



Co-funded by
the European Union



KING

Knowledge for INtegration Governance

Social networks, social capital and migrant integration at local level - European literature review -

Marta Kindler

with research support from Vesselina Ratcheva

KING Project – Applied Social Studies Unit
Desk Research Paper n. 14/July 2014



KING - Knowledge for INtegration Governance

The KING project is co-funded by the European Commission, Directorate-General Home Affairs, under the Action HOME/2012-2013/EIFX/CA/CFP/4000004268. Start date: 15 September 2013; end date: 15 March 2015.

The KING project’s objective is to elaborate a report on the **state of play** of migrant integration in Europe through an interdisciplinary approach and to provide decision- and policy-makers with **evidence-based recommendations** on the design of migrant integration-related policies and on the way they should be articulated between different policy-making levels of governance.

Migrant integration is a truly multi-faceted process. The contribution of the insights offered by different disciplines is thus essential in order better to grasp the various aspects of the presence of migrants in European societies. This is why **multidisciplinarity** is at the core of the KING research project, whose Advisory Board comprises experts of seven different disciplines:

EU Policy – Yves Pascouau

Political Science - Alberto Martinelli

Public Administration – Walter Kindermann

Social Science – Rinus Penninx

Applied Social Studies – Jenny Phillimore

Economics – Martin Kahanec & Alessandra Venturini

Demography – Gian Carlo Blangiardo

The project consists in the conduct of preliminary **Desk Research** to be followed by an empirical in-depth analysis of specific key topics identified within the desk research. To carry out these two tasks, each Advisory Board member chose and coordinated a team of two to five researchers, who have been assigned a range of topics to cover.

The present paper belongs to the series of contributions produced by the researchers of the “Applied Social Studies” team directed by Professor Jenny Phillimore:

EU Policy	ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER	DESK RESEARCH PAPERS
Political Science	JENNY PHILLIMORE Overview Paper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Migration and integration: a local and experiential perspective” by Gary Craig • “Social Networks, social capital and migrant integration at local level – European literature review” by Marta Kindler • “ Integration practice – initiatives and innovations by institutions and civil society” by Rachel Humphris
Public Administration		
Social Science		
Applied Social Studies		
Economics		
Demography		

The project is coordinated by the **ISMU Foundation**, based in Milan (Italy).

Contacts:

Guia Gilardoni, Project Coordinator – g.gilardoni@ismu.org

Daniela Carrillo, Project Co-Coordinator – d.carrillo@ismu.org

Marina D’Odorico, Project Co-Coordinator – m.dodorico@ismu.org

Website: www.king.ismu.org

Twitter: @KING_Project_EU

ISMU Foundation - Initiatives and Studies on Multiethnicity

www.ismu.org

Via Copernico 1

20125 Milano

Italy

© 2014 Fondazione ISMU - Iniziative e Studi sulla Multiethnicità. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form, or by any means, without the permission, in writing, from Fondazione ISMU – Iniziative e Studi sulla Multiethnicità. Licenced to the European Union under conditions.

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the European Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Social networks, social capital and migrant integration at local level - European literature review -

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper examines the state of knowledge concerning the relationships between social networks, social capital and migrant integration at local level. Using a wide range of literature from the past decade it focuses upon the ways in which social networks and social capital have been found to promote or hinder integration of third country nationals (migrants and refugees) into their local neighbourhood and communities across the European Union. Acknowledging the controversies around the concept of integration, as well as the confusion around defining anything social (for example, social ties) as social capital, the paper presents in brief the main concepts and approaches of the reviewed studies. The paper continues with a synopsis of the different types of social capital, including a discussion of the role of ethnic networks in social and economic integration. It follows with the discussion of the influence of inter-ethnic contact in mixed-neighbourhoods on building social capital, including consideration of the impact of the quality and character of neighbourhoods. Finally, it addresses policy and legislative contexts and how they affect development of social capital, among others in the form of the formation of migrant associations, and thus, integration at the local level.

In the context of this paper migrants and refugees are defined as third country nationals, born outside their country of residence. A number of important texts have been intentionally omitted in the attempt to keep the focus of this review to *local* level studies undertaken within the past decade.

2. CONCEPTS, MAIN DEBATES AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

This section reviews in brief some of the concepts and research methods used by authors on social capital's and social networks' impact on migrant integration at the local level. It also outlines the main debates of the reviewed literature.

2.1. Social capital, social networks, integration

The two key components that run through most of the writings on social capital are captured in the definitions of social capital by Pierre Bourdieu and by Robert Putnam. Bourdieu (1986, p.249) defined the concept as "*the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition*". Putnam's (2007) definition of social capital extends this to include "*social networks and the associated norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness*". However, Anthias and Cederberg (2009), underline that social capital is

not co-terminous with resources, such as ethnic ties and networks. The key is being able to use these resources for social advancement. That is why also Kitching and others (2009), when defining ethnic Diasporas as a form of social capital, define social capital not only as “resources”, but also as “opportunities available to agents occupying particular positions” (p.694). Thus, evaluating the quality and variety of social ties and networks is crucial in assessing the usefulness of social capital¹. Dahinden (2011) utilising network theory, refers to network social capital as one possible form of social capital and asset in a network – underlining the importance of resources (variety and quality of contacts) present in networks. The more differentiated social relations, the better the quality of social capital. Thus, those networks that are characterized by a high variety of diverse ties, both “strong and weak ties”, and by a wide-range of ties with qualitatively different connections to diverse others (in terms of gender, ethnicity, class, or more general, in terms of status) but also in terms of roles (kin, friends, etc.) are said to represent better network social capital. According to Dahinden embeddedness in social relations produces network boundaries (i.e. structures of membership) along the so-called homophily principle – the preference to interact with similar others (McPherson et al. 2001). Homophily implies that distance in terms of social characteristics translates into network distance and vice versa, limiting people’s worlds and thus having a tremendous impact on the information they receive, the attitudes they form, and on their everyday interactions.

Most of the studies also use the distinction of social capital developed by Putnam: bonding capital, referring to capital connecting an individual to his/her narrow group - and bridging capital, connecting an individual to broader society. As Nannestad and colleagues (2008) write: “bridging social capital can be identified as network cooperation that transcends group cleavages, while bonding social capital is exclusive and group specific in nature. Both types involve trust, but whereas bridging social capital is based on general trust, i.e. trust in strangers, bonding capital is based on concrete trust, i.e. trust in people you already know” (p.610). Most of the studies do not refer directly to the third type of capital - linking capital – that is ties to institutional structures, although the theme is addressed with research on the role of governmental policy and practice impacting the development of social capital and integration at the local level.

One of the main debates in the literature continues to be to what extent social capital leads through inclusion or exclusion to advantage or disadvantage. Thus, whether bonding social capital – strengthening community groups, both migrant and non-migrant—acts as a barrier to the bridging capital (seen as necessary for integration) or rather is conducive to building bridges with people outside of the group and thus of a cohesive society (for previous reviews of literature see Castles et al. 2003, Spencer 2006). A number of studies, following Putnam’s US based findings that high levels of diversity undermine social capital and lead to “hunkering down” and a withdrawal from “collective life”, attempt to examine if and how ethnic diversity is negatively related to social capital in a European context. Some studies provide only partial evidence supporting Putnam’s findings, while others claim that there is no evidence at the local level in Europe and that it is disadvantage rather than diversity that results in low levels of social capital. A critical approach to this debate is given by Amin Ash (2005) who claims that the question to be asked is not whether there is something wrong with a community that produces bonding social capital rather than bridging, but the focus should be on “how community takes on different meanings in different conditions of economic and social well-being and in different institutional settings”.

Interestingly, none of the authors explicitly discuss the conversion of social capital into other forms of capital, although this role is often presented in the findings. Another major topic that appears in literature is the role of ethnic networks in migrants’ economic activity, their impact on economic and social integration at the local level. In general, the main argument is that the social capital migrants’ mobilize from their networks is believed to help them find better jobs – thus social capital is converted into

¹ Although the concept social network is used in practically all of the reviewed studies none of the authors provide a definition of this term. However, authors do refer to theory on interethnic contact and to network theory (with some basing their studies on it, such as Dahinden 2011).

economic capital (Drever and Hoffmeister, 2008; Engbersen et al., 2006; Van Meeteren et al., 2009). However, finding a job in an ethnic niche may not be conducive to successful economic integration as it may restrict individuals' access to opportunities and confine them to low paid employment thus undermining prospects for social mobility.

In many of the reviewed studies a very general notion of integration is given, referring to societal integration, in most cases following a Durkheimian notion of cohesion. Others focus on individual integration, analysing the level of labour market participation, educational attainment and, occasionally observance of dominant values. A few studies integrate both the group or community and individual level of integration (see Tillie, 2004; Laurence 2011). No studies were located that referred explicitly to "local integration" or integration "at local level", although several studies focus on the level of region, city and neighbourhood, and refer to "community cohesion" (see Amin, 2005; Laurence & Heath, 2008). Few authors give precise definitions of particular types of integration (see for example Tillie 2004 or Pilati 2012 for political integration) or critically approach existing definitions and attempt to redefine integration (for example, the notion of "everyday integration" by Cherti & McNeil, 2012). Ager and Strang (2008) developed a conceptual framework² of what is perceived as 'successful' integration, which includes processes of social connection – social bonds, bridges and links - and barriers to such connections in the community. However, social capital is presented by these authors in the context of interrelated integration domains, thus rightly avoiding the assumption that integration and social cohesion can be achieved through social connection alone. According to Ager and Strang (2008) processes of social connection (various forms of social ties, networks and social capital) provide what they refer to as "connective tissue" (p.177), which apart from facilitators (such as cultural capital in the form of knowledge of language), relate to, on the one hand citizenship principles and legal rights, and on the other outcomes of integration in employment, housing, education, health and other sectors.

Context plays a role – with social resources being useful in some situations but not others. Crul & Schneider (2010) propose a comparative integration context theory arguing that participation in social organizations and belonging to local communities across European cities is strongly dependent on integration context. Differences in integration contexts include institutional arrangements in education, the labour market, housing, religion and legislation. Differences in the social and political context are especially important for social and cultural participation and migrant belonging. The importance of analysing the contingent conditions that impact the types of outcomes in different contexts is also underlined by Sturgis et al. (2013), who acknowledge the exceptional character of London's migrant and ethnic 'make-up', and claim that the effect of ethnic diversity on community life should not be studied in a universal way.

2.2. Methods

This section briefly discusses the research methods and operationalization of concepts used in the reviewed studies.

The majority of studies overviewed in this paper are qualitative, based on in-depth interviews and on qualitative surveys (see for example, Jones et al. 2012, Wessendorf 2013, Anthias & Cederberg 2009). Several studies take a quantitative approach to the study of social capital, although it is difficult to quantify social capital - especially its norm-setting and norm-enforcing component. Among these are: the study based on data drawn from the Metropolitan Police Public Attitude Survey (METPAS) (Sturgis et al. 2013), The "Living in Germany" (SOEP) survey (Drever & Hoffmeister 2008), as well as a study based on data from the Belgian Census of 1991 (Fleischman et al. 2011) and UK 2001 census (Laurence, 2013). Crul and

² This conceptual framework defines core domains of integration: 1) markers and means (employment, housing, education, health), 2) social connection, 3) facilitators (language and cultural knowledge; safety and stability) and 4) foundation (citizenship and rights).

Schneider (2010) suggest that longitudinal quantitative measures are particularly relevant for considering the impact of integration policy due to the fact that policy is a process of different measures. Some authors have used a combination of both quantitative and qualitative research methods (for example, Dahinden 2011, Santelli 2012).

A number of studies are based on neighbourhood specific attitudinal indicators of social capital, such as trust in neighbours or neighbourhood (for example, Ivarsflaten & Stromsnes 2013). However, this method has been criticized among others by Laurence (2013), who argues trust may increase or decrease in response to factors unrelated to social connectedness. He claims that the “size” of, and “frequency of interaction” within individuals’ social networks (meaning actual contact) are more valid indicators of social capital. For example, Letki (2008), similarly as Lancee & Dronkers (2011) and Gijsberts, van der Meer & Dagevos (2012), makes a distinction between cognitive and behavioural components of social capital, operationalizing the former as trust and the latter as social contact, giving informal help to others and voluntary work. Studies also analyse the opportunities for inter-ethnic contact in ethnically diverse neighbourhoods. Such studies are criticized by Sturgis et al. (2013) stating that opportunity for contact does not have to result in actual meaningful social contact between ethnic groups. Another problem these authors point to when looking at various studies of inter-ethnic contact in neighbourhoods is the “use of measures of area ethnic composition that do not distinguish between the diversity of a neighbourhood and the spatial distribution of ethnic groups within it” (art.cit., p.16). As a result, studies that “appear to show a negative effect of diversity may, in some instances, actually be picking up the effect of minority group segregation with which diversity is correlated” (art.cit., p.16). These authors also criticize the drawing of population average estimates on associations between neighbourhood diversity and trust, while these are strongly related to the age cohort to which an individual belongs. When analysing the role of diversity in neighbourhoods several studies have shown that it is important to include and control for neighbourhood characteristics (Letki, 2008; Laurence and Heath, 2008, Laurence 2011).

Only a few studies follow all of the integration markers identified by Ager and Strang (2008), including issues of housing and health, and this research focused on the integration of refugees. According to Danzer and Ulku (2011), who studied Turkish households in Berlin integration should be explained by studying incentive structures or networks. They mention three key factors of integration: time exposure, geographic exposure and social exposure (i.e. established contacts to host country institutions). They assume that integration becomes attractive for a migrant if it promises economic success (opens up labour market chances or prospects for the migrant’s children). Where labour market discrimination prevails, the payoffs from integration are expected to be small. According to these authors a migrant will integrate into the receiving society only if (i) the costs of integration are smaller than the expected gains, and if (ii) the gains from integrating minus the foregone gains from remaining in the ethnic network are positive.

3. THE ROLE OF SOCIAL NETWORKS IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND MOBILISATION OF THE DIFFERENT TYPES OF SOCIAL CAPITAL

A number of texts point to the importance of social networks in the formation and mobilisation of social capital. Social networks may become at different stages of migrant settlement a source of different types of social capital, ranging from bonding to bridging. However, they also may also impact negatively on inclusion.

3.1. Quality and types of social networks

A critical finding by Blockland and van Eijk (2010) refers to the limited role of social networks in contributing to a community's social capital and integration. These authors studied the use of neighbourhoods and the social networks of people they refer to as '*diversity-seekers*' in a mixed neighbourhood in the Netherlands. According to their study "*social inequalities in access to resources that result from the excluding and including mechanisms of social networks are not being overcome through the diversification of neighbourhoods, not even for those who move there because they enjoy the thought of a diverse community*" (p.328-329). They found that openness to diversity does not translate into more diverse networks – the networks of "diversity-seekers" continue to be divided by class, ethnicity and education.

The results of another study, by Górný and Toruńczyk-Ruiz (2011), carried out in three areas in Warsaw on the level of neighbourhood embeddedness between migrants and natives, complement this finding – their results show that social networks are more important to migrants than to natives. Migrants tended to have larger networks of important persons (strong ties), with neighbours playing an important role, and less weak ties. Types of networks may also be related to the length of residence of migrants and the size of the migrant group, with social capital playing a crucial role in the initial period of migration when the migrant group is still small. For example looking at Polish migrants in Brussels Grzymała-Kazłowska (2005) found the initial broad co-operation among co-ethnics changed over time and with size of the group into competition and reliance on family and close-kin.

The differing role of social networks is also linked to the question of legal status, education and establishment of the group. As Roggeveen and van Meeteren (2013) found in their study of the Brazilian community in Amsterdam, legal status (or lack of it) and education were the main barriers for social capital to be mobilized and to circulate via networks. Those Brazilians who were already established migrants in Amsterdam – with a stable legal status – did not have ties to irregular migrants. However, Engbersen, et al. (2006) analysing the role of networks among irregular migrants in an inner district of the Dutch city, the Hague, claim that social capital is "*the most important currency for irregular immigrants*" (pp.223). Thus, although they might not receive support from their ethnic-fellows belonging to a more established group, within the group of irregular migrants, social networks were a crucial source of information and an informal safety net. These findings echo those of Phillimore's (2010) study of undocumented migrants in Birmingham which found that social networks with co-ethnics, faith organisations and civil society organisations were critical for everyday survival. The division between established and newcomers was confirmed by Dahinden's (2011) study results, who researched the personal social networks of 250 inhabitants (migrants and non-migrants) of a small city in Switzerland. Dahinden findings point to the difference between established groups and newcomers, with established groups – primarily of transnational guest workers who have already experienced upward mobility (Italian, Spanish, Portuguese)-closing ranks, stigmatising the newcomers, keeping them at the bottom of the social hierarchy and thus reinforcing internal cohesion.

Dahinden analysed not only the networks of migrants, but of all inhabitants. She found high volumes of network social capital conditioned by nationality (country of origin), level of education, religion, type of mobility and level of earnings. Being born in Switzerland or in central or northern Europe, possessing high educational capital, being Protestant, being either immobile or highly mobile, and having a high salary were factors associated with high values for network variety and volume. On the other hand, the following characteristics point to low volumes of network social capital: people from Southern Europe or outside Europe, working migrants or those having arrived through asylum, Catholics (and to a lesser degree Muslims), persons having experienced a one-way migration and lived in the country of origin or in Switzerland, and those possessing a residence or an annual permit. The most important factors segregating

networks are—in this order—nationality, regional origin, education and residence status. A large portion of Swiss people turn exclusively to other Swiss in daily interactions. Europeans from the South as well as third-country nationals interact in over half of the cases within their national categories, better educated people rely on other persons with a good educational level; those seeking asylum and obtaining an annual permit – many of them Muslim – have modest social capital and keep to themselves. “Race” and “Islam” serve as symbolic boundaries to close the network borders. However, Dahinden’s (2011) study shows that ethnicity was relevant within a boundary perspective solely in combination with other categories—for instance, with education, establishment or residence permit. According to Dahinden (2011) highly educated mobiles were strongly embedded in transnational networks but not very well anchored in the city. She points to this enhanced mobility of the highly skilled as a challenge—theoretically but also on a policy level. Although these migrants were not integrated into the local context of Neuchâtel, it made no sense to speak of non-integration, given their high network, economic and cultural capital. Vathi (2013), who explores the integration of Albanian-origin teenagers in Tuscany and the relationship between their transnational orientations and their integration strategies, found that both the social and cultural institutions and the spatial ‘units’ to which these teenagers refer in their integration discourse go beyond their country of origin and their host country. They not only refer to a translocal dimension when referring to places of attachment, but their views and perceptions of integration contain a strong cosmopolitan orientation and result in cosmopolitan practice.

Santelli (2012) studied the labour market integration young adults of Maghrebi origin from the French Banlieues and created a typology of occupational integration, which later on was compared to the parents’ occupational status to track social mobility. She points to diversity of educational pathways, but underlines the current *“changes in the labour market, growing job insecurity and downclassing”*, which have a particular influence in the context of urban segregation. Worsening economic conditions aggravated the impact of segregation. She explores residential status, whether a respondent still lives in a banlieue neighbourhood or has moved out, to understand the modes of occupational integration. Unemployment in banlieue neighbourhoods was two to three times higher than in other areas. In her group of respondents, *“despite common characteristics at the outset (having lived with the same neighbours, attended the same schools, and lived in an identical residential environment), the survey revealed highly differentiated modes of entry into the labour market, as well as considerable variation in the types of social mobility”*. The typology summarises modes of entry into the labour market accessed through place of residence and educational qualification. She distinguished five ideal types —the excluded, the insecure moving towards emancipation, the invisible proletarians, the insecure graduates and the stable employed. From Santelli’s analysis, for three of her “types” social networks play a considerable role as a source of social capital. The second type (the insecure moving towards emancipation) was integrated into a denser network of social relations, especially family network, which they used as a resource (assistance, support, role models – particularly in the case of family business) to change their employment situation. The next type, *“the invisible proletarians”*, apart from a more structured social environment – family –also received support/assistance from teachers, advisors at educational institutions and social services. Santelli calls those interactions *“milestones towards entry into adulthood”*. They felt they belonged to society, which occurred thanks to reaching a stable position more quickly both through employment and sociability networks and activities such as sport. And finally, young adults belonging to the fifth type, experienced upward occupational mobility, thanks to family support, and broad extended sociability networks which facilitated integration into social groups outside the banlieue neighbourhood. However, although they lived outside the neighbourhood, they were convinced having lived in the banlieue environment provided them with essential life skills.

Gidley & Jayaweera (2010), focussing on migrants in London found migration networks based on organizational ties (schools, professional associations, agencies) served better to match skill levels and jobs, although they were open to competition and therefore less certain in conditioning migration outcomes. Key among these networks were those related to the experience of being an international student, which

facilitated movement and labour market integration of the highly skilled overseas students and peers from their home country.

Types of network and capital possessed and how they are utilised may differ substantially by gender. Looking at refugees in the West Midlands cities of Birmingham, Coventry and Wolverhampton Goodson & Phillimore (2008) find that women were more likely to develop networks around schools and home while men built networks around employment. Further gender differences were found when exploring the roles of networks for undocumented migrants in Birmingham. Men were more likely to connect with co-ethnic groups particularly to access informal employment while women depended on a smaller network of friends and civil society organisations. While both genders relied heavily on co-ethnics and civil society for food and shelter women's networks were much smaller than men's because they were subject to sexual exploitation when seeking supported from those whom they were not closely connected (Phillimore 2010). Indeed while men could use networks to access informal work which could help them pay their way, women were often asked for sexual favours in exchange for resources. Gender differences also surface in Cheung & Phillimore's (2013) analysis of the UK's Survey of New Refugees with men and women both connecting, and seeking help from, friends, family and faith organisations but accessing different kinds of resources from those networks. In particular there was a strong relationship between women's health and their access to networks.

3.2. Ethnic or diaspora-based networks as social capital

Danzer & Ulku (2011) analysed the joint impact of integration as well as local ethnic, familial and transnational networks on the economic success of immigrants of Turkish households in Berlin. According to their results local (ethnic and familial) networks were positively associated with economic success of "unintegrated" migrants while maintaining a transnational ethnic network was negatively correlated with economic integration. However, local ethnic and familial, or transnational networks have no impact on integration – with the exception of social integration. Having local ethnic networks even reduces economic integration. The authors argued that integration was a choice coming at a certain cost. Poorer migrants used ethnic networks to facilitate earning money (providing them with access to ethnic goods, labour market niches and informal insurance) rather than attempting to integrate (and gain access to the labour market in general). For them using local networks was the optimal economic strategy while wider integration was a positive determinant of economic success only for those migrants who were already wealthier.

Drever and Hoffmeister (2008) analysed the role of social capital in finding employment by migrants living in the 20 largest cities in Germany and discovered that nearly half of all migrant-origin job changers found their positions through *"networks and that the most vulnerable to unemployment – the young and the less educated – were especially likely to rely on them. Also, jobs found through networks were as likely to lead to improved working conditions as jobs acquired through more formal means"* (p.425). Social networks served as a functional equivalent to the formal degrees and training migrants had difficulty obtaining in Germany. Their results did not confirm the hypothesis that spatial concentration plays a role in the development of networks with migrant communities. The neighbourhoods in which persons relying on networks lived had only a slightly higher percentage of non-nationals than the others. They tested whether *"being a member of an ethnic network without Germans affected either the quality of working conditions or working condition improvements resulting from a job transition mediated by personal networks"* (p.442) and found that *"the less assimilated (as measured by whether a person of German nationality was listed among an immigrant-origin's three closest friends) were more likely to end up in jobs involving mundane tasks, otherwise the ethnic makeup of an immigrant's network affected neither the conditions of employment obtained nor the improvement in working conditions"* (p.442). These findings contradict Jones and other

authors (2012), who examined changes in ethnic minorities business in new migrant firms in the East Midlands region (UK) and claimed that only a radical change in resources made a difference in the functioning of migrants in the labour market. They concluded that *“the novelty and diversity of the new migrant self-employed themselves are far from reflected in the nature and performance of their firms (...). Irrespective of geographical origins or personal characteristics, migrant business owners must follow similar rules to those shaping their forerunners if they wish to survive in a system which does not allow for exotic exceptions”* (p.3173).

According to Kitching et al (2009) researching Chinese and Vietnamese businesses owners (first-generation migrants) in London commercial exploitation of ethnic diaspora-based networks, meant that *“under certain conditions, diaspora-based networks enable higher levels of business competitiveness. They facilitate access to resources and markets by minority-owned businesses, particularly for those supplying ethnic goods and services”*. Such networks could be exploited to access resources that were unavailable or more expensive to acquire from other sources and provided a market for goods and services. However, the exploitation of networks was dependent on the character of the diaspora/migrant community – its size, geographical and sectoral location. For that reason, with diaspora having restricted resources and markets, networks might actually constrain business competitiveness. Breaking out of ethnic market niches required business owners to exploit diaspora-based and non-diaspora networks, including the regulatory context and depended on owners’ capacities and motivations to do so plus finance, skills (including English language skills) and time.

Anthias and Cederberg (2009) found ethnic ties were a form of social capital used in self-employment. Employment of ethnic staff meant an assumption of trust and facility in communication. Level of education affected links to the ethnic community and use of ethnic ties as social capital. Those educated in the UK were distanced from their ethnic community (lack of direct identification) and instrumentally used ethnicity for the development of their business. Ethnic ties (with the assumption of generating trust and reciprocity) were also used as a buffer against the negative aspects of ethnic entrepreneurship.

For ethnic entrepreneurs their minority position and the low valuation of the networks with which they are involved may have given them poor access to dominant networks (Anthias and Cederberg 2009). The negative role of social networks was also visible in the study in their role for women migrants, who saw them as a form of social control by the ethnic community and thus were more selective in the reproduction and transmission of ethnicity. Holgate (2012) studying the work-related aspects of self-help networks and community organisations of Kurds in Hackney (London), points to the link between the level of exploitation at work and the tight character of social networks (mainly based on kin). Most Kurds are refugees for whom a sense of belonging was built around shared experiences of oppression. *“Thus issues of class or gender, and associated power relations, are often masked, ignored or marginalised as ‘bigger’ diasporic politics take precedence. A consequence of the conflictual class relations within the kinship network is that workers are reluctant to use community resources as a means of advice and support for work-related problems.”*

Whether one is first or second-generation has an impact on the attitude toward ethnic community and dominant ethnic group (Anthias & Cederberg 2009). They find that being second-generation was flagged as a source of distance from the *‘traditional’* and thereby *‘less modern’* way of life by the first generation. Here there is a distancing from both the main society and migrant ways of life and a sense of belonging to something that is neither one nor the other (!). Children were encouraged by their parents, and sought themselves, to break out of the ethnic niche in which their parents operated, whether through work or self-employment. Fanning et al. (2011) underline that the integration of immigrants must be considered with a focus on the inter-generational reproduction of social inequalities.

3.3. Discussion

The literature shows an ambiguous and to some extent contradictory role of the networks among migrants and native inhabitants in the development and proliferation of social capital in the various localities in the EU. The quality and scope of networks, which determine whether they become a source of social capital, differ not only between migrants and native inhabitants, but also there among the migrants. There is an important differentiation between the various national/ethnic migrant groups, but also within the same national/ethnic group (among others along the lines of legal status, education and gender).

On the one hand networks do play a significant role among migrants in the initial settlement process, helping to find a job or accommodation and giving support – especially buffering to some extent the negative effects of weak cultural and economic capital, as well as lack of a stable legal status. At this stage ethnic networks do constitute a source of bonding social capital. With time, these can lead to the development of ethnic places, such as shops, business and restaurants, where migrants and native inhabitants meet, and which then can become a source of bridging social capital. The extension of good quality of ethnic networks, based on strong ties and mutual trust (which thus constitute bonding capital), via weak ties to wider social networks, seems to allow to have the best of the two types of capital – in an optimal form of providing opportunities for chance encounters, leading to attachment to place and social integration.

However, on the other hand, establishment of the group (both for migrants and non-migrants) in the country of migration and increase in size of the community can cause networks to be exclusive than inclusive, limited to very small groups and divided along lines of residence status and education. Membership in such networks is characterised by distrust towards other groups, so they can become a negative form of bonding capital, through stigmatisation of others while increasing inner group cohesion. Such networks may also be characterised by distrust towards one's own national/ethnic group, thus are neither a source of bridging nor of bonding social capital. Ethnic networks, especially when it comes to economic participation of migrants, may become exploitative rather than a source of social and economic improvement. More established migrants disassociate themselves from newcomers with unstable legal and weak social statuses. Also younger generations may be unwilling to participate in the networks of older generations.

Those migrants, who are highly mobile and educated seem to use transnational networks as a source of bonding capital, thus are not tied to place and one can refer to a trans-local form of integration. Of crucial importance in future studies is the differentiation between what people (whether migrant or not) declare – in terms of having ties and trusting others – and what they actually practice (which may significantly differ from the declarations).

4. FROM DIVERSITY TO DEPRIVATION: WHAT IMPACTS SOCIAL COHESION AND NEIGHBOURHOOD ATTACHMENT?

Social capital, especially one of its key elements – social trust - is seen as the fundament of social cohesion. Meanwhile, according to the findings by Putnam – diversity undermines social capital by decreasing mutual contact and overall social trust in neighbourhoods. The literature addressing the impact of inter-ethnic contact and of the quality of neighbourhoods on social cohesion in mixed-neighbourhoods is primarily based on research carried out in the Netherlands and the UK. Only three studies from the reviewed literature attempt to compare a number of cities across Europe (see Górný & Toruńczyk-Ruiz 2013; Gijsberts, van der Meer & Dagevos, 2012; Lolle & Torpe, 2011). Scattered studies from neighbourhoods in

other European cities complement this picture (see for example, Dahinden, 2013 or Górný & Toruńczyk-Ruiz 2011). The findings from these and the comparative studies will be reviewed against the results from the main bulk of literature.

4.1. Diversity, compositional effect or beyond: mixed neighbourhood and social cohesion

Lancee and Dronkers (2011) analysed data on the four largest migrant ethnic minority groups (Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese and Antilleans) and a comparable native sample in at the level of neighbourhoods in the Netherlands. They found, after controlling for economic disadvantage, partial support for Putnam's thesis: in ethnically mixed neighbourhoods where mutual contacts declined among all residents. According to Gijberts et al. (2012), studying the relationship between ethnic diversity (in socio-graphically defined neighbourhoods) and four dimensions of social cohesion (trust, informal help, voluntary work, and neighbourhood contacts) for the 50 largest cities in the Netherlands, ethnic diversity (the presence of many ethnic minority groups) had a negative effect on the degree of mutual contacts in the neighbourhood. However, they did not find any impact of ethnic diversity for other dimensions of cohesion. This contrasts with the findings by Lancee and Dronkers (2011), who claim that while diversity can undermine, it can also build various aspects of trust. For example, economic diversity positively impacts on trust in the neighbourhood and inter-ethnic trust. They refer to the inter-group contact theory (see Pettigrew, 1998; Allport, 1954) exploring whether diversity in the neighbourhood fosters or discourages social trust and finds it depends on equal status between groups, common goals to be reached, inter-group cooperation, support of laws and customs and the potential for friendship. They see as an explanation the different values and norms that accompany ethnic and religious diversity. Again Laurence and Heath (2008) point to the character of ethnic diversity and found *"Once other factors are accounted for, ethnic diversity is, in most cases, positively associated with community cohesion"* (p.7). The positive effect of diversity partly results from increased proportions of inter-ethnic friendships. This emphasis on friendship contrasts with the approach by van Eijk (2012), who claim that neighbourly relations are not based on affective (involving emotions), but on affinitive ties. He underlines that *"neighbour interactions are often shaped by chance encounters and ideas about 'good neighbouring' rather than by affectivity or attempts to establish friendships. Many respondents did not seek connectedness with their neighbours and maintained neighbourly relations despite interpersonal differences or dissatisfaction with the neighbourhood"* (p.3022). Laurence and Heath (2008) point to the importance of the type of ethnic mix in an area: a positive predictor of cohesion is living in areas which have a great variety of residents from different ethnic groups, while a negative predictor is an increasing number of migrants born outside of the UK. Laurence (2011; 2013) on the one hand shows that increasing ethnic diversity in a community was related to inhabitants reporting lower levels of social capital, but at the same time inhabitants of such communities were also likely to have more positive interethnic contact and interethnic ties in their social networks. Those with 'bridging' ties experienced the effect of rising diversity less negatively than those without such ties. Thus, *"diversity erodes interconnectedness and the level of interaction between community members, as it is those who have no 'bridging' ties (who are therefore less likely to be connected in a diverse community) that experience the lowest level of social capital."* (Laurence 2011).

Laurence claims that policies, creating for example opportunities and incentives for volunteering, could play a crucial role in promoting both trust and tolerance. Most importantly, while diversity did play a role in weakening social capital, this translated also into weakening of in-group boundaries and the encouragement of a super-ordinate identity, which may be beneficial.

Meanwhile, according to Gijberts and others (2012) the fact that trust in others, doing voluntary work, and giving informal help are all lower in multi-ethnic neighbourhoods is due to the fact that more people live in these neighbourhoods who achieve low scores on those dimensions. This is thus a compositional effect, not

a diversity effect. There is less social cohesion in ethnically diverse neighbourhoods, but this is simply because more people live in these neighbourhoods who are in a disadvantaged position. A different finding comes from Boschman (2012) - ethnic composition of the neighbourhood studied had no effect on contact, so segregation at neighbourhood level did not necessarily hinder integration. Boschman refers to other authors (Boomkens, 2006; Van der Laan Bouma-Doff, 2007; Dagevos, 2009) and her results indicates that city inhabitants are not limited by the borders of their neighbourhood. This is particularly the case for those in the most mobile age-group 15-65 while children and elderly are more likely to remain within borders. Globalisation and communication technology have diminished the influence of the neighbourhood on contact between individuals. Thus, contrary to earlier research, Boschman does not expect the share of Dutch people within the neighbourhood to have a significant influence on interethnic contact. Her research, however, shows that *“interethnic contact, more than on ethnic concentration at the neighbourhood level, depends on concentration in a larger area”*, such as whole cities (pp.365). Similar findings are found in the UK in Clayton’s (2012) study of the city of Leicester, as well as in Petermann’s (2013) study of spatial contexts on inter-ethnic contact in Germany. These findings have significant impact on restructuring policies, attempting to enhance interethnic contact. As Bochman writes *“Although, preventing concentrations of, for example, low-income households and ethnic minorities at the neighbourhood level also remains important (for instance, to prevent stigmatising and accumulation of liveability problems). However, to enhance interethnic contact, policy-makers should pay more attention to the ethnic composition of larger areas, instead of smaller neighbourhoods”* (pp.366).

Sturgis et al. (2013), looking at the perceived level of social cohesion in neighbourhoods by residents in London showed that when area-level economic deprivation was controlled, diversity emerged as a positive predictor of social cohesion. Meanwhile, ethnic segregation in communities was associated with lower levels of expressed social cohesion. Sturgis and others point to the overlooked part of Putnam’s (2007) original thesis that *‘in the short run there is a trade-off between diversity and community, but that over time wise policies (public and private) can ameliorate that trade-off.’* Their findings, that ethnic diversity seems to be challenging for majority white cohorts who were raised with less contact with ethnic minority groups, confirm Putnam’s expectation. They claim that once adequate account is taken of the spatial distribution of migrant groups in neighbourhoods and the degree of social deprivation, ethnic diversity increases community cohesion and trust. This is to some extent confirmed in the study by Lolle & Torpe (2011) based on data from eight European capital cities (Paris, London, Vienna, Copenhagen, Oslo, Stockholm, Amsterdam/Rotterdam and Berlin). They claim that it is not generally the case in Europe that trust is less among the ethnic majority population living in ethnically mixed areas. Sturgis and other authors (2013) point to the moderating effect of age on the relation between diversity and social cohesion – *“the positive effect of diversity and the negative effect of segregation among the youngest adults both weaken over successive cohorts, until the direction of the association is reversed among the oldest residents of London’s neighbourhoods”*. This is explained: *“in older cohorts, areas of high ethnic in-group concentration act as a ‘safe haven’ on arrival and as a buffer against the worst forms of inter-group conflict that can arise during the early stages of settlement of new immigrant communities. But, for subsequent generations, the utility, significance and symbolism of such segregated areas changes as they become - through schooling, language, social networks and so on - more integrated in the host country.”*(p.17)

The study by Schaeffer (2013), analysing the roles of children and interethnic partners in explaining inter-ethnic neighbourhood acquaintances find people living in regions with larger shares of children had more inter-ethnic neighbourhood acquaintances. He underlines however the importance of context – *“the brokering role of inter-ethnic partners is evident particularly in interaction with interethnic encounters at local bars and restaurants, while that of children is evident particularly given their frequent inter-ethnic encounters in public parks and playgrounds”* (p.1219).

A number of authors came to the conclusion that diversity in the neighbourhood meant something different and has different impact for migrants and native inhabitants’ social capital. According to Lancee

and Dronkers (2011) for natives, ethnic diversity was positively associated with interethnic trust, whereas for migrants there was no effect. Religious diversity negatively affected the quality of contact of natives with neighbours and inter-ethnic trust, whereas for migrants this effect was positive. The same conclusion was reached in the comparative study of 18 urban areas in different European cities (Górny & Toruńczyk-Ruiz, 2013). Having interethnic relations ‘neutralised’ the eroding effect of ethnic diversity on neighbourhood attachment for natives, while the opposite was the case of migrants - having no inter-ethnic relations ‘neutralised’ the negative effect of ethnic diversity on neighbourhood attachment.

Laurence (2013) claims that *“diversity may undermine local social capital yet exert little effect on individuals’ total levels of social capital. Instead, individuals in diverse communities possess equally sized (and active) but less neighbourhood-centric networks. However, this appears dependent on individuals’ ability to maintain dispersed social networks: less mobile individuals (e.g. the elderly) report both lower local and lower total social capital in diverse communities”*. This is similar to the cross-European findings by Górny and Toruńczyk-Ruiz (2013) that although an increase in ethnic diversity in the residential area tends to decrease various indicators of neighbourhood cohesion—among them, the level of neighbourhood attachment, individual experience of inter-ethnic contact (regardless of where it took place!) moderates the relationship between neighbourhood diversity and neighbourhood attachment.

Analysing the impact of the presence of migrants in disadvantaged neighbourhoods on education, Fanning et al’s (2011) study emphasises the benefits of some forms of cultural capital over some forms of social capital when it comes to either the integration or social inclusion of both migrants and the receiving society. Comparing experiences of recent migrants and Irish citizens living in disadvantaged communities they found out that many migrant children possessed transferable cultural capital manifested in behaviour and attitudes towards education, with Irish children benefitting from examples set by immigrant children.

4.2. Neighbourhood structure and quality

As Letki (2008) showed low neighbourhood status is the key element in eroding social capital and social cohesion. The status of neighbourhood is characterised among others by its economic standing, measured by features such as the rate of employment, as well as the quality of housing, educational institutions and health care services in the area, and also the functioning of social networks. Meanwhile, deprived areas are characterised by *“higher crime rates, more unemployment, poorer health and economy, less social network, more widespread political powerlessness and greater insecurity”* (Lolle & Torpe, 2011, p.204; see also Laurence 2011).

Letki (2008) looking at the impact of racial context on various dimensions of social capital in British neighbourhoods, found when the association between racial diversity and economic deprivation was accounted for, there was no evidence of the eroding effect of racial diversity on interactions within local communities. Letki shows there was no deficiency of social capital networks in diverse communities, but a shortage of them in disadvantaged ones. The same was found by Laurence and Heath (2008), who systematically examined community cohesion at the individual and the community level in the UK and claim *“irrespective of the level of ethnic diversity in a community, disadvantage consistently undermines perceptions of cohesion”*. More importantly, deprived areas that are diverse have actually higher levels of cohesion than deprived, homogenous “White areas”. They recommend reducing individual level of disadvantage (a negative predictor of cohesion) by increasing income or improving the level of qualifications. Apart from disadvantage, crime and fear of crime strongly undermine cohesion (also undermining the positive effects of living in very diverse areas). In terms of inclusion and ability to use resources, the studied group showed that *“feeling able to influence local decisions is a strong positive predictor of community cohesion”* and *“feeling that an individual would be unfairly treated because of their*

race (especially by local housing authorities), coupled with a feeling of racial prejudice has a strong negative impact on cohesion” (p.8). Those individuals who engaged in volunteering had more positive views on cohesion. However the findings of van Eijk (2012), examining the relation between narratives of dissociation and practices of neighbouring of people living in two neighbourhoods in Rotterdam (a multi-ethnic deprived ‘problem’ neighbourhood – Hillesluis- and a mono-ethnic, affluent ‘problem-free’ neighbourhood -Blijdorp), are contradictory. According to his findings, narratives of dissociation are not reflected in practices of withdrawal – on the contrary – they can be accompanied with efforts to connect with fellow-residents, based on norms of good neighbouring.

Fleischmann et al. (2011) analyse the impact of neighbourhood stability and quality on educational attainment of second generation migrants - Moroccan, Turkish and Italian³. The assumption is (based on previous research results) that stable residential areas are more conducive to the development of local social support networks of co-ethnics and that the quality of the neighbourhood has an impact on the so-called positive ethnic density effects, meaning that co-ethnic neighbours gain access to valuable local resources via social connections, which in turn impact on individual outcomes such as school completion. Overall, the authors found that *“ethnic educational inequality in Belgium is systematically linked to the ethnic stratification of municipalities in terms of residential stability and quality”* (p.421). The authors compared the housing situation of migrants. Moroccan Belgians lived in poor quality social housing and displayed *‘ethnic ghetto characteristics’*, lacking valuable resources and effective support networks. These structural neighbourhood characteristics overlapped significantly with ethnic concentration. Neighbourhood structure may turn the presence of co-ethnic neighbours into an advantage or a disadvantage for the second generation, as is the case of Turkish and Italian Belgians. According to these results, above a certain threshold of neighbourhood stability, Turkish migrants through local co-ethnic networks effectively supported their children, improving secondary school completion. The *“social enclave”* model – focusing on co-ethnic social capital and a high level of cultural maintenance - might lead to economic upward mobility in the long run. However, ethnic capital may turn into a *“mobility trap”* for the children of first generation Turkish Belgians, when residential profile was not accompanied by labour market inclusion of the first generation, an increase in human capital and a decrease in cross-border marriage in the Turkish community. Italian Belgians living in less advantaged neighbourhoods used co-ethnic networks as a buffer against the effects of poor quality of neighbourhood conditions, however, for those living in more privileged areas co-ethnic concentration became a disadvantage. The negative effects of ethnic density are visible on the school completion rates of Italian second generation in more privileged neighbourhoods, where other in-group members may be regarded as competitors for scarce resources, as they are trying to gain access to native Belgian networks.

“Thus, the Italian, Moroccan and Turkish second generation have lower completion rates in less stable and more urbanized neighbourhoods and in those with higher shares of single households and lower rates of home ownership. The interactions reveal that ethnic penalties are contingent on neighbourhood structure, so that ethnic disadvantages are larger in more unstable and lower-quality municipalities.” (p. 409)

The importance of spaces of encounters and association in neighbourhoods is analysed in the research by Wessendorf (2013) who studied four groups of Hackney’s inhabitants, including Vietnamese people and Turkish speakers and found that social relations in this neighbourhood were characterized by a co-existence of separation and mixing. Vietnamese people and Turkish speakers did not mix, many did not speak much English, both groups had self-sufficient support networks, but at the same time they were not perceived by Hackney’s inhabitants as breaking the *“ethos of mixing”*. These separate worlds are accepted, as long as they participate in one way or another in associational spaces or in the public realm. Turkish speakers and Vietnamese people interact in mainstream society in the context of residential mixing and institutions (ex. nurseries, schools), as well in business and trade (restaurants, corner shops, nail parlours).

³ The Italian, Moroccan and Turkish migrants make up respectively 2.6%, 2.8% and 1.5% of the population (2001 Belgian census) with the Italians arriving after WWII and the Moroccan and Turkish migrants arriving after the 60s.

Such 'ethnic' places as restaurants or grocery shops formed 'bridges' between these groups and residents of other origins. These findings are similar to the research results by Van Eijk (2012), looking at practices of neighbourly relations in two neighbourhoods in Rotterdam. Being 'good neighbours' also meant working out a balance between proximity and privacy so 'keeping oneself to oneself' is important, too" (p. 3022). Ager and Strang (2008) find that local understandings of integration in two studied neighbourhoods in London were influenced by expectations of relationships between groups within the area – a continuum in terms of depth and quality, although most reached beyond the basic absence of conflict, toleration, to active "mixing" of people. However, Wessendorf's study shows that non-participation in local life, ranging from economic activities to participation in civil society or institutions such as schools, was encountered with limited understanding. Encounters in public and associational space do not necessarily enhance deeper intercultural understanding, but the absence of such encounters can enhance prejudice.

4.3. Discussion

As in the studies focusing on social networks, the evidence from research focusing on neighbourly relations in mixed-neighbourhoods gives us a rather complex picture. Studies show that although diversity leads to a decline in mutual contact and trust, under certain circumstances it actually lead to an increase of these aspects of social cohesion. Research also shows that diversity in the neighbourhood although it may affect negatively group social capital, might not affect negatively individual social capital. It seems that the assumption that social cohesion has to be based on in-depth relations is false – people will feel and regard others as integrated when they have the opportunities for encounters (not necessarily leading to relationships based on strong, intimate ties).

The evidence suggests that deprivation, rather than diversity should be the focus in terms of the level of social capital. Various authors point to the importance of the composition of the neighbourhoods – that there is less social cohesion in ethnically diverse neighbourhoods, but this is simply because more people live in these neighbourhoods who are in a disadvantaged position. Structural deprivation in neighbourhoods – as poor quality of housing, education and employment possibilities etc. - is the main reason behind the perception of areas as having little social cohesion. However, again, it is crucial to distinguish between the perceptions of neighbourhoods – their quality – and the actual contacts people have in them. Also important is the finding that focusing solely on the level of neighbourhood may be misleading, with people having networks and ties extending beyond their locality.

5. POLICY, ORGANISATIONS AND INTEGRATION: BRIDGING AND LINKING SOCIAL CAPITAL AND THE LEGAL/INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

The literature addresses the link between policy impact on generation of social capital and thus integration from a number of angles. We find discussions of national policies aimed at the at integration at the local level, but also particular local policies, which aim to improve integration in neighbourhoods or cities by fostering inter-ethnic contact. There are also debates on policies that, while not aimed at integration per se, do have an impact (positive or negative) on integration at the local level. When analysing the discussion in literature around organisations, which in general are recognised as an important feature for participation (not only political) and integration – we find a discussion on the impact of the policy and legislative environment on the creation and functioning of such organisations. Also, on the one hand the texts address mainstream institutions assisting migrants, often criticizing them for "crowding out" migrant associations, but also provide a critique of the functioning and development of migrant organisations. From the set of

three factors necessary to understand the functioning of migrant organisations identified by Schrover and Vermeulen (2005): 1) the migration process, 2) the opportunity structure in the country of migration, 3) the character of the migrant community, the studies primarily focus on the latter two.

5.1. Policies stimulating inter-ethnic contact and critique

Many integration policies actually follow Putnam's thesis on the reciprocally enriching relationship between participation in civic associations and good governance, as well as between mutual trust and economic dynamism. They are also increasingly sensitive to Putnam's distinction between bonding and bridging social capital. For example, according to the UK Commission on Integration and Cohesion (CIC 2007) report "*only bridging capital is about people from different groups getting on*" and is regarded as the key measure of cohesion. Their study results also show that cohesion is higher among those who have bridging social capital for almost every ethnic group. However, they "*have found that bonding capital can give people the confidence they need in order to bridge.*" They thus propose a new approach to integration and cohesion⁴. Research on interactions: the meaning and motivations between people from different backgrounds was also the main focus of a project prepared for the Commission of Racial Equality by SHM (2007), with a study carried out in two localities (Hackney and Wolverhampton)⁵. The policies saw the problems with integration confined to particular areas, neighbourhoods and thus argued that solutions should be local. In Germany, policy makers have endorsed direct measures to improve personal networks within low-income, predominantly migrant communities. These "Quartiersmanagement" neighbourhood management programs attempted to strengthen personal networks by initiating volunteering and social events. However, few migrant residents participated in these activities (Drever & Hoffmeister 2008).

Amin (2005) presents a critical analysis of New Labour policies in the UK directed at generating social capital in poor neighbourhoods. His main critique of the government when dealing with the most deprived areas is the reduction of the social to the local community and the focus on community cohesion as the panacea. He claims that social exclusion at the local level does not have solely local origins and thus cannot be challenged by local means only, but has to be part of a wider political economy of decentred power and redistributive justice. Another critique comes from Letki, who argues that the British government instead of attempting to stimulate interethnic contacts, should combat economic disadvantage, which in her opinion is the main reason behind lowering of social capital and social cohesion (see also critique by Cheung & Phillimore 2013). A critique comes also from Van Eijk (2012), who writes that "*it is not productive to advocate a policy focus on local relations and social cohesion as it fundamentally conflicts with social changes that have impacted on the formation and location of networks and relations (notably the*

⁴ This approach is based on four principles: 1) a sense of shared futures (an emphasis on articulating what binds communities together), 2) a new model of rights and responsibilities (makes clear both a sense of citizenship at national and local level, and the obligations that go along with membership of a community, both for individuals or groups), 3) an ethics of hospitality (mutual respect and civility that recognises that alongside the need to strengthen the social bonds within groups) and 4) equality (the need to deliver visible social justice, to prioritise transparency and fairness).

⁵ Some of the findings: 1) interaction is determined by social class, status, lifestyle and economic circumstances, as well as by ethnicity; 2) there were many different barriers to interaction between people from different ethnic backgrounds: physical segregation, lack of opportunities and arenas, differences of language, mistrust, and anxiety about saying something 'culturally inappropriate'; one of the most important barriers facing adults was the fact that family and friends already took up most of their social time; 3) participants thought that young people should be central to any attempt to promote greater interaction between people from different ethnic groups, as the young are still forming their social networks. Schools were felt to be of particular importance as places where children and parents can meet. 4) Particular emphasis was placed on ensuring that interactions do not seem forced or false, because people are unlikely to be motivated by a scheme that deliberately tries to promote inter-ethnic interaction. Interaction must grow out of the things that people have in common. For instance, a project to create a new space for an entire community might provide exactly the forum in which people can interact in new ways. 5) Policy-makers should direct their efforts at the specific needs that different communities might have, both to tackle the lack of interaction and to build on positive motivations to interact.

separation of neighbourhood and domains of work, leisure, etc.) and the nature of many neighbour relations (as shaped by the balancing of proximity and privacy)” (pp.3024).

5.2. The impact of policy contradictions and institutional incoherence on integration

According to Schrover’s and Vermeulen’s (2005) findings the nature of the relationships between the character of the migrant community, as well as the political opportunity structure and migrants’ organisational activity is bell-shaped: *“too much and too little competition (from governments and others) leads to reduced organisational activity. Too small and too large communities experience problems in maintaining organisations”* (p.823). Two main features of the legal and institutional environment characterising opportunity structures and migrant organisations appear in the literature: first, lack or limited power of those at the local level to handle integration, and second, scarce number of stable, professional migrant organisations. The first point includes such aspects as policy contradictions between the local and the national level, lack of governmental bodies responsible for such activities, and lack of funds for integration.

Contradictions between different levels of policy were encountered in the study of the role of multi-agency networks in supporting asylum seekers and refugees in Glasgow (Wren 2007). There was disjuncture in Scottish and UK policy goals, lack of communication between the government department (then NASS) responsible for the resettlement process and the agencies on the ground, and absence initially of host community preparation. Several goals of the new policy, among others placing asylum seekers in language clusters and in multi-ethnic communities, were not met. Wren points to the severe deprivation of particular areas in Glasgow, to where asylum seekers were resettled experienced very negative responses from local communities who had misplaced beliefs about preferential resource allocation. Thus, service providers were reluctant to see the establishment of services *“which may be perceived as offering preferential treatment in any form”*. The service-providers were funded to carry out integration work among recognised refugees. Meanwhile, the main users of the services were asylum-seekers, who awaited decisions on their status while housed in communities. Participants in this research stressed the need for greater autonomy over aspects of immigration and asylum policy to increase the coherence of the current framework. Another example of unclear distribution of powers regarding migrant integration policies was found in the study by Moralez and Ramiro (2011). According to their research results although in Spain *“regional governments are allowed to regulate immigration issues within the limits of their own powers (health care, education, social services, etc.) [...] these powers have not been extensively developed thus far, and regional governments and local governments mostly manage daily integration issues”*. In general, they conclude there is *“unclear distribution of powers over core immigrant integration policies, with multiple overlapping policies implemented by various levels of government.”* (2011:149). One of the main aspects hampering the effectiveness of the policy process is that social consultation and intermediation has no clear procedure. Migrant organisations’ level of social capital determined their access to local policy-making. Also Pilati (2012), looking at integration of migrants in Milan, criticised the lack of policy-base for the involvement of migrant organisations in local politics, both in terms of participation in consultations and the decision-making process. She points to the lack of a specific service or department dealing with migration (placing the responsibility on the Department of Health and Social Services).

According to Pilati (2012) in Milan very limited funds, only 2.9 per cent of the department’s resources, were used for migrant integration from 2006 to 2008. Similar findings regarding Milan and two other Italian cities are in the study by Caponio (2005). In their review of literature on civil society in the UK, McCabe, Phillimore and Mayblin (2010) point to other studies that underline the fact that refugee community organisations (RCOs) do not have the resources to contribute to long-term integration of refugees, having to compete with wider civil society for limited funding (see Phillimore & Goodson, 2010; Griffiths et al,

2005; Gamelidin-Ashami et al. 2002). According to Zetter and Pearl (2000), the most comprehensive review of the situation of refugee organisations in the UK to date, financial and legal constraints in place since the mid-1990s meant refugee community organisations (RCOs) provided poor quality service provision, “*very limited access to public resources, lack of co-ordination and networking, and limited professional capacity*”, placing them in a position of being sub-contractors and not equal partners to mainstream service providers. These authors criticize the centralised management of asylum-seeker housing needs, undermining the role of smaller, local organisations.

5.3. Social capital and organisations: between importance of participation and quality of functioning

Before presenting the critique of weakness of migrant organisations and linking it to the existing opportunity structure and the character of the migrant community, it should be noted that a number of studies also provide evidence that migrant organisations, both in terms of membership and services provided by them, play an important role in the settlement process and in integration. An important study by Tillie (2004) shows that political participation of migrants at the individual level is increased by being a member of an ethnic organization, cross-ethnic organisation or trade-union, as well as by having active friends (social activities in the social network of a person). Levels of political participation of ethnic groups can be explained by the social capital at ethnic group level. The higher the social capital at group level, the higher levels of political participation⁶. Similar findings come from Berger et al. (2004), who carried out research among ethnic communities in Berlin and found that those who were better educated and were members of cross-ethnic networks were better integrated politically. The important role of migrant organisations is also presented in the study of refugee community organisations (RCOs) providing pre-arrival assistance (Phillimore et al., 2009), initial reception in the form of translation, interpretation, and support; assistance with building of skills and the provision of cultural knowledge (Challenor et al., 2005; Phillimore et al., 2009); facilitating access to volunteering opportunities, as well as providing opportunities of social space and social contact (Hunt, 2008). However, in general according to most of the findings RCOs, but also other minority organisations, lack individual social capital and their access to broader governance networks are weak (Phillimore & Goodson 2010).

According to the study by Zetter et al. (2005), based on UK fieldwork in the West Midlands, Manchester and Liverpool and London, the UK Border Agency policy of asylum-seekers dispersal supported the emergence of strong refugee community organisations (RCOs) in London, but insecure and unstable RCOs in other cities. The authors claim that due to the hostile policy environment RCOs could not be regarded as “*formally constituted organizations of social capital which crucially mediate the process of integration*”. RCOs continue to resist institutionalisation. In addition, Zetter and other authors (2005) discuss the fact that although dispersal has stimulated the establishment of RCOs in new localities, they see this production of ‘social capital’ as a response to social exclusion and overall crisis (financial, institutional) and not the positive result of the state or civil society providing such incentives and opportunity structures for social integration. They claim that many of the asylum-seekers organised informally and “*there is little evidence of*

⁶ Members of an isolated organisation have a lesser amount of social capital than members of connected organisations, because the social capital of connected organisations is higher since these organisations also have access to the social capital of the organisations they have contact with. If one is not a member of an organisation, two situations are possible. A citizen can be a member of a social network in which people are socially active. These links provide the individual with the social capital of his or her friends. The analyses above demonstrate that these networks do have a positive effect on the political integration of immigrants. The second circumstance is an individual who is isolated or a member of an isolated group (people only having contact with each other). In this situation a much smaller (or no) effect on the political integration of the individual can be expected. Organisational membership as such is only a partial indicator of individual social capital. At least two additional indicators should be taken into account: the social network of the (ethnic) citizen, and the social capital of the organisation as reflected in the connectedness of the organization or the density of the organisational network of the (ethnic) community.

either linking or bridging social capital as a convincing explanation of the current forms of associational organization amongst asylum-seekers". Phillimore & Goodson (2010) find that there are major institutional barriers to engagement, as RCOs lacked mechanisms that would enable representation and effective communication.

Pilati (2012) studied the role of ethnic networks in creating political contact and opportunities important for participation of migrant organisations, based on data from survey carried out among 46 immigrant organisations in Milan including people of Filipino, Egyptian and Ecuadorian origins. She considered how social networks between ethnic organisations were conceived as enabling or developing 'civic-ness' and how Catholic representatives have become intermediaries in Filipino women's access to the labour market. According to these findings the new multi-ethnic landscape was hardly recognised in Milan as institutions considered the role of Italian organisations in the field of migration to be more legitimate. The author concluded that *"ethnic networks seem to be primarily relevant in political contexts, such as the Dutch one, where the social organisation around ethnicity is well promoted by multicultural policies"* (p.683). Caponio (2005) analysed the role played by migrants' associations in local policy networks in Italy, focusing on how the different political opportunity structures in Milan, Bologna and Naples were created and how they affected the development and functioning of migrant organisations. She finds migrant associations had weak organisational structures and played a peripheral role in the local decision-making process. In general, local governments favoured Italian organisations providing services to migrant, both in terms of funding and running for public contracts. Thus, national welfare associations – especially experienced lay and Catholic associations - crowd-out migrants' own initiatives. Some of the opportunities for migrant organisations provided by left-wing administrations were of contradictory nature. Caponio shows that due to the diversity of migrants (in terms of nationalities, culture) no migrant organisation was truly representative. Meanwhile, initiatives aimed at encompassing this complexity (either by simplifying or channelling) proved contradictory. Since the second half of the 1990s migrant organisations in all three cities have withdrawn into the community sphere – having been first oriented towards their homeland in terms of activism and later on to activism in Italy – in terms of housing and access to social and political rights. As Caponio writes *"deceived by the limited access to public participation, immigrants' associations have attempted to focus on the community once more, through initiatives such as mutual self-help or national celebrations"* (p.947). This return to an "inward-oriented" approach was heavily influenced by particular opportunity structures created by local institutions. On the one hand, responsive to the demands of migrant associations, but on the other hand providing inadequate institutional resources. Caponio argues *"the inexperience and structural weakness of immigrants' associations explains the distrust of public institutions, and in turn this distrust has the effect of keeping immigrants' associations even more inexperienced and structurally weak"* (p.948). Caponio saw potential for the fostering of migrant associations' autonomy through empowerment policies, although these are often expensive and risky. At this stage she sees mediated participation as the only practical way for immigrant groups to gain some kind of access to the Italian national and local policy-making process.

Morales and Ramiro (2011) analysed the ways that political capital might be gained through social capital, using data from a survey of migrant networks in Madrid and Barcelona. The authors considered the types of connections which led the largest degree of impact on policy, bearing in mind that a lot of migrants' associations are established for different purposes. They concluded that social capital of the migrant organisations determined their access to local policymaking. This is particular to places where the policy process *"is characterised by a lack of clear procedures, structures and practices of social consultation and intermediation"* (p.149). *"Both the indicator that taps into "bonding" social capital (contacts with other migrants' organizations) and that which relates to "bridging" social capital (contacts with autochthonous organizations) significantly increase the chances that a migrant association will be invited to have a say in policy making, as expected. Indeed, also as hypothesized at the beginning of this article, "bridging" contacts are slightly more consequential than "bonding"* (p. 160).

Some migrant associations are internally divided (Phillimore et al. 2009; Griffiths et al., 2005). Hooghe (2005) studying numerous ethnic organisations in Flanders (Belgium), claims they were fragmented along ethnic lines and often divided politically and religiously. In addition, the electoral impact of ethnic minorities remained limited for demographic reasons. The political opportunity structure in Flanders lacked time-specific elements, making the entry of newcomers into the system very much time-dependent. In addition, instead of regarding themselves as potentially important players in the opposition, the representatives of these associations sought to be allies with the ruling elite.

5.4. Discussion

Several main findings can be presented regarding the policy and institutional settings' role in enhancing social capital and thus integration. According to the evidence, policy-makers favour fostering bridging social capital through direct policy intervention at local level. Meanwhile research point to the importance of taking a broader approach (not only local) and of providing opportunities for encounter rather than stimulating directly inter-ethnic contact. There are contradictions in integration policy at different levels of government, with local government often lacking the necessary powers to provide proper integration assistance. At the same time lack of trust of local governments in migrant self-help organisations combined with lack the organisational strength and knowledge about how to compete with mainstream organisations results in a scarce number of trustworthy organisations and limits the possibilities of accessing funds and/or organisational development. Migrants' communities are also on the one hand very diverse and on the other also very divided, so it might be the case that organising around particular causes rather than nationalities/ethnicities may be more effective. Meanwhile, organisational membership (whether ethnic or not) increases participation of migrants at the individual level.

Discussing the findings in this section it is worth pointing to the recommendations made by researchers. Kitching and others (2009) recommends to policy-makers working with *"London's minority businesses should encourage owners to view diaspora-based networks as potential assets for business development purposes, enabling access to resources and/or the identification and exploitation of new markets."* They claim that diaspora-based networks are not a substitute to engaging with mainstream networks, but should be seen as complementary. The character and scope of network contacts and other resources should be identified by business advisers and use made of these resources at different stages of business development. They propose policy-makers consider providing financial support to proposals of exploitation of transnational diaspora-based networks for minority business development. Overall, they claim that *"Identifying diaspora networks and encouraging and enabling business owners to utilise them can contribute to the achievement of economic competitiveness and social inclusion policy objectives."* According to Drever and Hoffmeister (2008) policies seeking to improve migrants' labour market integration should take into account the importance of social networks, as ways of linking migrants to the job market, but also as means of occupational mobility. They play a crucial role in the case of individuals without (or with unrecognised in Germany) formal degrees or formal training. They suggest the need to fund football clubs and cultural clubs, which indirectly improve the labour market integration of migrants. Engbersen et al (2006) recommends policy-measures that would de-criminalise irregular migrants. For example, the expansion of labour migration programmes (both temporary and permanent) would enable some irregular labourers to work legally, and might help to counteract the development, of informal labour markets. They also propose the selective legalization of irregular migrants, as well as systems of earned regularization, and realistic return programmes that stimulate people to go back voluntarily.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Analysing the factors that support the development of different kinds of social network and capital and examining which types, or combinations of types, are most useful in integration terms, the evidence from the literature points to seven main points.

First, the formation, use and meaning of social capital not only differs between migrants and natives, but also within migrant groups – with legal status and education being important dividing factors.

Second, bonding social capital, among others in the form of ethnic networks, can be conducive to integration at the local level, however, it has to be accompanied by a particular context – or opportunity structure. Bonding social capital leads to the establishment of spaces of encounter, which are essential for the formation of bridging social capital.

Third, social capital – its formation and development – is age and generation dependent and people's social networks that are sources of social capital extend beyond the locality, creating even trans-local places of reference and attachment.

Fourth, for those who primarily have access to local social networks and spaces, what impacts social capital is not so much diversity, but the quality of neighbourhoods.

Fifth, policies instead of directly attempting to foster inter-ethnic contact, should provide such opportunities by creating places of potential meeting between different groups.

Sixth, the overview of the literature from the last decade studying the role of social networks and social capital in the integration of migrants at the local level has demonstrated the importance of taking a broader spatial perspective than neighbourhood or locality. Not only in terms of actual research, showing the importance of broader context – also institutional -, but also in terms of policy design and implementation.

Seventh, membership in any form of organisation (ethnic or not-ethnic) increases political participation and integration.

The literature provided little evidence about the impact of the character of migration on the development of social capital and integration at the local level, focusing primarily on already settled migrants, distinguishing solely between “established” groups and “newcomers”, but not looking at for example the temporary character of most labour migrants. A critical discussion of the notion of locality seems to be missing, with only one text providing an alternative way of thinking, of the locality not being given, but rather being constantly reproduced, also via social capital. The same can be said about the notion of community – which is somehow assumed to be given. Missing also was the link between the redefinition of social identity/ethnic identity in the new context (with some evidence given by Anthias & Cederberg 2009).

REFERENCES

- Ager A. & A. Strang 2008, "Understanding integration: A conceptual framework". *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21 (2), pp. 166-191.
- Amin A. 2005, "Local community on trial". *Economy and Society*, 34 (4), pp. 612-633.
- Anthias F. & M. Cederberg 2009, "Using ethnic bonds in self-employment and the issue of social capital". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35 (6), pp. 901-917.
- Berger M., Ch. Galonska & R. Koopmans 2004, 'Political integration by a detour? ethnic communities and social capital of migrants in Berlin'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30 (3), pp.491-507.
- Blokland T. & G. Van Eijk 2009, "Do people who like diversity practice diversity in neighbourhood life? Neighbourhood use and the social networks of 'diversity-seekers' in a mixed neighbourhood in the Netherlands". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36 (2), pp. 313-332.
- Boschman S. 2012, "Residential Segregation and Interethnic Contact in the Netherlands", *Urban Studies* 49(2),pp. 353–367.
- Bourdieu P. 1986, "The Forms of Capital" in Richardson, JG (ed) *Handbook of Theory & Research for the Sociology of Education*. Greenwood Press, pp.248
- Caponio T. 2005, "Policy Networks and Immigrants' Associations in Italy: The Cases of Milan, Bologna and Naples". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31(5), pp. 931-950.
- Castles S., M. Korac, E. Vasta & S. Vertovec 2003, *Integration : Mapping the field: Report of a project carried out by the University of Oxford Centre for Migration and Policy Research and Refugee Studies Centre, contracted by the Home Office Immigration Research and Statistics Service (irss)*. Research Development and Statistics Directorate, Home Office, [London].
- Cherti M. & C. McNeil 2012, *Rethinking Integration*. Institute for Public Policy Research. Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation. London.
- Cheung S. Y. & J. Phillimore. 2013, *Social networks, social capital and refugee integration*. Research report for nuffield foundation. Nuffield Foundation.
- CIC 2007, *Our shared future*. Commission on Integration and Cohesion, Weatherby.
- Clayton J. 2012, "Living the Multicultural City: Acceptance, Belonging and Young Identities in the City of Leicester, England." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35 (9) pp. 1673–1693.
- Crul M. & J. Schneider 2010, "Comparative Integration Context Theory: Participation and Belonging in New Diverse European Cities." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33 (7), pp. 1249–1268.
- Dahinden J. 2013, "Cities, migrant incorporation, and ethnicity: A network perspective on boundary work". *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 14 (1), pp. 39-60.
- Danzer A. M. & H. Ulku 2011, "Integration, social networks and economic success of immigrants: A case study of the turkish community in Berlin". *Kyklos*, 64 (3), pp. 342-365.

-
- Dines N. & V. Cattell 2006, *Public spaces, social relations and well-being in east london*, Bristol, Policy Press.
- Drever A. I. & O. Hoffmeister "Immigrants and social networks in a job-scarce environment: The case of Germany". *International Migration Review*, 42 (2), pp. 425-448.
- Engbersen G., M. Van San & A. Leerkes 2006, "A room with a view: Irregular immigrants in the legal capital of the world". *Ethnography*, 7 (2), pp. 209-242.
- Fanning B., T. Haase & N. O'boyle 2011, "Well-being, cultural capital and social inclusion: Immigrants in the Republic of Ireland". *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 12 (1), pp. 1-24.
- Fleischmann F., K. Phalet, K. Neels & P. Deboseree 2011, "Contextualizing Ethnic Educational Inequality: The Role of Stability and Quality of Neighborhoods and Ethnic Density in Second-Generation Attainment" *International Migration Review*, 45 (2), pp. 386-425.
- Gijsberts M., T. Van Der Meer & J. Dagevos 2011, "'Hunkering down' in multi-ethnic neighbourhoods? The effects of ethnic diversity on dimensions of social cohesion". *European Sociological Review*, pp.
- Grzymała-Kazłowska A. 2005, "From ethnic cooperation to in-group competition: Undocumented polish workers in brussels". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31 (4), pp. 675-697.
- Goodson, L., & Phillimore, J. (2008) Social capital and integration: the importance of social relationships and social space to refugee women. *International Journal of Diversity* 7 (6) pp: 181-194.
- Górny A. & S. Toruńczyk-Ruiz 2011, Integration of migrants from the perspective of social ties and neighbour relations. CMR Working Paper. Warsaw.
- Górny A. & S. Toruńczyk-Ruiz 2013, "Neighbourhood attachment in ethnically diverse areas: The role of interethnic ties". *Urban Studies*, pp.1-19.
- Holgate J., J. Keles, A. Pollert & L. Kumarappen 2012, "Workplace Problems Among Kurdish Workers in London: Experiences of an 'Invisible' Community and the Role of Community Organisations as Support Networks." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38 (4), pp. 595-612.
- Hooghe M. 2005, "Ethnic Organisations and Social Movement Theory: The Political Opportunity Structure for Ethnic Mobilisation in Flanders". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31 (5), pp. 975-990.
- Ivarsflaten E. & K. Strømsnes 2013, "Inequality, diversity and social trust in norwegian communities". *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties*, 23 (3), pp. 322-342.
- Johnson N. ed. 2008, *Citizenship, cohesion and solidarity*. Smith Institute, London.
- Jones T., Monder Ram, Paul Edwards, Alexander Kiselichev and Lovemore Muchenje 2012, New Migrant Enterprise: Novelty or Historical Continuity? *Urban Studies*, 49(14),pp. 3159-3176.
- Kitching J., D. Smallbone & R. Athayde 2009, "Ethnic Diasporas and Business Competitiveness: Minority-Owned Enterprises in London." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35 (4), pp. 689-705.
- Lancee B. & J. Dronkers 2011, "Ethnic, religious and economic diversity in dutch neighbourhoods: Explaining quality of contact with neighbours, trust in the neighbourhood and inter-ethnic trust". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37 (4), pp. 597-618.

Laurence J. 2011, "The effect of ethnic diversity and community disadvantage on social cohesion: A multi-level analysis of social capital and interethnic relations in uk communities". *European Sociological Review*, (1), pp. 70.

Laurence J. 2013, "'Hunkering down or hunkering away?' the effect of community ethnic diversity on residents' social networks". *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties*, 23 (3), pp. 255-278.

Laurence J. & A. Heath 2008, *Predictors of community cohesion: Multi-level modelling of the 2005 citizenship survey*. Communities and Local Government, London.

Letki N. 2008, "Does diversity erode social cohesion? Social capital and race in british neighbourhoods". *Political Studies*, 56 (1), pp. 99-126.

Lolle H. & L. Torpe 2011, "Growing ethnic diversity and social trust in european societies". *Comparative European Politics*, 9 (2), pp. 191-216.

McPherson M., L. Smith-Lovin & Cook 2001, Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks Annual Review of Sociology, Vol. 27 (2001), pp. 415-444.

Morales L. & L. Ramiro 2011, "Gaining Political Capital through Social Capital: Policy-Making Inclusion and Network Embeddedness of Migrants' Associations in Spain". *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*, 16 (2), pp. 147-164.

Phillimore J. 2013, "Housing, home and neighbourhood renewal in the era of superdiversity: Some lessons from the west midlands". *Housing Studies*, 28 (5), pp. 682-700.

Phillimore, J. (2010) Vulnerable New Communities Study For Barrow Cadbury Trust. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

Phillimore, J. & L. Goodson 2010, "Failing to adapt: institutional barriers to RCOs engagement in transformation of social welfare". *Social Policy and Society*. 9 (2), pp.181-192.

Phillimore, J., Goodson, L., Hennessy, D. & Ergun, E. 2009, *Empowering Birmingham's migrant and refugee community organisations: Making a difference*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Pilati K. 2012, "Network Resources and the Political Engagement of Migrant Organisations in Milan." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38 (4), pp. 671-688.

Putnam R.D. 2007, "E Pluribus Unum: Civic Engagement in a Diverse and Changing Society" *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30 (2), pp.

Santelli E. 2012, "Young Adults of Maghrebi Origin from the French Banlieues: Social Mobility in Action?," *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 13 (4), pp.541-563.

Schaeffer M. 2013, Inter-Ethnic Neighbourhood Acquaintances of Migrants and Natives in Germany: On the Brokering Roles of Inter-Ethnic Partners and Children, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39 (8), pp.1219-1240

Schrover M. and F. Vermeulen 2005, "Immigrant Organisations". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31 (5), pp. 823-832.

Shm 2007, *Promoting interaction between people from different ethnic backgrounds. A research project for the commission for racial equality. Final report.* Commission for Racial Equality, London.

Sturgis P., I. Brunton-Smith, J. Kuha & J. Jackson 2013, "Ethnic diversity, segregation and the social cohesion of neighbourhoods in London". *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, pp. 1-21.

Tillie J. 2004, "Social capital of organisations and their members: Explaining the political integration of immigrants in amsterdam". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30 (3), pp. 529-541.

Torpe L. "Growing ethnic diversity and social trust in european societies". *Comparative European Politics*, 9 (2), pp. 191-216.

Vathi Z. 2013, "Transnational Orientation, Cosmopolitanism and Integration among Albanian-Origin Teenagers in Tuscany". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39 (6), pp. 903-919.

Van Eijk G. 2012, Good Neighbours in Bad Neighbourhoods: Narratives of Dissociation and Practices of Neighbouring in a 'Problem' Place. *Urban Studies*, 49(14), pp. 3009–3026.

Van Meeteren M., G. Engbersen & M. Van San 2009, "Striving for a better position: Aspirations and the role of cultural, economic, and social capital for irregular migrants in belgium¹". *International Migration Review*, 43 (4), pp. 881-907.

Wren K. 2007, "Supporting Asylum Seekers and Refugees in Glasgow: The Role of Multi-Agency Networks," *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20 (3), pp.391–413.

Zetter R., D. Griffiths & N. Sigona 2006, *Immigration, social cohesion and social capital: What are the links?*, York, Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Zetter R., D. Griffith & N. Sigona 2005, "Social capital or social exclusion? The impact of asylum-seeker dispersal on UK refugee community organizations". *Community Development Journal* 40 (2), pp. 169–181.

Zetter R. & M. Pearl 2000, "The minority within the minority: refugee community based organisations in the UK and the impact of restrictionism". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 26 (4), pp.675–98.