



Co-funded by
the European Union



KING

Knowledge for INtegration Governance

Local and experiential aspects of migrant integration - An overview -

Jenny Phillimore

KING Project – Applied Social Studies Unit
Overview Paper n.7/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 three to four researchers, who have been assigned a range of topics to cover.

In the present Overview Paper Jenny Phillimore summarises and comments the papers written by the researchers of the “Applied Social Studies” team she directed:

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 author, and the European Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Local and experiential aspects of migrant integration - An overview -

1. INTRODUCTION

The past twenty years have seen enormous changes in the way we live, as societies and cultures across the world have become integrated through communication, transportation, and trade. Globalisation has accelerated the speed and scale of migration, brought changes to migration patterns, and supported the development of the phenomena of new migration. The “old” post-colonial migrations of the 1950s to 1980s brought large numbers of relatively homogenous groups of people to a small number of places with which they had some kind of connection, for example Indians and Pakistanis to the UK, Surinamese and Moluccans to Netherlands, and North Africans to France. New migration sees relatively small numbers of people from countries across the world arriving to very many places with which they have little or even no historical connection (Vertovec 2007). Vertovec (2007) argues new migration is superdiverse because new migrants are diverse across a wide range of variables including ethnicity, immigration status, rights and entitlements, labour market experiences, gender and age profiles, and patterns of spatial distribution. The scale, complexity, heterogeneity and pace of new migration far exceeds that of the early post-Commonwealth arrivals.

“Old” migration was characterised by relatively static clusters of migrants who moved to manufacturing centres to take up jobs, and were later joined by their families. New migrant populations are less fixed. They are spread across the developed world, and connected transnationally to friends and family in many other countries. They may settle permanently in one location, or move around the country of migration or super-national region. Thus we see global communities such as Somali migrants who move in and between Bolton, London and Birmingham or between Sweden, Netherlands and the UK, and Kurdish migrants between Germany, Sweden and the UK. The culmination of the heterogeneity, speed and scale of new migration is the evolution of superdiversity as so-called “global neighbourhoods” (Logan and Zhang 2010) are created wherein diversity is the norm and no majority group or groups are evident.

Over the last 20 years, in excess of 26 million people have migrated to the EU15 (Boeri 2011). This figure does not include the movement of Accession country migrants after 2004 (A8s) and 2007 (A2s), a migration widely acknowledged to have had major impacts in some local areas in some countries of migration. The poor quality of migration and ethnicity data does not enable an accurate estimate of the numbers, ethnicities and statuses of migrants, while the presence of large numbers of undocumented migrants means that it is difficult to build an accurate picture of the size and location of new migrant populations. In 2009 the percentage of overseas citizens living in the EU was 6.4% although across Europe populations varied enormously. Luxembourg topped the list at 43.5% of residents born overseas followed by Switzerland (21.7%) and Latvia (17.9%). The UK came in 13th out of 30 countries with 6.6% (Eurostat 2010). While it is acknowledged that rural and urban areas have become more diverse, the scale and scope of superdiversity varies by country and by settlement area with large urban centres most affected (Robinson & Reeve 2006). Although London is generally thought of as the most diverse UK city, with 29% of residents from ethnic minority backgrounds (GLA 2005), regional cities such as Birmingham (Phillimore 2010), likely to become one of Britain’s first minority majority cities in 2020, are becoming increasingly diverse (Finney

& Simpson 2009). Superdiversity is in evident in other European cities from Milan where 19% of the population are born overseas and have arrived from 138 different countries (Comune di Milano 2008) and Amsterdam where 45% are born overseas and come from 170 countries (City of Amsterdam 2012). Such diversity provides a range of challenges for integration.

The advent of superdiversity has in the past few years been juxtaposed with several other trends. Perhaps most importantly there is the global recession, considered by many to be the worst in a generation (Martin 2009) and associated austerity cuts introduced in a bid to address budgetary problems in many of the world's leading countries of immigration. These global developments occur in an environment already unfavourable to immigration and integration. Developments including the re-politicisation of migration, the rise of new right-wing and xenophobic movements, growing use of welfare rationing, and increasing levels of negative media and public opinion, all impact on migrants' ability to integrate. Claims have been made that the increase in diversity has reduced levels of social solidarity in society, and with it support for the welfare state, as the general population are prepared only to contribute to welfare measures for people with whom they share an affinity (Goodhart 2004; Banting and Kymlicka 2006). In the combined eras of superdiversity and austerity the successful integration of migrants is more important and more challenging than ever.

In this overview we explore migrant integration at local level. We first examine access to functional aspects of integration: health, housing, education and employment, described by Ager & Strang (2007) as means and markers as they are viewed as both a means to integration and where equal access has been achieved, a marker of being integration. We then progress to examine the role of social capital and social networks. The third part of the paper examines the kinds of integration approaches that have been implemented at local level and their effectiveness. The remainder of the paper is devoted to considering the implications of the findings for policy and practice and to outlining a potential research agenda. Following instructions from KING project leaders we have not sought to provide a definition of integration, which is acknowledged to be a much debated term, and instead sought to review literature in which our key search terms were utilised. It is important to note that this overview paper is based upon the three working papers developed for the KING project in conjunction with Gary Craig, Rachel Humphris and Marta Kindler themselves based on a review of existing literature. The majority of papers were written in English or Polish. Thus there will undoubtedly be materials offering different perspectives written in other languages.

2. FUNCTIONAL INDICATORS

2.1 Health

There is an extensive literature on the access of migrants and minorities to healthcare and a number of studies that examine health outcomes in migrant/minority communities. With some exceptions these indicate that following arrival and an initial "healthy migrant effect", associated with a combination of the youthfulness of economic migrants and healthy behaviours; the health outcomes of migrants and those who remain as permanent residents (described herein as minorities), deteriorates. The trajectory of asylum seekers and refugees is noticeably different in that they often arrive with high levels of physical or psychological health problems associated with persecution experienced in their country of origin, during flight or the asylum determination process (Phillimore 2011).

A wide range of problems accessing health services have been identified. These include:

- Not understanding health systems
- Language barriers
- Poor interpretation/translation and over-reliance on family members for interpretation
- Lack of awareness about health prevention and inoculation systems
- Cultural misunderstandings in language and terminology used to describe symptoms
- Bureaucratic barriers to registering for healthcare
- Impacts upon health outcomes include
- High levels of poverty restricting access to fresh or health foods
- Overcrowding and exploitation in housing or employment leading to increased propensity to communicable diseases
- Unfamiliarity with culture/ climate etc and/or exploitation increasing stress levels
- Depression associated with lack of social mobility and isolation
- Poor access to antenatal care associated with higher infant and maternal mortality
- Lack of trust in health services or fear of being charged
- Exclusion from health services for undocumented migrants in some countries i.e. Sweden, charging for services in others i.e. UK
- Racism and discrimination by individual professionals
- Institutional racism and pathologising of ethnicity

On the whole the monitoring of migrant health is poor. The lack of appropriate monitoring of outcomes means that in most countries it is not possible to explore health outcomes by migration status, while in others naturalised migrants become invisible in the data. Alternatively health outcome data is based around ethnicity or even a basic minority/majority binary with scant consideration of other demographic characteristics that may have more extensive impacts upon migrant/minority health (i.e. age and gender) (Bhopal 2012). Furthermore there are gaps in knowledge about the relationship between other functional indicators and health.

2.2 Housing

The housing literature has largely focused upon the theoretical debates around mobility and home rather than on the link between migration, minority status and integration. The housing careers literature informs on housing trajectories of minorities, sometimes across generations although the focus here is on ethnicity rather than wider aspects of diversity. Grey literature, often emanating from local level studies, examines the housing experiences of newcomers or the impact of migration on housing markets. Policy literature generally focuses upon migration as a problem in terms of housing in that it is thought to reduce supply, increase rent levels and house prices and impact upon the quality of local neighbourhoods. There is some anecdotal evidence of the arrival of migrants into a deprived area having a positive impact on local housing markets, reducing the number of empty homes and bringing stability to deprived neighbourhoods that was previously absent.

The key challenges in respect of access to and experiences of housing are:

- Dependence on private rented sector
- Overcrowding either by unscrupulous landlords or through self-exploitation as migrants seek to reduce rent levels
- Poor conditions including damp, lack of heating, vermin infestation
- Poor health and safety with unsafe appliances etc

-
- Non-standard, inappropriate housing such as caravans, sheds and garages with poor/no sanitation
 - Lack of tenancy agreements leaves migrants open to abuse and increased homelessness
 - Inflated rent levels, especially where migrants depend on word of mouth to access a migrant housing market
 - Economic migrants vulnerable to financial and other abuse in tied housing
 - High levels of homelessness associated with insecure housing
 - Lack of stable housing, constant movement
 - Absence of furniture and other goods
 - Lack of knowledge about methods to access utility services
 - Poor knowledge of neighbourhood protocol, bringing conflict because of inappropriate parking or refuse disposal
 - Exclusion from certain neighbourhoods because of discrimination by housing agents/providers and lack of documentation or UK residence history
 - Lack of housing stock suitable for large minority families
 - Poor understanding of rights and entitlements results in lack of knowledge about how to resolve problems
 - Children and women housed inappropriately with unrelated men

Despite much rhetoric expressing alarm at migrants' access to social housing and consequent lack of such housing for the general population, the limited evidence available shows they are much less likely to access social housing than the general population. Furthermore the debate about self-segregating into certain neighbourhoods and thus creating 'ghettos' has not been resolved. In Europe it seems that migrants/minorities are more likely to be housed in mixed rather than mono-ethnic areas with majority populations the most likely to live in less diverse areas. Evidence suggests that the key determinants of access to housing for superdiverse populations are affordability and safety, the latter meaning choice of mixed areas to avoid racism that is often evident in majority population areas (see Finney & Simpson 2010).

2.3 Education

Once again there is an extensive literature on the access of minorities to education. The majority of focus is upon children of ethnic minority background. This finds that while some groups exceed national average attainment levels, others (for example Bangladeshi population in UK and Somalis in the Netherlands) are far below. The literature is less focused on the outcomes of the children of recent migrants or on the outcomes or experiences of adults in further or higher education, although some attention has been paid to access to language learning, either as part of general provision or as part of integration provision (particularly in Scandinavia). There is some evidence that newly arrived children are more conscientious in their studies than the host population, particularly in deprived areas where the quality of schooling can be low. Qualitative evidence suggests migrant children can out perform the established community and contribute to the creation of an ethos of learning in schools in superdiverse areas.

Findings show that barriers to access and achievement include:

- Lack of knowledge about how to identify school places and enrol children
- Lack of resources to pay for transport, school uniforms, stationary etc
- Overcrowding at home restricting ability to undertake homework
- Transiency and lack of documentation bringing breaks in schooling and disrupting learning
- Transferal from different systems leaves children struggling to adapt
- Children arriving from countries with poor education system, or disrupted education because of civil unrest, illiterate in their own language and unable to catch up with children of their own age

-
- High levels of depression and trauma making concentration difficult
 - Language barriers prevent children engaging in lessons and parents providing support with homework and communicating with teachers
 - Bullying of migrant children
 - Adults unable to access classes because they are incompatible with working hours
 - High costs of adult classes where immigration status impacts on access to fee remission
 - Existing qualifications not recognised so adults expected to recommence their education
 - Poor quality of language tuition makes learning slow and abilities inadequate for access to labour market.

Overall there is little consideration of how poor outcomes and access connect to other aspects of integration although it is important to note that the absence of host country language skills features large in integration literature in terms of barriers to a wide range of integration factors including other functional indicators, social networks and capital and civic participation.

2.4 Employment

The largest body of literature in relation to functional aspects of integration relates to employment. This paper will not focus on the “ethnic inequalities” literature which will be covered elsewhere by the KING team. Instead we look at barriers to accessing both employment and social mobility around which there is a far smaller literature with a heavy emphasis on refugees and Accession country migrants. Key barriers to employment include:

- Inability to speak the level of, or specialist, language needed in the workplace
- Lack of knowledge about application protocols, i.e. how to do a CV, perform in interviews
- Lack of host country qualifications and non-recognition of non-EU qualifications (but also a problem for accession migrants)
- Lack of employers references or membership of appropriate trade bodies
- Under-employment, below abilities, significant down-skilling
- Restriction to migrant dominated industries or to back of house activities
- Over-concentration in dirty, dangerous and difficult employment unpopular with majority residents

In addition migrants and to a lesser extent minorities experience high levels of exploitation within employment including:

- Being paid less than the majority population
- Paid less than the legal minimum wage or subject to piece work conditions that pay extremely poorly
- Poor, unsafe working conditions, with high levels of occupational injury
- Long and/or unstable hours
- Lack of employment contract
- Illegal deductions from wages
- Refusal to pay wages
- With-holding of key documentation i.e. passport which restrict mobility and choice
- False or inflated job offers, often after paying agency fees

Indeed there is increasing evidence of “modern slavery” where migrants’ employment conditions or remuneration or lack of freedom mean that they are heavily exploited and sometimes physically or

emotionally abused. Such individuals are likely to lack choice in employment and may get trapped into situations from which there is little opportunity to escape especially when they lack local language or institutional knowledge. Trafficking of migrants, particularly women and children, continues to be a problem across the EU with few local institutions having the knowledge or ability to intervene.

2.5 Overview of functional integration

On the whole the majority of emphasis in terms of migrant and minority integration has been on economic integration with scant attention to other factors that impact upon productivity such as access decent quality housing, the acquisition of local knowledge and, the opportunity to develop or translate existing skills or learn language. Furthermore there are strong connections between quality of employment and access to healthcare and good quality housing. There is little acknowledgement that integration is a process, even an ongoing negotiation between cultures, that can move forward in the right conditions, may not proceed in poor conditions or can be reversed if conditions or opportunities deteriorate. The poor health, housing and employment outcomes of many minorities provide clear evidence of the failure of states to support integration and the possibility that these problems may continue into 2nd and 3rd generations. A growing tendency to blame migrants for a range of social and economic ills, and minorities for poor levels of achievement and social integration, have possibly exacerbated tensions which are easily manipulated by nationalist, and more recently even mainstream, parties. Some of the key learning from the literature around migration, minorities and social integration are now considered.

3. SOCIAL CAPITAL AND NETWORKS

There is a burgeoning literature around the role of social capital and networks in migrant or minority communities. Social capital and social networks are sometimes conflated with the assumption made that the presence of networks is the equivalent of social capital, i.e. that networks automatically allow access to resources. Yet there is plentiful evidence that this is not the case (see Foley & Edwards 1999). In addition there are few articles that look directly at the relationship between integration as a process and networks or capital. Instead focus is upon networks/capital and one type of integration, possibly not even couched in the terms of integration, i.e. employment or social cohesion. The issue of segregation and the extent to which different ethnic groups access different types of networks has possibly dominated the academic and the policy debate with associated questions about the types of capital that are most beneficial both to individuals and communities. While some argue that diversity in itself impacts upon the range and quality of capital available, others show that this is dependent on levels of income or deprivation. Despite the extensive attention given to the above issues there are no conclusive findings. Variation in findings may depend on methods used, with strong contrasts between qualitative and quantitative methods and upon local context and type of migrant. Thus it is difficult to draw conclusions with policy relevance. Furthermore it is of note that little attention has been paid to network/capital development between majority and minority communities and how such connections and resources impact on integration. The emergence of superdiversity has not yet impacted upon social capital studies with the majority of attention paid to ethnic networks and few attempts to explore combinations of variable such as age, gender and migration status.

Seven main points were identified in the social capital and social networks literature review:

1. The formation, use and meaning of social capital differs between migrants and minorities, but also within migrant groups – with legal status and education being important determining factors.

-
2. Bonding social capital, in the form of ethnic networks, can be conducive to integration at the local level and certainly in the early stages of settlement, 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. There is some evidence that new migrants need to develop bonding capital before bridging and the key element in accessing wide ranging types of capital is the density and variety of networks.
 3. The formation, development and type of capital is age and generation dependent. But networks are not necessarily spatially confined with people’s social networks being sources of social capital beyond the locality, creating even trans-local places of reference and attachment.
 4. Where migrants are able to access local social networks and spaces, what impacts on social capital is not levels of diversity, but the affluence of neighbourhoods.
 5. Rather than directly attempting to foster inter-ethnic contact, policies are more effective when creating places of potential meeting between different groups.
 6. The literature from the last decade studying the role of social networks and social capital in the integration of migrants at local level has indicated the importance of moving beyond the locality to encompass wider geographical areas and transnational connections. The evidence suggests that policies too should take a broader focus.
 7. Membership in any form of organisation (ethnic or not-ethnic) increases political participation and integration.

The literature offered little evidence about the impact of the character of migration on the development of social capital and integration, focusing primarily on settled migrants or minorities, and making a blunt distinction between “established” groups and “newcomers”. Few attempts have been made to look at the role of social capital within institutions seeking to enhance migrant integration. Indeed there is a body of evidence that suggest connections between local state and migrant communities are fractured with institutions lacking knowledge about how to connect with migrants, particularly those that have recently arrived. Reference is made in the housing and employment literature to the role of word of mouth in accessing housing and work so it is clear social capital has a role. This requires further investigation. Most studies take locality or community as a given and have given little consideration to “the diversification of diversity” that is a key component of superdiversity. Finally there are few integration initiatives which focus on the development of social networks and capital. This point is picked up further in the final overview section.

4. INTEGRATION INITIATIVES

The vast majority of literature around integration initiatives is located in the policy and practice literature. Given that the majority of integration initiatives are implemented at local level, often by civil society, it is unsurprising that, if evaluation occurs, evidence is collected at local level. The dominance of the local can mean that it is difficult to draw some general conclusions about what types of initiative are effective. However it does enable us to identify the types of context in which programmes are efficacious. It is important to note that in some countries, notably Scandinavian countries, there are national programmes which are often delivered by partnerships at local level. These programmes are often evaluated through the collection of quantitative data generally focussing on migrants’ access to employment. Unfortunately it has not proven possible to identify a source of data on the effectiveness of the different approaches adopted by local partnerships or to access the project evaluations of ERF or EIF funded initiatives¹ which do not appear to be in the public domain but concern both nationally and locally based programmes. The

¹ With the exception of those undertaken by the author

difficulty in accessing these important resources means that possibly the most valuable datasets are not currently informing the development of future provision. From the information we were able to access we have identified five main issues in the delivery of integration practice. We will discuss each of these in turn.

Cultural mediators for a ‘multiplier’ effect

Across the EU in a wide range of cities programmes have utilised the services of cultural mediators or mentors. Generally using volunteers from the general public, or volunteer professionals such as business people, sometimes retired, or students, the idea is that migrants have one-to-one support from a member of the majority population or a long-established migrant. This individual can help them to negotiate complex institutional structures, to enhance their employability or to improve their language skills. It’s clear from the evaluations we were able to access that careful matching of migrants to mentors is the key to the success of this approach.

Partnerships

Effective and relevant partnerships are often the key to effective integration projects (CEPS, 2009, 49). Partnership approaches have been successful when multiple actors and agencies, including migrants themselves, come together to develop integration initiatives. Local and cultural knowledge are important in achieving success. The approach has largely been attempted with single ethnic groups and may be less effective, or require adaptation in superdiverse areas.

Forums and networks

Some success has been achieved in cities such as Leicester, Copenhagen and Berlin in establishing migrant or faith forums. These have functioned on an inter-faith and cross-ethnic basis and provide the opportunity for multiple actors from migrant communities to connect with agencies and institutions and discuss key issues of concern to migrant communities. The success of this approach depends on having the right political environment within which to operate so that institutions are open to the information they received and prepared to act. Otherwise migrant participants will quickly lose faith in the forum, seeing it as “a talking shop” without any practical purpose and withdraw their participation. Elsewhere networks have been established to bring all local actors interested in migration together to help the sharing of information or development of ideas.

Participatory Planning Integration Practices

While many local initiatives emerge organically in response to local problems or thinking, others are carefully designed around well research needs analyses. A number of cities have undertaken gaps consultations with local people, or mapped local service provision so as to provide signposting and avoid duplication of effort. Others have trained migrants to undertake needs assessments within their own communities. Such approaches have the advantage that they can access insider knowledge enabling future initiatives to be carefully tailored to the needs of local populations and to be connected to the local civil society and institutional landscape. Furthermore employability initiatives are more successful when carefully designed around local labour market requirements. Participative approaches do require resources in order to train migrants and at a minimum to cover the costs of their participation. As with forums it is important that participation results in actions.

Many approaches to integration are innovative but may not have directly measurable outcomes. “Myth-busting” activity, attempting to change attitudes to migrants and reduce racism have been widely utilised but are difficult to evaluate because of the soft-nature of outcomes. Furthermore when looking at initiatives which seek to foster social capital assessing effectiveness is particularly difficult. For example the number of individuals in a migrant’s social circle do not necessarily correlate with the usefulness of those connections in supporting integration. Indeed in the UK Cheung & Phillimore (2013) analysing the Survey of New Refugees longitudinal study find that only certain types of network translate into capital. Only by enquiring into the resources brought by connections can we assess their usefulness. Finally funding for integration projects is often contingent on demonstrable short-term results, yet the integration progress will often only be seen over years and can often be hard to disentangle from the impact of other developments. Often projects are short-term receiving only one to three years funding. This can mean that by the time projects are operational and evaluations commence the project must be wound up. The risk of re-inventing the wheel in integration initiatives is very high. Much more work is needed to collate good practice and to ensure that effective projects can access further funding without encountering an overly bureaucratic process.

5. CONCLUSIONS

It is clear that the flexibility of civil society institutions, the nature of the targeted group and versatility of services provided and tasks undertaken, enables them to provide important integration support. While there are clearly interventions which are more appropriate for national government or municipalities, there are others that are initiated by civil society organisations with detailed local knowledge. These sometimes occur as an adjunct to existing provision, which is often the case with faith organisations or can be entirely new. Programmes such as a refugee entrepreneur scheme funded by ERF and implemented by Refugee Action in the UK, provided refugees with the skills, knowledge and finance needed to establish social enterprises aimed at supporting integration in the wider refugee community.

Participation, through the greatest possible involvement of all stakeholders leads to better projects. The most effective and sustainable projects had a clear strategy for identifying the problem that required addressing and identified exactly what was taking place in that field. This might be difficult for smaller organisations and may benefit from an institutional overview. Projects should examine issues in context, looking at both the socio-economic and local situations and the backgrounds and profiles of target groups. Recruiting volunteers from the community as cultural mediators, and actively working with community contact points has proved particularly effective. Such an approach may become more important as Europe’s migrant population becomes increasingly diverse. Focusing on specialist services aimed at one or a few ethnic groups is no longer practical or affordable (Vertovec, 2007). Projects need to take into account the many differences and potential tensions between migrant, ethnic or religious groups and their capacity to participate.

A balance needs to be found between using approaches found to be successful elsewhere, and responding to the particularities of local situations, where previous experience may not be directly applicable. Variables affecting transferability include: the national, regional and local frameworks for inclusion and integration, political climate, resourcing, the historical development of policies and civil society response, the historical perceptions of migrants or a specific group, the local complexity of a situation including the specific political, economic and social context of an area, and make-up of migrants and speed of migration, the local reception, spatial elements including housing and provision of services and how this is managed.

However it is clear that the local level is pivotal in providing the conditions for successful integration. The flexibility inherent in civil society may become more pertinent as migrant groups evolve, new issues emerge or political issues shift in saliency.

Overview and policy implications

Migrants essentially settle into their country of migration at local level. It is at this level they find housing and employment, their children enter education, they build social connections (in addition to those elsewhere) and utilise services. Thus it makes sense to understand integration processes at local level and to design policies that are locally appropriate. However the risk of setting out policies only at local level is that so much depends on local governance and knowledge meaning provision can be something of a postcode lottery. So a national or regional framework setting out expectations and even ideas for actions is important to ensure that all areas are covered. It is clear that some localities have much experience, knowledge and expertise in running initiatives while others have less. Forthcoming research evidence from TSRC indicates that matching emerging initiatives to experienced ones is an effective way of building capacity (Phillimore & McCabe forthcoming). It may make sense to look at pairing approaches connecting organisations or even municipalities so they can learn from each other in an organisational version of the mentoring initiatives discussed above.

There are some themes that emerge across our three working papers and demand particular attention. These are discussed below with some suggestions for policy actions which might help enhance migrant and minority integration.

1. Ability to speak the host community language is essential to enable migrant/minority access to services, support the development of social relations with others and to enable participation in networks and forums. Provision of language training at local level perhaps associated with mentoring or volunteering for language practice is an absolute necessity regardless of locality.
2. Lack of knowledge about institutional structures and systems and local behavioural norms prevents access to services and interaction with local people. Superdiversity brings challenges associated with newness and novelty of cultures, experiences and problems (see Phillimore 2014 forthcoming) both for providers and migrants. A key gap in integration initiatives is developing the skills that providers need to adapt services in an ever-changing fast diversifying environment. Further migrants and minorities also need support to navigate the system – this is another area where mentoring can be useful.
3. Exclusion and deprivation have enormous impact upon the ability of new migrants and existing minorities to integrate and meet their potential, to develop social connections and social capital. Furthermore given the economic imperative placed upon migration down-skilling and, in migrant children, poor education outcomes and economic activity levels have an economic (as well as social) opportunity cost. Thus introducing national mechanisms for recognising or converting qualifications, enhancing employability, providing work experience and supporting migrant children in school are likely to impact on their integration in other domains.
4. There are clear indications of high levels of exploitation in minority and migrant communities both documented and undocumented (with more problems in the latter). Whilst some exploitation is instigated at local level by landlords or employers, there are clear signs than much of it is organised beyond the local by actors such as gangmasters and people traffickers. Local institutions lack the knowledge and power needed to address these issues and arguably given that there is a degree of

transnationality in some forms of exploitation, local institutions are not best placed to address them. They should however be trained in identifying exploitation and should have clear procedures to follow when they uncover exploitative actions. At policy level there should be a clear message that exploitation is unacceptable and will be firmly addressed.

5. Social networks are of great importance to everyone and are key to the integration of migrants. The debate about bonding and bridging and moral panic around “self-segregation” has not been helpful. It is clear that having any kind of social network is important and the more varied and dense social networks are the more they are likely to lead to development of social capital. Not enough is known about the connections between networks, capital and integration so this is an area that needs more consideration. At the current time we might suggest that initiatives which provide sustainable opportunities for interaction both within and between neighbourhoods will inevitably impact on integration outcomes.
6. Participation in partnerships, networks and fora are important ways in which migrants, minorities and institutions can come together to understand and learn from each other, shape initiatives and build connections. These approaches offer a short cut to linking social capital but can only be sustainable if they are resourced and lead to tangible outcomes. A key question raised over the years has been “who represents migrants?” There is a tendency in some areas to rely heavily on one or a few “community leaders” who, while experienced at participating, may not truly represent the views or experiences of local people especially new arrivals. Local fora need to be as inclusive as possible and open to wide ranging participation rather than seeking representatives. Ideally participants would receive training to understand how partnerships/fora etc. work and these mechanisms would work towards clearly outlined goals which can evolve as work develops.
7. Civil society organisations have a clear role in local areas and tend to be the bottom line in providing support for the most vulnerable or those with the most intractable problems. Such organisations tend to have the local and community knowledge needed to make integration initiatives successful and thus are a resource that might be utilised more widely. In times of austerity when funds are low civil society continues need resources, perhaps experiencing greater pressure on services as state provision is cut back. In the absence of funding local institutions might look at different ways in which support could be provided for example offering advice about putting grant applications to foundations together, mentoring, pairing organisations or offering low cost space.
8. Talented and creative leadership is important in superdiverse communities. There is some evidence that leadership can emerge from new communities or from civil society organisations in the locality. Investment must be made into building excellent leaders who can themselves inspire and ensure learning trickles down across communities. There are a number of projects who have trained leaders and been able to make a difference. Leaders must come from a wide range of backgrounds and be a mixture of men and women, nationalities, statuses and ages.
9. A key issue impacting upon migrant and minority communities is racism, both individual and institutional. Racism prevents minorities from achieving their potential, impacts on social mobility and reduces social confidence restricting social networks. The current anti-migrant, anti-multiculturalism ideology is created and perpetuated by politicians and the media, making migrants and minorities too fearful to access all integration domains, impacting upon mental and physical health and access to opportunities. Such ideology legitimises racism while the move towards welfare chauvinism enhances vulnerability and exclusion. There is a need to rationalise the immigration debate and to highlight the important role that migrants play in economies and society and to accept the inevitability of diversifying populations in a globalised world. Understanding that

the world (rather than just particular localities) is changing and highlighting the reality behind immigration (i.e. surveys have shown that residents think that migration levels are 3 times higher than they are) may begin to bring a more sensible discussion. Focussing resources on areas where there are clearly higher levels of migration and pressures on services will help to improve access for all and reduce tensions, possibly curtailing racist behaviour.

10. While there are clear signs that we have entered an era of superdiversity, policy, practice and academia have largely failed to adapt. Policy and practice activities and monitoring continue to focus on ethnicity or on particular immigration statuses and give scant consideration to the wider range of variables that may combine to impact upon outcomes and integration. Much further research is needed into how to understand and monitor integration outcomes in superdiverse areas. More thinking is needed about the implications of super-mobility and change for integration. Should policies makers work to ensure every resident integrates? How long should someone be resident for before integration matters? We also need to find ways to build initiatives that are sufficiently adaptable that they can help superdiverse populations.
11. The vast majority of research and integration activity is focused on urban areas, particularly deprived inner city neighbourhoods (with exception of peripheral banlieus). The advent of new migration has seen the emergence of migrant communities in non-traditional destinations such as rural areas and suburbs. In the future it may be necessary to focus integration initiatives in these areas, perhaps linking rural municipalities and civil society organisations to urban ones with greater experience so they can learn from other.
12. As outlined above there has in the past been much duplication of effort as a result of the failure to disseminate good practice or knowledge about how to overcome challenges and problems. While websites like Cities of Migration do a great job highlighting practice there is currently no systematic method for sharing the outcomes of evaluations. Evaluations often happen at the end of projects rather than being formative and helping to shape project development. The EC might look to creating an Europe wide database of good practice perhaps using a crowd-sourcing approach wherein projects can input their own ideas. Furthermore guidance around the evaluation of integration funds might be changed so that they are encouraged to be more formative.
13. Many excellent projects cease to function because they reach the end of their funding cycle. All the learning, capacity and knowledge that resulted from investment is lost. While innovation is good, sometimes it is important to invest in something that is known to work. With this in mind a proportion of integration funds should be retained to re-invest in successful projects. Projects should be able to apply for these funds halfway through the funding cycle and receive an accelerated decision on their application – reducing levels of staff attrition when their contracts are about to expire.
14. Integration theory has long outlined the two-way nature of the process. True integration can only occur when majority and minority communities adapt to a new reality. This is barely if ever acknowledged by politicians and thus does not translate into policy and practice. There is a great need to focus initiatives on host communities. Providing education about the reality of migration, introducing majorities to minorities, teaching intercultural communication skills, myth-busting and embedding migrants in organisations to try and help them adapt from insider perspectives are some of the ways in which this might happen.
15. While much research has explored different aspects on integration, as yet no mechanism has been developed that can examine integration processes in their entirety. Such methods would need to be longitudinal in order to take into account the lengthy period of time integration can take.

Indeed as yet indicators of integration although developed are not widely used and access to employment and income equity continue to be the main measurements of integration. This clearly unsatisfactory given concerns emerging across Europe about the negative effect of migration on social solidarity. More attention needs to be paid to how social, economic and cultural domains of integration connect.

REFERENCES

- Amsterdam City Council (2012) *Diversity in the city*. <http://www.iamsterdam.com/en/living/city-of-amsterdam/people-culture/diversity>. Downloaded 24/3/12.
- Banting, K. & Kymlicka, W. (2006) *Multiculturalism and the welfare state*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boeri, T. (2011) *It is migration, stupid*. Vox EU accessed 11/11/11. <http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/3688>
- Bhopal, R. (2012) Research agenda for tackling inequalities related to migration and ethnicity in Europe. *Journal of Public Health* 34 (2) 167-173.
- Cheung, S.Y. and Phillimore, J. (2013) 'Refugees, Social Capital and Labour Market Integration in the UK', *Sociology*, DOI: 10.1177/0038038513491467
- Comune di Milano (2008) *Popolazione straniera residente nel Comune di Milano* Al 31.12.2008.
- Eurostat (2010) *Population of foreign citizens in the EU27 in 2009*. Eurostat news release. 129/2010. 7th September 2010. Accessed 15th November 2010. http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/3-07092010-AP/EN/3-07092010-AP-EN.PDF
- Finney, N. & Simpson, L. (2009) *Sleepwalking to Segregation? Challenging Myths About Race and Migration*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Foley, M. & Edwards, B. (1999) Is it time to disinvest in social capital? *Journal of Public Policy* 19 (2) 141-173.
- GLA (2005) *London – the world in a city: an analysis of the 2001 census results*. London: GLA Data Management and Analysis Briefing 2005/6.
- Goodhart, D. (2004) Too diverse? *Prospect magazine*. February 95 pp:1-6.
- Logan, J. and Zhang, C. (2010) Global neighbourhoods: new pathways to diversity and separation. *American Journal of Sociology* 114 (4) pp1069-1109.
- Martin, P. (2009) *The Recession and Migration: Alternative Scenarios*. International Migration Institute Working Paper 13. Oxford University.
- Phillimore, J. (forthcoming) Delivering maternity services in an era of superdiversity: the challenges of novelty and newness. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*.
- Phillimore, J. (2011) Refugees, acculturation and integration. *Journal of Social Policy* 40 (3) pp.575-593.
- Phillimore, J. (2010) *Healthy and wealthy together*. Birmingham local mapping report. Brussels: Healthy and Wealthy Project.
- Phillimore, J. & McCabe, A. (2014 forthcoming) *Luck, passion, networks and skills: the recipe for action below the radar?* Working Paper tba: TSRC: University of Birmingham.

Robinson, D & Reeve, K. (2006) *Neighbourhood experiences of new immigration: reflections from the evidence base*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Vertovec, S. (2007) Super-diversity and its implications. *Journal of Ethnic and Racial studies* 30 (6) p:1024-1054.