So I said nothing [to her] either. She only asked me if I am still attending my training. I said yes. She said that I have to send the papers saying that I have a training contract. (Wallonia, B, beneficiary, 12/05/2021)

The quote above illustrates that engaging in more 'limited' forms of collaboration is not necessarily the result of a form of passivity (Dubois, 2010). Indeed, as the quote shows, opting for such limited forms of collaboration is sometimes expressed as a way to respond to what is perceived as a lack of professional commitment from social workers' part. In this case, the beneficiary describes his reticence to inform his social worker about the allowance as a response to the fact that his social worker did not inform him about the existence of the allowance in the first place. This suggests that the degree of collaboration shown by newcomer beneficiaries can also depend on the level of commitment of social workers. The quote also illustrates that avoiding sharing information – as long as social workers do not ask for this information – is also a way to limit the control that social workers have over the newcomer's life.

The data collected during the fieldwork shows that the vast majority of the newcomers adopt a compliant attitude when interacting with social workers.

As mentioned above, this compliance can be explained by the structural constraints faced by newcomers – such as the need for material support, their perception of the imbalance of power, and the blurred distinction between legal rights and aids conditioned to the discretionary power, due to the centrality of social workers in the access to such support. However, this compliance can also be explained by the fact that newcomers either interiorise and/or share with social workers some representations of deservingness that might converge with the ones circulating within the institution (see Chapter 12). Therefore, they tend to adapt their attitudes accordingly when interacting with social workers.

In a limited number of cases, however, interviews show that newcomer beneficiaries can also go beyond mere compliance with the terms of social workers and develop strategies to try to mitigate the power unbalance characterising their relation with social workers and to cope with social workers' discretion.

In his ethnographic study of unemployment in Northern Ireland, Howe (1990) analyses the relations between beneficiaries of income support benefits and the administration. He notes that, when beneficiaries are interacting with the officers, they are engaged in a role relationship (Kelvin & Jarrett, 1985, p. 84) where they are expected to display a certain set of behaviours including subordination, acquiescence and humility (Howe, 1990, p. 140), which – according to the author – most claimants conform to. However, Howe also noted that some of them (a minority) could break with this social role and become what he calls 'assertive' claimants who

> may attempt to negotiate the role relationship [street level agents] in ways which confer individualistic advantages […]. Generally speaking, such claimants become sensitised to the fact that their relationship to the SSO [social security office] and its staff is not predetermined but can be manipulated. When, or if, this happens, these claimants begin to perceive the situation in a new light, and become aware that, *within limits*, it is possible to play a more active and ambitious role. (Howe, 1990, p. 140; emphasis in the original)

A similar dynamic seems to be at play here. One way for newcomers to become more assertive in their relation with social workers is to make reference to what they perceive as 'the law' or 'the rules' to contest a decision:

> When I register to the PCSW, the PCSW has to give me my rights without discussing, this is normal. We also have duties [to the PCSW]. You have to

> go do your integration [integration course], you have to … this is normal. But when someone does the integration [course], does everything but has no rights … Also when I [mention] the law, that based on this article I am asking for this and this, [my SW] said, 'How can you know more than me? I am from Belgium, you, you are a foreigner, you cannot talk like that!' (Wallonia, I, beneficiary, 04/05/2021)

Making reference to the law has three effects in the quote above. First, it allows to switch the perception of PCSW support as a favour (see Chapters 9 and 10) and to redefine it as a right. Second, it contributes to redefine the position of the newcomer in the interaction by showing competences and understanding of the regulations. Third, by making reference to the law, newcomers also make a distinction between what depends on the law and what depends on social workers' discretion. This distinction allows newcomers to – as Howe (1990, p. 140) puts it – 'perceive the situation in a new light', to perceive the power dynamics existing within their relation with social workers differently. Newcomers who adopt more assertive attitudes generally accept final decisions when they are clearly identified as the result of the application of the rules. What is sometimes contested, however, is the discretionary power of social workers when it is perceived as an obstacle to a fair and objective evaluation of the demand:

> When my wife died, it was difficult. When I called the assistant for the funeral, to help with the expenses, and to change the situation, for me not to be the household second anymore [and to be able to receive the social integration income]. And [the SW] told me on the phone that it was a very serious situation and that it will be very difficult before even doing and submitting the application, and she told me she was really sorry. But then, the authorities are looking at the rules, the law and they gave a warning that we are in another level and so we had the income for social integration. Effectively [the help for the funeral's expenses] was not included, this we understood. But what we did not understand is that every time we submitted an application to the assistant [the SW], she started to deny [the possibility of a support] before analysing and submitting the demand. (Wallonia, M, beneficiary, 27/08/2021)

Making a distinction between the law (or what is perceived as the law) and social workers' discretion often requires for the newcomer to have a certain level of understanding of the functioning of the institution. The knowledge and competences accumulated by newcomers can then impact

their understanding of the function of social workers within the institution as well as their understanding of their own agency when dealing with the institution. In this perspective, some respondents were more confident in their capacity to argument and to make their own demands to the PCSW:

> I went to the council,[2] but I was prepared, I wasn't stressed. [...] I said [to the president]: 'I know what I want, this is for the better, let me go to University.' This is also a question of human rights to let people study [...]. I will have my degree and with my degree I will have a job which will allow me not to return to the PCSW, to contribute, to give back what you gave me. [...] So when they see how I defend myself, they know I will not fail at school! They have to support me for University. Well, at the end it's him [the president] the boss, I can't decide. Then they told me, 'Ok'. I explained to them why. (Brussels, G, beneficiary, 11/02/2022)

As the quotes above illustrate, newcomers sometimes use the reference to 'rules' as a way to mitigate the impact of their social worker's discretion upon their life. In this context, an important element of attention is the way in which the 'rule', which is the set of legal provisions governing access to social assistance in Belgium, is approached differently by social workers and beneficiaries. While for the former it is perceived as a constraint to access rights and must be challenged – through discretionary and even moral commitment – to guarantee social assistance (Chapter 8), for the latter it is, on the contrary, a tool that can be used to limit the discretionary power of social workers and to ensure, as a consequence, equity.

As Howe (1990, p. 163) argues, becoming assertive in front of social workers is the result of a learning process that also depends on the specific situation of the claimant. More specifically, our data shows that developing assertiveness depends on the type of capital (Bourdieu, 1986) that immigrants have at their disposal and that is usable in the Belgian context. Our material suggest that specifically cultural capital is important when it comes to exerting agency. Instances of assertiveness were generally encountered during interviews with newcomers who had a good knowledge of the language spoken in the PCSW. This did not only concern immigrants who were native speakers of one of the contact languages used in the PCSWs but also those who studied one of these languages during their studies or learned it in Belgium. Adopting an assertive attitude in front of social workers also generally requires a certain degree of understanding of the regulations and of the administrative processes. Some newcomers – because of their education and profession in the home country – were more comfortable with dealing with administration upon their arrival

in Belgium. Others also could develop their understanding of the PCSW's administrative processes from their own experience with the institution.

Besides cultural capital, newcomers also use their social capital, which represents the person's network of social connections and social obligation (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 47) to collect information that can be used when interacting with their social worker. The importance of having a social network in challenging social workers' decisions is illustrated in the following quote:

> When I made the request for a laptop [and got rejected], I didn't sit still and I used a lot of my contacts. I received a response from [name], she is not a PCSW assistant, but she helps students. She informed me that I am entitled to an 80/20 ratio which I can get through them. [...] After asking around a bit, I went back to my assistant. I said what I had heard and that I am entitled to a laptop where apparently the PCSW pays 80% and I pay 20%. Finally, she suddenly changed her answer and said that I am entitled to a laptop. (Flanders, C, beneficiary, 20/01/2022)

In fact, it appears that the social capital acquired by newcomers in Belgium is often a crucial tool to develop assertiveness as well as to develop forms of resistance (as we will see in the next section). To a certain extent, social capital can compensate the lack of cultural know-how (language skills, administrative knowledge, and so forth) that immigrants might experience when interacting with the PCSW (see Chapter 11).

2. COPING WITH STREET-LEVEL BUREAUCRACY: TYPOLOGY OF RESPONSES TO OVERCOME DIFFICULTIES

Until here, we analysed different attitudes that newcomers can adopt when interacting with PCSWs' social workers. As mentioned throughout this book, the relation with social workers is of critical importance for newcomers' access to social benefits. Newcomers are largely – but not exclusively – dependent on social workers regarding the access to information, the relevant formulation of their demands, and the transmission of their demands to the relevant authorities. Newcomers can also be dependent on social workers in receiving other types of non-financial support, such as help with paperwork. Therefore, when difficulties arise in the relation between social workers and newcomers, it can have an important impact on the access of the latter to much needed support. As we saw, despite being limited by the unbalanced power dynamics in favour of social workers, newcomers still have a form of agency in this relation. In

this section, we will analyse different types of responses that newcomers put in place when facing difficulties in their relation with social workers. Such responses depend on the type of attitudes that the beneficiary develops in relation with their social worker studied before (compliance, assertiveness).

2.1. Mobilising cultural and social capital: negotiate, protest, and bypass

A first response that we encountered during the fieldwork was to *try to resolve the difficulty directly with the social worker* through practices of negotiation or through practices of more frontal protest. In some cases, newcomers can adopt a compliant and collaborating attitude for the resolution of a problematic situation or to try to overcome difficulties with the social worker through negotiation, as the following quote illustrates:

> One time in a volunteering job, I got a lot of money that I didn't expect, it was 800 euros. […] And I kept it secret, I didn't tell them [PCSW] because it's a volunteering job and we have decided before: anytime that we're going to work as a volunteer, this money is for me. And all of a sudden, she [the social worker] told me: 'Give me your bank card, we need to check it'. […] She told me: 'You got this money, why didn't you tell me?' […] And she told me 'Sorry but we need to discuss this with the PCSW' and she said it in a gentle way, in a nice way, 'We're going to discuss this and we're going to have a decision. I try but you have to keep in mind, maybe we're going to take this money from you.' I said 'I don't refuse to pay it back. You have the right and you pay me every month. But is there any way to try to keep this money?' She told me 'Yes, there is a way. You can ask the person you worked with to give us a proof that you deserve this money so we cannot take it from you. Otherwise, we'll have to take it from you.' […]. Then I went to [volunteer coordinator] and they did really nice, like an email to PCSW and she called them and communicated with my assistant. She justified and they gave me the decision that I will not pay it back. […] (Flanders, C, beneficiary, 21/01/2022)

In the quote above, showing a compliant attitude by accepting a priori the principle of being penalised cannot be reduced to a sign of total submission to the logic of the institution, as it is also a way for the newcomer to open the possibility for a (positive) resolution of the problem. This echoes what Dubois (2010) describes as 'the strategic dimension of docility' in his study of the interactions at administration desks of French Family Benefit Offices (CAF). For the author an 'ostensible allegiance to institutional morals can

take a strategic dimension' (Dubois, 2010) in the sense that beneficiaries can use it – for example – to try to attract the indulgence of the institution's agents or to mitigate the effects of a possible sanction. The data collected during the interviews shows, however, that attitudes of compliance and collaboration are not always used as a strategy but also illustrates the fact that beneficiaries can also genuinely share – at least some – of the objectives of social workers such as the building of a relation of trust based on the respect of the rules. Attitudes of compliance and collaboration can also be favoured in a context where newcomers largely perceive the PCSW's support as a favour (see Chapters 9 and 10).

Trying to overcome a difficulty can also take another form with newcomers protesting against the social worker's decision.

> Most of [newcomer] families do not speak French well. But they are also afraid because they are foreigners […]. They are not like me when I say that the PCSW does wrong. […] The [social worker] said that this is wrong and that [my husband] benefited from the PCSW's rental deposit and that he has to give 950 euros. But this is not true. We have proofs. I brought my proofs to the PCSW and I talked to the [social worker] and I said: 'Is this normal to say such things?' She has to present some proofs [if the social worker argues] that she gave the PCSW's rental deposit to my husband. (Wallonia, I, beneficiary, 04/05/2021)

> We consider PCSW as our god […] even when [PCSW] is yelling at you, you don't dare yelling, [PCSW] can break you. In my community, we are afraid. You go to the PCSW to access your rights, not to get friends. You can't let people step over you. If you don't know, you ask. It is important not to be afraid. There are NGOs [non-governmental organisations], get close to them, they have time to listen to you and to inform you about your rights and your relation with the [social worker]. What is the link between you? The law between the PCSW and the person who receive. […] First, you need some self-confidence. (Brussels, G, beneficiary, 11/02/2022)

These quotes illustrate that protesting is not always easy for newcomers. It requires some resources and some competences, such as being able to speak a contact language, knowing how to express and/or file a complaint, or having sufficient confidence to go against a PCSW's decision. It also often involves specific practices, such as the collection of proofs mentioned in the first quote. Similar to what have been observed in other migration contexts (Lafleur & Mescoli, 2018, p. 492) the collection of evidence and, more generally, the

meticulous conservation of PCSW documents, letters, and emails was a relatively common practice among newcomers, especially for newcomers who had limited skills in French or Dutch.

> We have this thing, we make an archive. For example, I have papers from the commune, from PCSW … we have an archive. We are afraid of this thing because maybe one day the PCSW will ask me a paper which is … which goes back to 2015, and this happened already and you don't find this paper online or you ask for the paper and they tell you 'No, it's your responsibility to find, it's your responsibility to keep these papers.' Now, I have boxes and … it's for all refugees. We are afraid of losing the papers. (Brussels, B, beneficiary, 23/09/2021)

This illustrates the ambivalent dimension of the use of 'proofs' within the PCSW. One the one hand – when required by social workers, proofs are an instrument of control that also transfer part of the responsibility of the access (or lack of it) to social benefit on the shoulders of beneficiaries. On the other end, the conservation and collection of proofs can be used by beneficiaries to negotiate with social workers.

A second response to the difficulties experienced in the relation with social workers is to try to *bypass* such relation. Bypass refers here to taking contact with another actor (institutional or not) to try to get over the discretionary power of social workers. One way to bypass the blockage with social workers is 'vertical', which refers to social workers' hierarchy. It is important to note that, as described in detail in Chapter 7, the regulation allows the possibility to contest a PCSW's decision through a procedure of appeal. Chapter 8 also shows how social workers themselves sometimes advise newcomers to make such appeals. However, the formal appeal procedure primarily concerns the PCSW's decisions and is therefore less effective for other types of difficulties such as conflicts with social workers. An appeal can be formulated against an unjustified refusal – which can then cover a complaint against the social worker's work of completing the file with the right demands – but not against a conflict with the social worker. From our interviews, it seems that only a few respondents have asked the transfer of their file to another social worker. In one instance, a respondent who encountered difficulties in their relation with their social worker obtained such a transfer. This transfer was possibly bringing other difficulties for the newcomer:

> So I asked to … and then somehow they change the assistant. Because they said that that assistant he had a lot of problems in files on him and they

> assigned another assistant for me and I was her first file to process you know. She knew nothing. She was always afraid. She was always anxious when I talked to her. She was almost crying. (Brussels, G, beneficiary, 14/12/2021)

More generally, the data we collected during the interviews with newcomers showed that newcomers rarely try to appeal to social workers' hierarchy. This can be explained by different factors, including the difficulty to identify and contact a relevant interlocutor linked to a lack of understandability of the institution, but also by the fact that the hierarchy can be perceived as relatively supportive of social workers.

Bypassing can also occur in a more 'horizontal' way, when newcomers seek and/or find support with other social workers or other workers of the PCSW. While formally asking for a new social worker can be problematic when difficulties arise, some circumstances such as a prolonged absence or a change of personnel can – temporarily or not – provide the newcomer with a new interlocutor. This change of interlocutor can help resolve some problems, as is illustrated in the quote below.

> Because, the application files for the family benefit, first, we were not informed about it. That's her [the SW] responsibility to inform us but she was always running away, telling that she did not know us. But we have been lucky because there were other assistants who were nice and who respect the law and do their job. So, during [the social worker's] absence for two or three months, some other assistants have transmitted our application that was still pending. And the children have had their benefits. (Wallonia, M, beneficiary, 27/08/2021)

Newcomers can also seek support and advice from other workers of the PCSW in the framework of activities organised by PCSWs in cities for newcomer beneficiaries, such as information sessions or weekly workshops. During these activities, newcomers can make contact with the PCSW's other workers and ask for advice or for support regarding their personal situation as illustrated in the fieldnotes below taken at the end of a weekly workshop organised by a PCSW that was aimed specifically at newcomers:

> At the end of the session, while most of the participants left, S. comes to see O. and A. [the PCSW's worker in charge of the workshop] and starts to talk to them discreetly. She explains that she will move soon to another apartment which is at the sixth floor of a building and that she is looking for a lift to rent. She says that a company made her an offer at 175 euros for half a day of use.

> 'Is it ok?' S. asks
> 'Well, it is the price' confirms A. who explains that this is the price that she herself had to pay when she moved.
> S. then talks to O. and asks her if it would be possible to have some support from the PCSW to cover the cost of the lift.
> O. [who is not in charge of S.'s file] answers that she will check if S. can have some support for renting the lift. (Wallonia, A, beneficiary and social worker, 08/02/2022)

This example illustrates what Dubois (2010, p. 15) calls 'the ambivalence of the relationship with the institution'. The relationship with the institution Dubois argues, 'Is a factor in producing both a "social bond" and coercion in the sense that it contributes to helping people with difficulties face their situation and keeping them in their "place".' We can then add to Dubois' observation that institutions such as PCSWs can also provide opportunities to build relations of solidarity either between beneficiaries and the staff or between beneficiaries themselves as it can occur during the type of activities mentioned above. Such relations of solidarity can then be used by newcomers to find allies who can help accessing services.

Bypass strategies can also be developed with actors outside of the PCSW. Indeed, the newcomers we interviewed were often in contact with workers of other organisations involved in the integration of immigrants. One type of practices that was encountered in the field was the fact to ask for the support of such workers who often have a good knowledge of the welfare system and who have the capacity to understand the administrative work of the PCSW's social worker. The support provided by this type of actors can be limited to information or advice, but some newcomers ask for more direct support in the relation with the PCSW.

> E.: […] some [social workers] were causing trouble and … I don't know. So yes, we saw the difference from one social worker to the other.
> Researcher: Did you try to make an appeal when there was an appeal?
> E.: No, we did not even know that we could do an appeal but we just complained to our acquaintances and to a woman who worked … who we knew from the reception centre. We complained and she came with us […] and after that, the problem was solved. (Wallonia, B, beneficiary, 09/02/2021)

> No, I did not have many discussions with her [the PCSW's social worker]. We did not get along. At the beginning I wasn't understanding everything.

> I was with [an NGO]. Once I started to adapt and to take my business into my own hand, I started to want to go [to the PCSW] alone, to do this, but I never got in touch with her [the PCSW]. So I went regularly to [the NGO] to say that it was not working, that I was not able to contact her [the PCSW's social worker], that I need help, she is not here, etc. [...]. They had the contact of this assistant. First she did not answer but then, they wrote an email and she answered. (Brussels, E, beneficiary, 11/03/2021)

In the first quote, the newcomer found support from one of the workers met previously in the reception centre. In the second quote, the support came from relations developed with a local NGO. This – and in particular the first example, illustrates that newcomers build different forms of capital during the migration process. Coping with the international protection system and the migration procedures can help to develop knowledges and competences (cultural capital) that can be used afterward. In the same perspective, by going through institutions and meeting professionals at different stages of the migration, newcomers develop social relations from which they can get support (social capital) when PCSW's social workers are not complying with their tasks. Regarding the specific question of the interaction with PCSW's social workers, while this social capital could help to unlock specific problematic situations, it was not necessarily followed by an immediate transfer of knowledge and competences to the newcomers themselves. In other words, the social capital of newcomers (their social networks in Belgium) was not always converted into more cultural capital (knowledge and competences usable within the PCSW). In this perspective, such social capital was also contributing to reproduce a form of dependence of the newcomers.

Finally, the data collected during the fieldwork show that many other actors can help newcomers in their difficult relations with social workers. Authors have described the importance of 'brokers' in immigrants' access to welfare (Ratzmann, 2019, p. 212 and sq.). Such actors have been described as 'intermediaries' or 'bridges' involved in the relation between beneficiaries and street-level bureaucrats. In this context, brokers 'play an important role in creating substantive access to benefits and services at the local level' (Ratzmann, 2019, p. 214). Among the actors mentioned during the fieldwork we find, for example, lawyers, friends, family members, volunteers from associations. or doctors and nurses.

Our research then shows that social capital is an important element not only to ensure the access to welfare in the considered case studies as analysed in Chapter 7 and Chapter 8, but also to cope with the power dynamics that characterise the relation between PCSW social workers and newcomers.

More specifically, it suggests that this social capital is largely dependent from the insertion of immigrant beneficiaries into what has been conceptualised as 'arrival infrastructures' (Meeus *et al.*, 2019) which allows immigrant to access resources and forms of capital that can be used to mitigate the power unbalance with social workers.

2.2. Coping with difficulties: endure and avoid

When newcomers face difficulties in their interaction with social workers, they can also adopt responses that are more passive than the responses listed above. One possible response is to simply *endure* the difficulty and wait for the situation to resolve itself without trying to actively protest or resist the social worker's decisions:

> I heard that there were others who did file a complaint against her [social worker], and that the person was transferred to another place because of those complaints. But I never filed a complaint against her, I didn't want to touch her personally. (Flanders, C, beneficiary, 24/01/2022)

Enduring a difficult situation can also be seen as a temporary strategy to be held until the material situation of the newcomer changes:

> I keep them out you know. And I spent the rest of time surviving, it was better than that. Then meanwhile I was staying with my ex-girlfriend, I found another apartment with the same landlord [...] So I called him like 'Hi Frederika, I am looking for an apartment. I know that you have a small one in [another municipality] and I want to get the f* out of [municipality where he was at the time].' Because I wanted to have access to PCSW [of the other municipality] and I knew that PCSW usually support you to find a job, you know. And I at that time started studying [...] I thought that I have a very good reason to stay, to stay depending on the welfare till I realise my [master's studies] project. (Brussels, G, beneficiary, 14/12/2021)

In some cases, this type of response can be linked to the fear of facing more problems in the case of a complaint. Such fear can be informed by previous negative experiences of others (friends, family) with resisting a social worker's decisions. One respondent, for example, refrained from filing a complaint about not receiving various benefits after a friend did the same with a negative outcome:

> I did not file a complaint because I was scared to do that. They would not have accepted my complaint. My friend had the same problem in [other municipality] and they didn't accept what he said. They opened a case for him and told him he had to leave the municipality. My friend did not receive money for one year, that's why he filed the complaint. (Flanders, C, beneficiary, 10/05/2022).

As mentioned previously, having social and/or cultural capital can be of paramount importance in determining whether to protest or not against a social worker's decisions. The lack of these types of capital may lead then to a passive response, as becomes apparent in the following quote by the same respondent as in the previous quote:

> When I didn't agree with a decision, I told the social worker, but she said, 'This is the rule, we cannot do anything.' I didn't know where else to go, so I didn't do anything. (Flanders, C, beneficiary, 10/05/2022)

Enduring difficulties in the relation with the PCSW does not necessarily mean staying passive in all aspects of socio-economic integration. Indeed, as we saw earlier in this book, benefiting from the PCSW is largely perceived as something temporary, and finding a job is perceived as a priority for newcomers. In this context, some newcomers can be encouraged to try to accelerate their integration in the job market (even at lower conditions than expected) in order to be able to leave the PCSW as soon as possible, rather than to try to solve the difficulties they encounter with the institution.

> When I asked my question [...] she [the social worker] answered very aggressively, very fast, she wasn't happy to be here, so it was very difficult to talk with her [...]. She was one reason I told myself: 'Ok, keep in mind that you have to leave this thing [the PCSW] as soon as possible.' First I was quite relaxed, I said I have time to learn French, do everything ... but then I had the feeling that I really needed to leave the PCSW as soon as possible, find a job fast, anything. (Brussels, E, beneficiary, 27/09/2021)

Finally, another response that we encountered during the fieldwork was for the newcomer to *avoid* the interactions with social workers. Indeed, some newcomers experienced high anxiety and stress due to the negative interactions experienced with social workers. In some cases, this anxiety translated in the newcomer's apprehension regarding the meetings with their social worker, as is illustrated in the following quote:

> The problem is that I work part-time now and my daughter goes to school. Certain things for school I have to request through the PCSW. It happened to a friend of mine, so I'm afraid that I will be sent to the PCSW by the school for certain requests. […] If needed, I will ask then for another assistant. (Flanders, C, beneficiary, 24/01/2022)

In a certain number of cases encountered in the field, the relation with social workers was characterised by the experience of various forms of violence. Very often this violence was symbolic in the sense that it was exerted through the discussion with the social worker and it contributed to reinforcing the social worker in their position of domination. These situations were very difficult to live for newcomers who were in a precarious socio-economic situation and produced experiences of psychological troubles, sometimes requiring medical attention. In this context, some of the people we interviewed described how they would later avoid getting in touch with their assistant in order to avoid a negative experience.

> Researcher: 'So you said that you were avoiding to see [the social worker] again.'
> E.: 'Yes, the frustration that we experienced.'
> Researcher: 'But how do you do when you have a question or when you need assistance?'
> E.: 'Sometimes, I had some psychological troubles and I contacted a psychologist and he told me that if I had more difficulties … because at this time, I was receiving a lot of bills and I was not daring to go [to the PCSW] because I knew that [the social worker] would tell no […].' (Wallonia, M, beneficiary, 27/08/2021)

The quotes illustrate how avoidance can also be a way of coping with the psychological costs – in this case the stress created by the anticipation of the interaction with the social worker – of the administrative process (Moynihan *et al.*, 2015). Avoiding the interactions with social workers can take different forms, either strict limitation of the interactions to what is necessary to ensure the access to benefits but also – as illustrated in the quote above – refraining to ask for support. Avoidance can have a high cost for newcomer beneficiaries as it can contribute to cut them from some forms of social support that they would otherwise be entitled to. This response against the difficulty encountered with social workers was concerning only a minority of respondents among our sample. Moreover, it is not always possible to avoid all interaction when, for example, beneficiaries are called by their social worker for an appointment.

Most of the time, avoidance was limited to the fact for the beneficiary to refrain from asking for support.

To conclude, in this section we saw that newcomers develop a diversity of responses to cope with social workers' discretion. Negotiation and protest are certainly part of the repertoire that newcomers can use, even if it often requires forms of cultural capital (contact language skills, administrative knowledge, and so forth) that is not always available to newcomers. Other strategies, however, can be developed on the basis of the social capital that newcomers have built since their arrival in Belgium. Indeed, the contacts they created with local actors as well as their enrolment (voluntary or mandatory) in different institutions provide resources that can be used to try to bypass – or at least mitigate – the discretional power of social workers. Finally, experiences of frustration and violence when interacting with social workers can also lead some newcomers towards responses including the avoidance of the contact with the institution. This last response leads us to the question of non-take-up that we will address in the next section.

3. NON-TAKE-UP

In the final section of this chapter we will discuss the issue of non-take-up of benefits and its different forms. The notion of non-take-up designates 'the phenomenon that people or households do not receive the (full amount of) benefit to which they are legally entitled' (van Oorschot, 1991, p. 16). Non-take-up of benefits can take many forms. The researchers from the Observatoire des non recours aux droits et services (The Observatory of Non-take-up of Rights and Services), identified different types of non-take-up (Warin, 2016, p. 4):

- **Non-take-up by non-knowledge**: when the beneficiary does not have knowledge of the existence of the benefit.
- **Non-take-up by non-proposition**: when the benefit is not activated by the agent despite the beneficiary being legally entitled to receive it.
- **Non-take-up by non-reception**: when the beneficiary knows the benefit, asks for it but does not receive it.
- **Non-take-up by non-demand**: when the beneficiary does have knowledge of the existence of the benefit but does not ask for it.

Despite the fact that the phenomenon of non-take-up started to gain political and academic attention in the 1990s in Europe and that research was subsequently developed on this subject (see, for example, van Oorschot 1991,

1996; van Oorschot & Math, 1996; Warin, 2012, 2016, 2018; Noël, 2016), to our knowledge, no studies have focused specifically on the non-take-up of immigrant beneficiaries. In a report about the non-take-up of the Income of Active Solidarity (RSA) in France (the French equivalent of the Belgian Integration Income), Warin (2011, p. 8) explains that the rate of non-take-up of the RSA is proportionally more important among non-EU-foreigners than among French citizens. In Belgium, a report on the trajectory of care of drug users of foreign origin (Derluyn *et al.,* 2008) suggests that this population has a lower rate of take-up of certain types of care services (such as residential care services) when compared with the drug users of Belgian origin. In the following paragraphs we will analyse non-take-up practices of newcomers in Belgium as it emerged from our fieldwork.

It is important to keep in mind that for this research we selected respondents that were or have been benefiting of the PCSW services. This necessarily produces a bias in what regards an analysis of non-take-up in the sense that our research does not take into account newcomers who have not – for any reason – accessed PCSWs' services despite being entitled to do so. As described in Chapter 4, for newcomers with a precarious residence permit, benefiting from social aid can mean being at risk of losing their residence permit.[3] However, as demonstrated below, the fieldwork still provided insights about some non-take-up practices. The analysis is structured following Warin's framework presented above (Warin, 2016).

3.1. Non-take-up by non-knowledge

As described in Chapter 9, information is a central element for an effective access to PCSW social benefits, while many newcomers do not have clear and exhaustive knowledge of the different services offered by PCSWs. For newcomers, one element that limited the capacity to access the PCSW's services was the lack of language skills upon their arrival in Belgium. The consequence is that some of the people we met during the interviews discovered some of the services well after their arrival, realising that they were not using a benefit that they were entitled to for many months. This situation is illustrated by the following discussion with a young man who discovered several months after his arrival and settlement in Belgium the possibility of asking for an installation benefit:

> I ask BF. how he learned about the existence of [the installation benefit]. He explains that he learned about it by his brother. He asked for help first to his brother and then to the PCSW. His social worker did not tell him about this benefit.

> I ask him what he thinks about that. He says that this is not normal. He explains that during the first meeting with the social worker, he received several leaflets with information but he could not read them because of his lack of language skills. Maybe the information about the installation benefit was on these leaflets he says. (Wallonia, L, beneficiary, 07/06/2021).

Because social workers are central in the access of newcomers to information, non-take-up by non-knowledge can also be analysed as forms of *non-take-up by non-proposition* where social workers fail to propose to the beneficiary a benefit to which they would potentially be entitled:

> [answer to what the beneficiary would change about the PCSW]
> Be honest about what people are entitled to. It is painful when they don't get what they're entitled to or have to ask for it themselves, because often they're entitled to the things they ask for. It is important to get clear information. (Flanders, D, beneficiary, 06/03/2022)

The quotes above concern non-take-up of a PCSW service but some of the newcomers we met were also not aware of the existence of the PCSW when they arrived in Belgium and thus did not take up social support when they were entitled to. For the newcomers that we met during the fieldwork, this specific case of non-take-up (because of the lack of information about the existence of the PCSW) also depended on the type of arrival in Belgium. Newcomers who applied for international protection and who went to a centre for asylum seekers were generally already in contact with a social worker in the centre. In this context, their direction to the PCSW once their status was recognised was relatively straightforward and immediate. In comparison, we encountered newcomers who followed different pathways of arrival with less direct access to the PCSW. This was the case for one of our respondents who has not been in a centre despite his application for international protection, but was living with one of his brothers since his arrival. In his case, he searched for a job for several months before finally contacting (upon his brother's advice) a PCSW once the resources of his brother became too scarce to provide for him. We also encountered the case of women who arrived in Belgium through family reunification and who had to suddenly leave their partner – sometimes after being victims of domestic abuse – or whose partner passed away. Without a proper knowledge of the Belgian welfare system, some of the women we met in this situation had to rely on family members of friends for several months – without any forms of income – before learning about the PCSW. In both cases, several months of potential resources have been missed because of the lack of knowledge about the relevant institutions. As we

have seen earlier in this book, non-take-up by non-knowledge can be favoured by the fact that PCSW rarely engage in active external communication towards the potential beneficiaries, and in particular newcomers.

3.2. Non-take-up by non-reception

Our fieldwork provided examples of non-reception due to human error from social workers when accomplishing the tasks of which he/she is responsible for. Among such errors, social workers can forget to process a request or to file a request with an external entity:

> I asked my assistant for rent subsidy and she said 'Ok, I will do that for you, you can come here to the secretariat and sign and that's all.' But now that's been six months of waiting and I sent an email to the rent subsidy and they replied 'You have no file with us, we don't have your name.' And I emailed my new assistant and she said 'You can reapply, I will send again.' But I have been waiting for six months. (Flanders, C, beneficiary, 07/01/2022)

> I have been on the waiting list for social housing for three years. After three years my brother-in-law came to Belgium, and I requested social housing for him as well and also asked the assistant where my name was on the list, but I was not on the list. The assistant forgot to send my application. (Flanders, D, beneficiary, 06/03/2022)

Finally, newcomers also experience forms of 'temporary' non-reception due either to the temporality of the administrative process (such as delays in requests) or to sanctions. This temporary non-take-up, also described as 'frictional' non-take-up (van Oorschot & Math, 1996, p. 7), can constitute challenging conditions for newcomers who – for most of the people we met – had very few if any financial resources when arriving in Belgium. In this context, the weeks between the first meeting with social workers and the attribution of the integration income were often described as very difficult because of the incapacity to meet very basic material needs (such as food) and the necessity to rely on food offered by local NGOs when it was not provided by the PCSW itself.

3.3. Non-take-up by non-demand

The cases of non-take-up described above are mainly caused by elements that are outside of the newcomers' control. However, the data collected during the interviews show that some instances of non-take-up can have a more voluntary

and strategic dimension. Sometimes non-take-up by non-demand is caused by the avoidance of contact with social workers or the PCSW, for example after a bad experience with social workers or the institution, as explained above.

> I always tried to have, to have minimum contact with the PCSW. Super minimum. But I didn't even ask for any benefits like Basic-Fit or food or transportation … Yeah, transportation I did but I am really, I was really minimising any contact with PCSW because it gave me a lot of stress. (Brussels, G, beneficiary, 14/12/2021)

In the quote above, the psychological costs related to the administrative burden (Moynihan *et al.*, 2015) of the beneficiary also plays a role in the instance of non-take-up. In other cases, non-take-up by non-demand occurs when newcomers know about a benefit but choose not to demand it without experiencing specific difficulties with the PCSW. Newcomers can refrain to demand support from the PCSW because of the fear to lose their residence permit, as mentioned already. For example, one of the newcomers met during the research explained that he could ask for PCSW's support but that he did not because, when he arrived, a desk agent of the city explained to him that – as a beneficiary of family reunification – this could prevent him from renewing his residence permit in the future.

It is important to note that, because of the criteria of selection of our sample, the instances of non-take-up we met rarely concerned the integration income but rather some other – more peripheral – services from the PCSWs. For example, several newcomers mentioned their choice not to ask for the rental deposit that the PCSW can provide as a support to the housing costs:

> Researcher: So did you also asked the PCSW for the rental deposit?
> F: Yes, but then, they explained to us that this rental deposit, they will take it from our income, from the money they give us and in our case we had some little savings with us. We decided that this [the PCSW's rental deposit] was not necessary, that we would pay our rental guaranty and they could just give us our money. Because if we signed this contract, we wouldn't be able to leave the house fast enough. (Wallonia, C, beneficiary, 10/05/2021)

In the quote above, the non-take-up can be interpreted as a form of strategic choice as it is a way for the newcomer to stay able to change house more rapidly. In other cases, however, newcomers described their refusal to ask for a benefit as a moral choice.

> She [the social worker] came more than one time to check the house, to check if everything was ok. I said I didn't need anything and everything was fine. I had everything I needed, I'm not going to ask for more. Some people do, but not me. For me, that's not important. (Flanders, C, beneficiary, 18/01/2022).

> A.: 'Yes, but sometimes it's special, you can take the ticket and give it to the PCSW for a refund.'
> Researcher: 'And you did this?'
> A.: 'Sometimes, yes. But I am a shy person and I can't always go and say, "Hey hello, I want to be reimbursed".' [...]
> Researcher: 'Can you explain this to me? Why?'
> A.: [...] 'I am not used to somebody giving me money. It's difficult for me. [...] When I need something, I ask to my family. That's the first time that somebody was giving me money. I did not want to accept it but I have no choice.' (Wallonia, O, beneficiary 05/06/2021)

The two quotes above translate the feeling of discomfort that many of our interlocutors described in relation to the situation of asking for public support. This feeling was also linked with an 'ethic of individual responsibility' (van Oorschot & Math, 1996, p. 9) that was shared by the large majority of the newcomers we met and that – as illustrated above – sometimes led to practices of non-take-up (although often limited to specific services). These practices, which contradict the suspicions of 'welfare shopping' and 'opportunistic behaviour' that are sometimes associated with migrants, also illustrate the political dimension of non-take-up (Warin 2010). Indeed, as Warin (2010, p. 11) notes, 'Non-take-up is not exclusively the result of forms of passivity and inaction. It also expresses forms of disinterests and disagreement. In this perspective, non-take-up by non-demand goes beyond the question of the effectiveness of the PCSW's services (its capacity to deliver its services), but interrogates its very pertinence.'

CONCLUSION

This chapter addressed the capacity of newcomers to develop forms of agency in their relationship with social workers. This capacity for agency needs first to be contextualised within the structural asymmetry of the relationship where it is social workers who have the power to intervene over the beneficiary situation. In the same perspective, the agency of newcomers is limited by

the fact that – beyond the difficulties that newly arrived immigrants have to face in terms of accessibility – PCSW's services are designed as last resort safety nets and that newcomers do not usually have alternative options to cover basic needs.

It was observed in this chapter that newcomer beneficiaries can adopt different attitudes when interacting with social workers. The attitude that was the most common among our interlocutors was a compliance with the administrative procedures and the demands of social workers. We show, however, that compliance can be performed in different ways by newcomers. Newcomers can develop 'active' forms of collaboration with social workers by trying to anticipate or exceed the social workers' expectations. Newcomers' beneficiaries can also engage in more 'passive' or 'minimal' forms of collaboration with social workers, by choosing to limit such collaboration to the fulfilment of minimal administrative duties and to develop strategies of integration outside of the control of social workers. In both cases, our chapter shows that the collaboration with social workers cannot be interpreted as a purely passive attitude and already involves forms of agency. Some newcomer beneficiaries can also stop – often temporarily – to comply with social workers' terms and adopt a more assertive attitude in their relationship with social workers. This assertiveness is possible when newcomers cease to consider social benefit as a favour and start to consider it as a right based on rules. To social workers' discretion, newcomer beneficiaries can then oppose what they perceive as 'the rule'. For newcomers in Belgium, it was observed that the possibility to perform such assertiveness is highly dependent on the skills and resources they have at their disposal. The language skills but also the capacity to understand regulations and law are indeed central, which suggest the importance of locally usable cultural capital in the capacity of newcomers to influence the relation with social workers.

Beyond these different attitudes the research also found different types of responses that newcomers can have when a difficulty arises in the relationship with social workers. These responses include instances of negotiation, protest, or bypass but also more passive responses such as enduring or avoiding the relation with social workers. This chapter illustrates how such responses are informed by the types of capital (social and cultural) that newcomers can mobilise locally. Cultural capital appears to be central for negotiating and protesting social workers' decisions/requirements. The research also highlights how social capital is also a crucial element enabling newcomers to act upon their relationship with social workers. Such social capital can be constituted outside of the PCSW (among friends, or NGOs, for example) but also within the PCSW and its different services. This last point suggests

a dual experience of the PCSW as a place of control and constraints and as a place where resources can be found.

Finally, it has been found that – despite the common representations of immigrants as welfare profiteers – the relation of newcomers with PCSW was also characterised by situations where the former did not access benefits or services they were entitled to. Some of these instances of non-take-up were informed by a lack of information or by the failure of the institution to provide some services (due to administrative errors, delays, and so forth). In some cases, however, newcomers also expressed their lack of access to certain services as the result of their own conscious choice of not demanding such services. In some cases, non-demanding can be informed by structural constraints or by the fear of negative impact on the newcomers' situation but, in other cases, newcomers can renounce to certain services on the basis of moral considerations. In these cases, non-take-up expresses forms of disinterests and disagreement, which also illustrates how newcomers can interrogate the very pertinence of PCSW's services.

NOTES

1. It is important to note here that if these different forms of collaboration are distinguished here for the sake of the analysis, they do not always appear as distinct in the field. Indeed, newcomers can resort to different forms of collaboration on different matters and thus alternate between then.
2. We recall that in the social benefits application procedure, beneficiaries are allowed to present their case to the committee, mainly if they do not agree with the decision taken.
3. As mentioned in Chapter 4, this concerns, for example, foreigners who have a recent residence status for family reunification, as stated in the immigration law of 15 December 1980. Newcomers can generally be informed about this risk by the Immigration Office, PCSW's social workers, or agents from the commune of residence.

REFERENCES

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. E. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory of research for the sociology of education* (pp. 46–58). Green Word Press.

Demazière, D. (1996). Des réponses langagières à l'exclusion: Les interactions entre chômeurs de longue durée et agents de l'ANPE. *Mots, 46*, 6–29.

Derluyn, I., Vanderplasschen, W., Alexandre, S., Stofels, I., Decorte, T., Franssen, A., Kaminski, D., Cartuyvels, Y., & Broekaert, E. (2008). *Trajectoires de soins des usages de drogues d'origine étrangère*. Academia Press. https://dial.uclouvain.be/pr/boreal/fr/object/boreal%3A153603

Dubois, V. (2010). *The bureaucrat and the poor: Encounters in French welfare offices*. Routledge.

Howe, L. E. A. (1990). *Being unemployed in Northern Ireland: An ethnographic study*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511735318

Kelvin, P., & Jarrett, J. (1985). *Unemployment: Its social psychological effects*. Cambridge University Press.

Lafleur, J.-M., & Mescoli, E. (2018). Creating undocumented EU migrants through welfare: A conceptualization of undeserving and precarious citizenship. *Sociology, 52*(3), 480–496. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038518764615

Lipsky, M. (2010). *Street-level bureaucracy, 30th anniversary edition: Dilemmas of the individual in public service*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Meeus, B., Van Heur, B., & Arnaut. K. (2019). Migration and the infrastructural politics of urban arrival. In B. Meeus, B. Van Heur, & K. Arnaut (Eds.), *Arrival infrastructures: Migration and urban social mobilities* (pp. 1–32). Palgrave MacMillan.

Moynihan, D., Herd, P., & Harvey, H. (2015). Administrative burden: Learning, psychological, and compliance costs in citizen-state interactions. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 25*(1), 43–69. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muu009

Noël, L. (2016). *Rapport thématique: Aperçus du non-recours aux droits sociaux et de la sous-protection sociale en Région bruxelloise*. Observatoire de la Santé et du Social de Bruxelles-Capitale.

Ratzmann, N. (2019). *Caught between the local and the (trans)national EU citizens at the front-line of German welfare policy* [Phd, London School of Economics and Political Science]. http://etheses.lse.ac.uk/3982/

van Oorschot, W. (1991). Non-take-up of social security benefits in Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy, 1*(1), 15–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/095892879100100103

van Oorschot, W. (1996). Les causes du non-recours [Des responsabilités largement partagées]. *Revue des politiques sociales et familiales, 43*(1), 33–49. https://doi.org/10.3406/caf.1996.1728

van Oorschot, W., & Math, A. (1996). La question du non-recours aux prestations sociales. *Revue des politiques sociales et familiales, 43*(1), 5–17. https://doi.org/10.3406/caf.1996.1725

Warin, P. (2010). *Qu'est-ce que le non-recours ?* La Vie des Idées.

Warin, P. (2011). *Le nom recours au RSA: des éléments de comparaison* (Working Paper 13). Observatoire des non-recours aux droits et services.

Warin, P. (2012). Le non-recours aux droits. *SociologieS*, novembre. https://doi.org/10.4000/sociologies.4103

Warin, P. (2016). *Le non-recours: définition et typologies. Actualisé en décembre 2016* (Working Paper 1). Observatoire des non-recours aux droits et services.

Warin, P. (2018). *What non-demand demands: On the non-take-up of social welfare*. Books & Ideas. https://booksandideas.net/What-Non-Demand-Demands.html.

Wright, S. E. (2003). *Confronting unemployment in a street-level bureaucracy: Jobcentre staff and client perspectives*. University of Stirling. http://dspace.stir.ac.uk/handle/1893/259