UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

Practising integration in the EU

Mapping initiatives and innovations by local institutions and civil society

Rachel Humphris

www.birmingham.ac.uk/iris

IRiS Working Paper Series

The Institute for Research into Superdiversity (IRiS) Working Paper Series is intended to aid the rapid distribution of work in progress, research findings and special lectures by researchers and associates of the Institute. Papers aim to stimulate discussion among scholars, policymakers and practitioners and will address a range of topics including issues surrounding population dynamics, security, cohesion and integration, identity, global networks, rights and citizenship, diasporic and transnational activities, service delivery, wellbeing, social exclusion and the opportunities which superdiverse societies offer to support economic recovery.

The IRiS WP Series is edited by Dr Nando Sigona and Dr Aleksandra Kazlowska at the Institute for Research into Superdiversity, University of Birmingham. We welcome proposals for Working Papers from researchers, policymakers and practitioners; for queries and proposals, please contact: n.sigona@bham.ac.uk. All papers are peer-reviewed before publication.

The opinions expressed in the papers are solely those of the author/s who retain the copyright. They should not be attributed to the project funders or the Institute for Research into Superdiversity, the School of Social Policy or the University of Birmingham.

Papers are distributed free of charge in PDF format via the IRiS website. Hard copies will be occasionally available at IRiS public events.

Institute for Research into Superdiversity
University of Birmingham
Edgbaston
B15 2TT
Birmingham UK
www.birmingham.ac.uk/iris

Practising integration in the EU

Mapping initiatives and innovations by local institutions and civil society

Rachel Humphris

Abstract

This paper reviews a wide range of integration practices undertaken by civil society and local institutions across European Member States that have been identified as 'good practice' examples. It focuses specifically on projects that have been considered innovative and transferable and aims to highlight common themes and processes. The paper is based on a review of academic literature, policy documents and online libraries to provide a synthesis of key trends and approaches to integration projects in Europe. Networks of cities and urban centres make up the majority of widely publicised best practice examples utilised in the review. It concludes that civil society with its inherent flexibility has a pivotal role to play, particularly as the European Union becomes increasingly diverse.

About the authors

Rachel Humphris, Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS), University of Oxford.
Email address for correspondence: rachel.humphris@anthro.ox.ac.uk

Contents

Acknowledgements

Introduction

The role of civil society and local interventions to aid integration of migrants has been well established (CSES 2013: 24). These institutions include non-governmental and not-for-profit organisations and are often the first level to introduce integration projects focusing on specific issues as they emerge in local places (Bücker-Gärtner 2011). Reasons for this include flexible action plans, lower administrative costs and the embedded nature of organisations within local areas. They have an important role to play in creating the right conditions for third-country nationals to access information and services relating to employment, education, healthcare, housing and culture. In addition in several EU member states, NGOs and other civil society actors play a vital part in the resettlement process for refugees. Due to the complexity of the local level, some initiatives introduced by municipal departments have also been included in this review in addition to NGOs.

Comparing integration practices across countries is a very complex exercise, both in terms of methodological considerations and interpretation of results (Piekut *et al.* 2012). Furthermore, demonstrating good practice is not straightforward (EUMC 2005; CLIP Network 2006b; Gidley 2014) nor is defining what successful integration looks like (Spencer 2011; Anthias 2013). Therefore, perhaps unsurprisingly, the technique of benchmarking integration at the local level shows a large and diversified setting of integration approaches and strategies (see Appendix). Clearly what counts as good practice in integration depends on a wide range of factors. Outcome indicators can only provide a partial picture. Similarly, rigorous impact evaluations can identify certain 'good practices' in terms of policies or programmes where impact has been proven in certain circumstances, but may also include limitations in terms of scale and scope. It is also important to ensure a focus on 'good practice' does not mask the task of rigorously engaging with difference (Jones and Gidley 2013).

Increasing attention has also been given to innovations within integration practice and in particular whether transferability is possible across contexts. In light of this a number of European networks have been established focusing on transferability of good integration practices. The LeCim project developed evaluation grids with a specific set of local indications to consider the possibility of a successful transfer of integration practice. The results indicated that successful transfer did not necessarily rely on close comparability of two places (in terms of economy, social situation, education and training policies, organisational or informal structures) but more on matching the concept of the programme and on the willingness to adopt new models by those responsible in the target institution. The EU-MIA project identified certain *processes*, rather than concrete practices, behind successful integration policies, which may be transferable to different locations (Ponzo *et al.* 2013: 14). This issue was also tackled by Concordia Discors, a study of 11 European neighbourhoods which highlighted the impact of local place, including narratives, memories, local policy and connectivity, which all played an important role in integration (Gidley 2014). However, it should be noted that there seems to be no consensus in the literature on whether transferability is successful, and the matter continues to be highly debated.

The structure of the paper is as follows. First, the methodology is reviewed. Second, the paper describes some general trends across Europe in terms of migrant integration policies. Third, four themes developed from the literature are explored. These comprise: approach and delivery, systemic changes, funding and evaluation processes and planning. Case studies from the reviewed literature are provided, addressing different migration and legal categories across countries and contexts. The aim is to establish exactly how and why an integration initiative was implemented, what it set out to

achieve and to assess whether these targets were been reached. Finally the conclusion highlights the main constraints to successful practices and looks to the future role of civil society to implement integration projects in an increasingly diverse Europe.

Methodology

There are a number of methodological issues relevant to this paper. Reviewed material includes academic literature, reports, studies, communications, policy documents and statistical information from national and regional governments, EU institutions, NGOs, civil society, think-tanks and other research bodies. Importantly, networks of cities and urban centres make up the majority of widely publicised best practice examples. These networks are listed in the Appendix (Table 1) including their benchmarking criteria. Materials on evaluation and measurement of integration were also reviewed.

An exhaustive review of all civil society initiatives and projects in all 28 Member States was not possible within the constraints of this paper. In addition, it is difficult to access reports from private foundations and funders as they do not always publish targets and outcomes from funded projects. Therefore the literature review includes case studies of best practice evaluated by secondary literature. The limitation of analysing previously identified case studies is acknowledged. The research may have overlooked practices which have not received previous publicity, or which have 'failed' but may nevertheless have lessons to offer. This has been accounted for in a number of ways. The methodologies utilised by previous evaluations are summarised in the Appendix to indicate where personal scope or limitations might lie. In addition, wherever possible, only case studies that had clear and measurable outcomes have been included in this study.[1]

Relevant trends in national approaches to integration

Civil society and local level institutions cannot be viewed in isolation. Local actors and authorities are influenced by national rules and policy frameworks. Some may be interconnected with national policies and share responsibilities with relevant bodies across different levels of governance. In addition, local authorities have different legal frameworks for the promotion of 'equality and diversity' or integration policies, which relate to how they, and civil society, develop and deliver services. The amount of financial resources, the way they are levied and the autonomy with which they can be spent also differ. Finally, political environments are not the same and, therefore, political priorities also differ, affecting development and delivery of local integration practice.

In addition, civil society initiatives often respond to, or are shaped by, national integration policies and priorities through funding streams, expertise and capacity, integration culture and perceptions, specific events which shape public perceptions and specific needs of migrants in particular areas.

---

[1] Examples of initiatives and projects included in this review are given for illustration purposes only. Inclusion in the guide does not constitute an endorsement of any project or service. There is no responsibility for the content or reliability of linked websites. While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of information supplied, it is recommended all information be verified with relevant government agencies or other organisations referred to in the text. The study does not aim to evaluate refugee or migrant integration, nor does it aim to evaluate policies or programming relating to integration at either local, national or EU level. Within the literature review, the study considered what approaches to integration appeared to have positive or successful outcomes, and sought to identify examples of good or interesting practice. However, practices identified in this report are not the outcome of any evaluation nor are the cited examples of practice exhaustive.

Some broad trends in national integration strategies are important to note here in order to frame the discussion surrounding civil society initiatives.

There has been a shift in many Member States to place the responsibility for integration on the individual migrant and their labour market participation. Measures include prevention of unemployment through education and training, more effective systems to recognise qualifications, fighting against discrimination in the work place and promotion of employment for immigrant women.

Most Member States are placing increasing emphasis on basic knowledge of the host society language as an essential element of integration. Many countries focus their integration strategies on introduction programmes, including (sometimes compulsory) language and civic orientation courses for the newly-arrived. A growing number of Member States increase the flexibility of courses in terms of targeting specific needs. However, only a few Member States carry out in-depth evaluation of these activities (Commission of the European Communities 2007).

There is a strong focus across European Member States on targeted language classes and tuition to facilitate integration at school. Many initiatives promote respect for diversity in the educational environment and support for teachers. However, immigrant children and youth continue to face specific challenges across Europe (Nonchev and Tagarov 2012). The participation of migrants in the democratic process is increasingly perceived as a significant aspect of successful integration; however, measures to promote their interaction, including the setting up of shared forums, are still limited. Similarly forums promoting the importance of inter- and intra-faith dialogue are increasingly being recognised but are only recently being promoted in a structured manner.

Some Member States have begun to develop cooperation between governmental stakeholders or to engage the private sector in debates on integration. In a growing number of cases, migrants' representatives are involved in the elaboration and implementation of integration policies. In addition, a limited number of Member States provide third-country nationals with voting rights in local elections.

Integration practice

This section examines the different practices implemented across the EU to facilitate migrant integration at the local level. It provides a review of the types of actions that have been considered as successful (benchmarking and indicators used for each project are included in the Appendix, Table 1). Four themes emerged including: positive developments in approach and delivery of integration practice; promising systemic changes; innovative funding and evaluation processes and successful planning practices. The review focuses in particular on projects' practical application and outcomes and the situations in which they are useful.

Approach and delivery of integration practice

Cultural mediators for a 'multiplier' effect

Engaging cultural mediators has led to a number of successful projects. The forerunner of this approach is Consorzio Spinner, a local consortium of research and economic development groups in Bologna, which encouraged Chinese entrepreneurs to regularise their businesses by conforming to

Italian labour standards. To overcome linguistic and cultural barriers, Spinner trained Chinese intercultural mediators and set up a network of 87 public and private organisations to support the transition process of Chinese workshops. They contacted 354 Chinese entrepreneurs (32% in the area), visited 187 businesses (17% of potential beneficiaries), trained 185 Chinese entrepreneurs, and delivered 38 consulting services. In addition, they trained 53 entrepreneurs on Safety and Security Law (90% finalised with certification). Success has been attributed to the support of a network of public and private organisations working towards a very clear, identified and agreed goal (Cities of Migration 2012a).

The model has also been used in education settings in Berlin, Hamburg, Genk and Rome through 'parent companions' and for addressing health inequalities (FRA 2008: 25; Bücker-Gärtner 2011: 101; DIVE 2013: 15; Intercultural Cities 2013b: 10), for example in Bilbao, 'Putting women's health in women's hands project' (Cities of Migration 2012a, 60; URBACT II 2010) and in Hamburg through the MiMi project (Cities of Migration 2012a). The project, 'Migrant Women as Doulas and Culture Interpreters' was also externally evaluated positively (Akhavan and Lundgren 2010). Similarly in Waltham Forest, UK, Health Preachers were trained from the borough's Muslim, Christian and Sikh communities to draw on their position as faith leaders to communicate important messages on health to their congregations (OSF 2011). This approach was utilised in other areas of identified need, for example 'tenants helping tenants' in Berlin or 'mothers helping mothers' (DIVE 2010; OSF 2011). The evaluations of these projects all noted that success rested on use of mother tongue languages and knowledge of local neighbourhoods and community spaces to engage with others.

A similar initiative was developed in Oslo where Master's students acted as diversity mentors in secondary schools. Over the four years of the project the final evaluation reported a 30% increase in university admissions from these schools, compared to an average seven per cent increase in Oslo schools more generally. A mentoring scheme for mature students from minority backgrounds helped to lower dropout. In 2012 there were 11% minority students admitted to Oslo University with the target of 15% likely to be reached within the next two years. Encouragingly, Oslo University turned the project into a permanent diversity office (Intercultural Cities 2013a: 8).

However, caution should be noted. When this model was applied to financial services it did not have the same effect. The Offenbach Project recruited and trained motivated Germans with migrant backgrounds as intercultural mediators who could help educate and guide others in the community on financial matters and on how to improve their chances on the labour market (Cities of Migration 2012a). The key element of the project was the personal skills of the mediator chosen. Despite some positive results the programme was not deemed successful enough to be rolled out across the country as was initially hoped.

It seems for labour market participation cultural mediators alone cannot ensure success. The Austrian Economic Chamber (WirtschaftskammerÖsterreich/WKÖ), the Austrian Integration Fund (ÖsterreichischerIntegrationsfonds/ÖIF) as well as the Public Employment Service (Arbeitsmarktservice/AMS) launched a joint initiative with the aim of integrating migrants into the labour market. In the framework of the initiative *Mentoring for Migrants*, migrants were matched to experienced members of the business community (Federal Ministry of Social Affairs Vienna 2008).

Unlike the Offenbach Project this large scale project included detailed matching criteria and a strong support network for both the mentor and the mentee. In addition, training and other events were organised on a regular basis to reinforce networking. The project reports that it was popular amongst

mentors and mentees, with 75% of mentors stating that they would enter into a mentoring partnership again. In the most recent round 120 couples were paired in Vienna alone (Bittmann 2011: 51).

Partnerships

Effective and relevant partnerships are often the key to effective integration projects (CEPS 2009: 49). The importance of effective and relevant partnerships is perhaps most easily detected from examples where they have broken down or were absent. The Migrant Voter Project (Dublin) recognised the project lacked key partners such as the police and elected members of the City Council, who should have been encouraged to engage with participants in the programme (URBACT II 2010). The Basque Government also implemented a programme for legal advice with the Bar Association but after 2006 the partnership broke down, resulting in a much less effective service (CSES 2013).

A different approach was taken in the Generation Project, which shifted the traditional roles and actions of public and private partnerships to reach disadvantaged young people in Amadora where the majority of residents are Cape Verdean in origin (Cities of Migration 2012a, Intercultural Cities 2013b). The project engaged teams of facilitators working in tandem with social workers and community volunteers. The range of people involved included anthropologists, economists, language professionals, enterprise managers, hairdressing teachers, musicians, psychologists, animators, violinists as well as librarians and a priest. Since 2005 over 1,000 children and young people have benefited from the project. The scale of the project and resources employed in it were noted as key elements of its success, coupled with targeted professionals to help arrive at solutions.

Mainstreaming and targeting

There is continuing debate regarding the benefits of targeted as opposed to mainstream projects. A general consensus is emerging that new migrants require specific assistance but targeting of groups specifically as 'problem' communities provokes fears of a backlash from the majority population who may feel that they are being denied scarce resources.

A strategy identified as effective for including new migrants is seen in the Foreigners' Forum in Poland. The Forum aimed to find remedies to issues faced by third-country nationals by bringing together representatives of non-governmental organisations, migrant communities and local government officials. The evaluations noted that the particular strength of the Forum was its ability to communicate issues regarding third-country migrants' integration to higher levels of government (CSES 2013: 62).

Targeted approaches clearly require sensitivity but also a favourable political climate. For example, the German Islam Conference was founded in 2006 as a new space for dialogue and joint action to define and improve relations between the state and Muslim organisations. It received many criticisms mainly due to a lack of transparency and a 'top-down' approach. In contrast, Berlin set up its own IslamForum to bring together key stakeholders to discuss topics in a safe and private environment. Although the work of the Forum is not easily quantifiable it does seem to have the support and participation of many key minority groups who do not have previous experience of working within a network. It also included key partners in the Berlin Senate and police (OSF 2011). However, this was in the context of Germany acknowledging Muslims to be part of Germany. The

particularities of the political situation may have affected the outcomes of these initiatives (Ramalingham 2013: 6).

Engaging with groups in new ways, not by singling out one group for a particular programme but by creating an interfaith network, seems to be an increasingly common strategy from the reviewed literature. Examples include the many Council of Faiths organisations in the UK or the Faith Leaders Forum in Leicester, a platform for the discussion of more sensitive and controversial matters concerning faith communities. The Forum represents all faiths and has been in existence since the 9/11 terrorist attacks in the United States. Similarly to IslamForum it also includes representatives from the city council, the police and other agencies (OSF 2011: 15). This type of initiative may be particularly useful for 'super-diverse' communities with complex interplays of faith and ethnic groups (Vertovec 2007). However, it is acknowledged that this approach relies on engaging with 'religious or community leaders' and caution should be exercised when generalising about representativeness and influence.

The most effective projects may not be based directly around integration but on a wider issue or local problem that has brought people together. This took place in the Five Estates Project in Dudley (Cities of Migration 2012a). Through Foundation funding a community development worker was employed to create opportunities for residents to come together with the shared goal of cultivating open discussions. Over 550 people participated in the 47 community meetings and events, 50% of whom were visible minorities. The diffuse nature of such projects may mean 'integration outcomes' go unnoticed and are not reported in the literature. However, the innovation within these projects should not be overestimated.

Systemic changes

Small organisations often have the most trust from beneficiaries but the least capacity to share best practice or to engage in innovative evaluation processes. Furthermore, outside large cities resource-intensive actions, for example those which properly take into account the skills and competences of migrants and local employment demand, are often too small scale to have a large impact. In addition, levels of funding and other structures often mean that support provided by civil society organisations is relatively short term and small scale, linked to a limited target group and may only be delivered in a single location.

A key structural issue in integration initiatives is the short funding cycle. An organisation may only be given enough time to begin to deliver an innovative project before funding ceases. In response to this, the UK Home Office changed ERF funding from one to three years, but nonetheless most projects ceased after this time despite excellent evaluations (Waddington *et al.* 2008; Phillimore *et al.* 2009).

The sheer number of different actors who become involved at the local level, and the fact that services have often developed on a 'bottom up' basis, means that service providers can become relatively isolated; reducing their ability to guide migrants into other relevant support and new opportunities. This has led to criticisms that organisations may duplicate work and that they lack expertise in the local labour market, links with the employment services and relationships with further education colleges (OECD 2009).

This limited capacity is evident in language training provided by civil society organisations which can result in oversubscribed and overly basic level language programmes. Many successful initiatives

have been implemented in partnerships with schools such as Frankfurt's 'Mama learns German – even Papa' (Cities of Migration 2012a); however, these programmes may not help parents meet the demands of knowledge and service related jobs.

One identified innovative approach that works within current systems has been developed through the Mercator Special Instruction Project in Germany. Mercator approached universities to ask if they would train their students to teach German as a second language. Through a series of negotiations with schools and universities, and with improved grades and positive testimonies from participants to evidence its success, the teacher training model and curriculum has now officially been instituted throughout North Rhine-Westphalia by the state government. A change of law in 2008 now requires every university to implement the programme (Ramalingham 2013: 57).

A further well-evaluated practice to overcome limited capacity for small organisations was to encourage forums and networks. The Migrants Rights Network (Ramalingham 2013: 50); the Conseil Roubaisien de l'Interculturalité et de la Citoyenneté (CSES 2013: 102) and COSIM in Dunkirk (LeCim 2012b) are examples of practices deemed to be successful. However, networks can also cause tensions due to different ways of working or conflicting priorities of organisations. Unless managed correctly, networks can also increase workloads for participants and coordinating organisations and therefore have to be well-resourced to be effective. Interagency work should ideally complement practitioners' existing work, not add to or replicate it (MISTRA 2013b). The South Belfast Integration Project brought together a number of organisations, but the evaluation conceded a full-time member of staff was needed to successfully coordinate the various integration activities and to provide a continuous link between organisations (URBACT II 2010). In Italy a number of initiatives have been shared through national networks. However, the effect of recession has been felt on these networks which might limit the scope of their information sharing activities in the future (Pogliano 2012: 9).

Universities have proven to be effective in providing coordination for networks. Glasgow University hosts Glasgow Refugee, Migrant and Asylum Seekers Network (GRAMNET) which brings together researchers, practitioners, NGOs and policy makers working with migrant groups to share knowledge, and also piloted a collaborative Masters programme where students spend four weeks as interns with knowledge exchange partners (Jones 2012).

Planning integration practices

Research on local service needs and subsequent detailed planning were pivotal to some projects' sustainability. The Ausbildung in Sicht (AiS) – Training in Sight (TiS) project in Berlin developed a strong methodology to check the service provider 'landscape' and the city structure to ensure replication was not taking place (MISTRA 2013c: 17).

However, in order to address needs gaps specifically, consultation with a large range of organisations is required. The Forum brought front-line staff together to problem-solve and identify key issues and gaps, and develop new initiatives. For example, out of a team 'power analysis' exercise conducted with support from the Carnegie Trust, the Forum's Digital Activism Project emerged: a project aimed to equip migrant and refugee community organisations with skills to excel in a digital society. The project explicitly filled an identified gap and is now seeking to implement digital training modules led by migrants for mainstream organisations (Ramalingham 2013: 57).

A different approach to planning integration projects was pioneered in Dublin as part of the Equal Youth project. Young people were trained as community researchers to conduct their own needs assessment. A virtual planning exercise was undertaken where organisations agreed to discuss how a local budget would be spent to best meet the needs of young people. This reportedly enabled interagency working and targeting of services to the needs of the client (MISTRA 2012: 22).

To deliver employability measures successfully, specific research and planning is highlighted as the key to effective integration programmes. Those deemed most successful contained an emphasis on identifying local employment needs relevant to communities living in specific areas. This has been identified as effective in Lisbon through tailored placements of doctors; in Reggio Emilia through matching migrants and adult social care services; and in Paris through developing individual mobility plans for refugees (Cities of Migration 2012a).

Similarly, Matchingprojekt Integration aims to match unemployed migrants with private enterprises in Denmark. The evaluation identified that they conducted particularly effective research and planning exercises. In total, 480 people participated in the programme in 2010. Of these, 25% of participants were engaged in employment three months after they had left the programme. At the time of evaluation, 120 participants had obtained a trainee position or a partly subsidised job position. Interestingly, a review of the programme emphasises that it has been more successful in getting migrants into employment than ethnic Danes (OSF 2012).

These sorts of actions need to be based on the gathering and analysis of information on the local labour market, on local skills shortages and on the employment potential offered by migrants. In order for civil society organisations to undertake these kinds of projects they may need support navigating the dynamics behind public administration. Making connections between migrant groups and employers, employment services and vocational training organisations to link demand with supply is also crucial but resource intensive. One successful project operates in Amsterdam where the Platform Arbeidsmarkt en Onderwijs (PAO) brings together key stakeholders and produces a twice yearly labour market monitor which provides the local administration with up-to-date data concerning the labour status of Amsterdam citizens, including those with a migrant background (DIVE 2013: 16).

The plan for a particular project should also take into account the participation of the majority community. The importance of this can be highlighted by the outcome of the opening of a new mosque in Duisburg (Cities of Migration 2012a). The mosque advisory board was made up of a large range of different people including a Catholic priest. The outcome of the consultations meant that there was no tension surrounding the opening of the new mosque. This can be compared to the planning of a new mosque in Cologne which provoked considerable conflict.

However, a potential problem with participatory planning is how to achieve representativeness. This is a particular concern in very diverse places with increasing numbers of small migrant groups. In the participatory planning initiative for the station area in Reggio Emilia, the vast majority of citizens who became involved turned out to be natives, in an area where most residents are of foreign origin (Pogliano 2012: 8). Nevertheless, when given time participatory planning has been a success, for example in Berlin. The Quartiermanagement (QM) programme was set up by the Senate in 1999 in 15 neighbourhoods, most of them with a high migrant population. A dedicated 'resident fund', a form of participative budgeting, led to previously unseen levels of local citizen involvement. With a particular focus on people with a migrant background, this participative policy enabled the city to

have a better understanding of the needs and priorities of migrant communities. By involving migrant residents in decisions to shape the use of 'resident funds' the feeling of shared ownership of local policies reportedly increased (DIVE 2013). Also, developing effective structures which allow migrants to contribute their views on communal activities such as festivals and events is thought to encourage wide ranging participation, as was the case with the Peoples of the World Festival in Bilbao (URBACT II 2010: 13).

Funding and evaluating integration practice

When examining evaluation practice, it is important to note first, that some indicators do not seamlessly correlate with levels of integration. For example, the level of inter-ethnic contact is a popular indicator of integration, but does not necessarily correlate with integration outcomes like financial capital and social mobility: some migrants may have low levels of inter-ethnic contact, but their social mobility is enhanced by the strength of their ties within a migrant community, while others may be civilly active but excluded from the labour market.

Second, there are many projects that engage in attitudinal change and anti-discrimination whose impacts are difficult to capture. For example 'soft issues' such as recognition, respect, feelings of belonging, tolerance and openness are notoriously difficult to evaluate. Even where detailed data is collected, it is not necessarily possible to make a direct link between an intervention and changes in outputs or outcomes (Jones 2012). Some also noted that attitudinal change may take several years to be visible (particularly, for example, when approaches were focused on young people who may not be included in surveys of the general population until they reach adulthood). The AMICALL project found that long-term work could easily be undermined by a serious local, national or international event (such as a terrorist attack) or changes to local services (Jones 2012). Thirdly, continued funding for integration projects is often contingent on demonstrable short-term results, yet integration progress will often only be seen over the course of many generations and can be hard to disentangle from the impact of other developments.

One solution has been devised by the Institute for Social Research (SCP) in the Netherlands, a government agency which conducts research into the social aspects of government policy. It has implemented some innovative approaches to measuring integration by running experiments to test levels of discrimination in society. One such experiment involved sending 1,300 job applications for vacancies, one set using non-Dutch names and another set using Dutch names (the applications were of a similar quality); these were sent to employers to gather a data set on discrimination in the labour market (Ramalingham 2013: 51).

Copenhagen is also implementing innovative evaluation processes to provide more concrete evidence of the diversity advantage. Through its Innoversity programme it recruited 30 companies and showed that diverse cleaning teams in ISS Facility Services generated 3.7% more earnings than homogenous teams. ISS has more than 11,000 employees in Denmark; they therefore calculated that if every cleaning team in Denmark were as diverse, it could mean a growth in revenue of DK 100 million per annum. The Danish government has published an official report proving that diversity within an organisation enhances innovative capacity by as much as 30% (Intercultural Cities 2013: 9).

Evaluations could also be shared between organisations so individuals can share innovative ways of capturing results and lessons learnt from previous projects. However, when funding is dependent on good outcomes this can also act as a strong disincentive to admitting failures. Funders and

foundations could change the donor–recipient relationship in order to promote greater critical analysis of outcomes. Foundations could set longer-term goals, like Mercator Foundation in Germany which states an objective of reducing educational inequality by 70% between 2005 and 2025 (Ramalingham 2013: 32).

Ramalingham argues that funders could have a wide-ranging impact on promoting a more learning-based model of evaluation. She argues foundations and funders should be active in setting goals based on learning rather than outcomes. The Swedish Inheritance Fund Commission was identified as a forerunner of this approach as it requires its funded projects to test out new ideas, or to develop innovative methods and come up with solutions to social issues. It recognises that innovation may be accompanied by failure but considers this as part of a learning process. If a funded project fails, the Commission pairs the project with a trained researcher to work together to assess both processes and outcomes, analyse what did and did not work, and identify lessons to be learned. The Commission then publishes these learning points in a series of reports, available for public download on their website (Ramalingham 2013: 52).

Conclusion

Several recurring themes emerged from the literature review of identified successful and innovative practices. A key issue in securing change from project learning was governance structure. In Member States with federal systems rather than a central unitary national authority, legislative changes were more feasible and therefore successful project outcomes may have had more impact. A second key theme that emerged from projects evaluated as successful was a commitment to understanding the needs of target groups, the majority society and also relevant local services. However, it was clear that small organisations often do not have the capacity to develop and maintain expertise in all these different areas. Also, funding structures and donor–recipient relationships were pivotal not only to establishing a successful practice but also learning from and disseminating the outcomes. Innovative approaches to information sharing and promoting a culture where problems can be reported were being pioneered by some but this was not widespread. It was also surprising so few evaluations contained migrant voices or were disaggregated by any category other than nationality or migration status (such as gender, age, ability, sexual orientation).

As established at the outset, this paper has not sought to isolate transferable integration initiatives but rather to review the available literature on identified successful, innovative practices. Transferability is a contested issue; however, the evaluated projects reviewed here indicate that variables affecting transferability include: the national, regional and local frameworks for inclusion and integration, political climate, resourcing and the way that this is structured, 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, 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, the challenges associated with policy transfer around integration are acknowledged (Gidley 2014).

It should also be noted that innovation does not necessarily mean better integration projects. A concern from some projects stemmed from the need to innovate to secure funds for projects that seemed to be already working well (Bücker-Gärtner 2011: 100). The notion of 'innovate or perish'

has also emerged in critiques on this issue (Uitermark and Duyvendak 2008). It seems a careful balance needs to be maintained between using approaches found to be successful elsewhere, and responding to the particularities of individual local situations, where previous experiences and processes may not be applicable.

A key factor affecting all civil society actors at the current time is the economic downturn. A recent MPI study concluded that the effects of the economic situation on the integration outcomes of migrants will be contingent on the depth of the recession, the nature of immigration to each country and the length of time spent developing and implementing integration policies (Collett 2011). Core policies for employment and training may be maintained but there may be little extra resource for new policies or innovative integration practices outside this area. NGOs are often the central service provider at the grassroots level but they depend on stable sources of funding for their own institutional survival. Furthermore, as shown above, donor–recipient relationships can have wide-ranging effects on project planning and implementation. Decreasing government and foundation support for NGOs leaves these organisations in a deeply vulnerable position (MRCF 2011).

Civil society and institutions are therefore facing many changes coupled with increasing diversity among Europe's population (Vertovec 2007). This may result in the growing significance of organisations that are strongly embedded in the local area, as it may be less desirable to implement projects for just one group based on ethnicity, legal status or migration trajectory. As well, the many differences and potential tensions within and between migrant, ethnic or religious groups and also levels of previous engagement are increasingly salient. Furthermore the growing complexity of migration regimes in some Member States may create confusion regarding eligibility, resulting in services and projects becoming fragmented at best and exclusionary at worst.

In addition, non-urban areas are increasingly encountering the effects of migration. Rural or semi-urban areas often have neither previous knowledge nor the service infrastructure to provide for migrant populations effectively, resulting in increased risks of marginalisation and exclusion from services and society.

It is clear that the flexibility of civil society institutions, in the range of migrants they potentially reach, versatility in services provided and tasks undertaken, enables them to provide pivotal integration support. This versatility may become more pertinent in an increasingly diverse European Union.

Appendix: Benchmarking criteria utilised by secondary sources

In the last decade, several EU-funded research studies have attempted to benchmark and measure integration of migrants across EU countries. In addition, evaluation reports and networks of cities have developed their own methods for defining successful integration practices. The problems inherent in benchmarking have been identified by a recent study by Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS 2009: 62) including, lack of common approach, ideological nature, personal scope, uncertainty of the benchmarking community, and methodological weaknesses. A table of benchmarking criteria including locations of good practice is included below. This is followed by a brief overview of the different networks and reports detailing their funders, methodologies and approaches.

Table 1: Benchmarking criteria for evaluating 'Good Practice' by secondary sources

Name of network	Location	Benchmarking Criteria
CLIP Network	Amsterdam, Arnsberg, Antwerp, Athens, Barcelona, Bologna, Breda, Brescia, Budapest, Copenhagen, Dublin, Frankfurt, Helsinki, Istanbul, Izmir, Kirklees, Lisbon, Liège, City of Luxembourg, Matarò, Malmö, Prague, Sefton, Stuttgart, Sundsvall, Tallinn, Terrassa, Torino, Turku, Valencia, Vienna, Wolverhampton, Wroclaw, Zagreb, Zurich	In-depth research in case study locations on the themes of housing, diversity policy, intercultural policy and ethnic business.
Cities of Migration	n/a	Inclusion in online library is determined by whether the self-selected case study is practical, innovative, successful and transferable.
DIVE	Amsterdam, Berlin, Leeds, London and Rome	The Migration Policy Group developed benchmarking and peer reviewing exercises supplemented by interviews and empirical research carried out by senior city officials.
EU-MIA	Barcelona, Bilbao, Hamburg, London, Nantes, Reggio Emilia, Turin, Vejle, Vienna, Visby	The project developed a methodology for selecting 'functioning practices' involving multiple mechanisms for identifying practices; five prerequisites to qualify for a long list; extensive evaluation on four axes (innovation, success, sustainability, transferability). The final case studies were chosen to represent different policy areas.
European Website on Integration	All Member States	Good practices are collected through a template and are selected through evidence of research and evaluation to illustrate effective, efficient, sustainable and/or transferable practices.
Intercultural Cities	Amadora, Arezzo, Barcelona, Bilbao, Dortmund, Duisburg, Bari, Campi Bisenzio, Capannori, Cartagena, Casalecchio di Reno, Castelvetro di Modena, Constanta, Erlangen, Fermo, Forlì, Fucecchio Fuenlabrada, Genova, Gexto, Ivano-Frankivsk, Jerez de la Frontera, Lodi, Kherson, Khmelnytskyi, Kristiansand, Lutsk, Mexico City, Milano, Montréal,	The Intercultural City Index benchmarks different cities in the programme. Analysis is based on a questionnaire involving 66 questions grouped in 14 indicators with three distinct types of data. Indicators are weighted for relative importance. These indicators comprise: commitment, education system, neighbourhoods, public services, business and labour market, cultural and civil life policies, public spaces, mediation and conflict resolution, language, media, international outlook, intelligence/competence,

Name of network	Location	Benchmarking Criteria
	Munich, Nizhyn, Novellara, Olbia, Offenburg, Palermo, Parla, Pavlohrad, Pizzo, Pompei, Pryluky, Ravenna, Rijeka, San Giuliano Terme, Sabadell, Sechenkivsky, Senigallia, Setubal, Tenerife, Trondheim, Torino, Turnhout, Unione dei Comuni-Savignano sul Rubicone, Västeras, Venice, Viareggio, Vinnystia, Yuzhne, Zhytomyr, Zurich.	welcoming and governance.
INTI-CITIES	Amaroussion, Belfast, Barcelona, Düsseldorf, Genoa, Helsinki, Lyon, Malmö, Milan, Rotterdam, Tampere, Utrecht.	Peer reviews utilised to assess general migrant-related integration policies. Benchmarked on general governance, individual empowerment, administrative cooperation, working partnerships. Indicators included: ambition, leadership, resources, implementation and evaluation.
LeCiM	Budapest, Catania Santander, Berlin, Bologna, Dunkerque.	Working group established to develop research grids in order to select case studies. A research study was carried out based on interviews with stakeholders from the six country locations.
MiStra	Dublin, Berlin, Vienna, Bologna, Taranto, Burgas, Prague, Budapest.	Best practices were chosen, based on previous experiences and research into successful social inclusion.
MRIP	Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Italy, Sweden, United Kingdom	Case studies of best practice were chosen by ENAR member organisations and subject to peer review.
OPENCities Monitor	Aarhus, Amsterdam, Auckland, Barcelona, Basel, Beijing, Berlin, Bucharest, Buenos Aires, Cape Town, Chongqing, Copenhagen, Düsseldorf, Edinburgh, Hamburg, London, Los Angeles, Madrid, Manchester, New York, Paris, São Paulo, Sofia, Toronto, Vienna, Zurich	The Monitor developed 53 indicators of city openness grouped into 11 areas: migration, freedom, barriers to entry, international events, international presence, education, international flows, infrastructure, quality of living, standard of living and diversity actions.

Overview of secondary sources

CLIP Network (Cities for Integration Local Policies), was established in 2006 by the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe, the city of Stuttgart and Eurofound and terminated at the end of 2012. It comprised a network of 30 European cities and a group of expert European research centres. The network aimed at enabling local authorities to learn from each other and to deliver more effective integration policies. Methods of good practice were identified through in-depth research in case study locations. Good practice guides have been developed for four modules (housing, diversity policy, intercultural policy, ethnic business) based on this data.

http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/populationandsociety/clip.htm

Cities of Migration is hosted by the Maytree Foundation, Canada. The project addresses integration issues that relate broadly to international migrants and their families seeking to improve local

integration practices in major immigrant receiving cities worldwide. The website acts as a repository for 'promising' practices in integration. The website defines a 'good idea in integration' as practical, innovative, successful and transferable.

http://citiesofmigration.ca/

DIVE, the Diversity and Equality in European Cities project, was led by EUROCITIES and ran from December 2008 to April 2010. It aimed to facilitate learning on innovative approaches to local governance. It involved the cities of Amsterdam, Berlin, Leeds, London and Rome, as well as the Migration Policy Group and ethical partnership combining benchmarking and peer reviewing exercises to assess cities' approaches to incorporating diversity and equality principles. The assessment was based on a set of benchmarks on the promotion of diversity and equality management, and interviews and empirical research carried out by senior city officials.

www.integratingcities.eu

EU-MIA was a research and action project, funded by the European Fund for the Integration of Third Country Nationals (EIF), delivered by the International Training Centre of the International Labour Organisation (ITC-ILO), the International and European Forum of Migration Research (FIERI) and the Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS) at the University of Oxford. The project aimed to establish connections between researchers, practitioners and training institutions in Europe.

The project developed a complex methodology for selecting 'functioning practices'. It reviewed a wide variety of literature from many different platforms including city networks and national repositories. An online survey was also distributed to experts on migration across Europe and local stakeholders were asked to identify good practice. Ten Functioning Practices were identified based on degree of innovation, degree of success, degree of economic and financial sustainability, degree of transferability, capacity and willingness of the local actors to learn.

http://www.eu-mia.eu/

EUROCITIES constitutes a network of 130 large cities across 30 European countries. Created in 1986, it aims to provide 'a platform for its member cities to share knowledge and ideas, exchange experiences, analyse common problems and develop innovative solutions through a wide range of Forums, Working Groups, Projects, activities and events'. Its activities cover a wide range of policy areas affecting cities, such as 'social affairs' for which it has set up a Working Group on Migration and Integration. It is the umbrella organisation for many of the platforms listed in this Appendix.

http://www.eurocities.eu/

The **European Website on Integration** is jointly operated by the Directorate General (DG) Home Affairs and the DG for Communication, Networks, Content and Technology. The website includes a database providing details of projects demonstrating good practices with regard to integration.

'Good practices' are defined by the website as 'strategies, approaches and/or activities that have been shown through research and evaluation to be effective, efficient, sustainable and/or transferable, and to reliably lead to a desired result'. Good practices are collected through a template which was developed to include 'all the information needed to judge whether the practice is adaptable to other contexts'.

Results from CSES evaluation of EIF found the largest EU Member States tend to account for the largest proportion of the records; approaching half the total (47.2%) is accounted for by Germany, France, Italy, Spain and the UK. However, the Netherlands have also contributed a relatively high proportion of good practice examples.

http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/en/

IBIS (Integration - Building Inclusive Societies) is an interactive community jointly built by the UN Alliance of Civilisations and the International Organisation for Migration to collect and highlight successful models of integration of migrants to counter polarising speech and stereotypes and to encourage the replication of these models in other contexts. Practices included in IBIS have not been used for this review as there is no formal evaluation of initiatives.

http://www.unaoc.org/ibis

The **INTEGRACE** project involved five main partners – three institutions from Western Europe (the Censis Foundation, Italy, the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute of Human Rights, Austria, and Halmstad University, Sweden) and two NGOs from Eastern Europe (the Centre for the Study of Democracy, Bulgaria, and the Peace Institute, Slovenia). The project partners with a history of immigration shared their knowledge and greater experience in refugee and/or immigration research and initiatives and in protecting vulnerable groups with NGOs from newer migration receiving countries.

Intercultural Cities is a Council of Europe programme which includes a wide range of municipal actors. It aims to provide policy-auditing expertise, strategy development guidance, networking and learning opportunities for cities. A second strand of the programme, carried out in partnership with EUROCITIES, is aimed at facilitating dialogue and exchange of good practices between politicians, citizens and municipal service providers.

The Intercultural City Index benchmarks different cities in the programme. Analysis is based on a questionnaire involving 66 questions grouped in 14 indicators with three distinct types of data. Indicators are weighted for relative importance. These indicators comprise: commitment, education system, neighbourhoods, public services, business and labour market, cultural and civil life policies,

public spaces, mediation and conflict resolution, language, media, international outlook, intelligence/competence, welcoming and governance.

www.coe.int/interculturalcities

The **INTI-CITIES** project (Benchmarking Integration Governance in European Cities) was co-financed by the INTI Funding Programme for Preparatory Actions of the European Commission's DG JLS. The project was coordinated by EUROCITIES in cooperation with the Migration Policy Group and 'Ethics etc'. The network was made up of 12 cities: Amaroussion, Belfast, Barcelona, Düsseldorf, Genoa, Helsinki, Lyon, Malmö, Milan, Rotterdam, Tampere and Utrecht.

The project used peer reviews to assess general migrant-related integration policies. It measured policies against a benchmark focusing on four pillars: general governance, individual empowerment, administrative cooperation, working partnerships. A set of indicators was designed to enable peers to assess cities' progress against the benchmark standards for each governance pillar. Indicators were: ambition, leadership, resources, implementation and evaluation. The report shares findings on eight core aspects of urban integration governance: needs assessment and data collection, integration in the municipality, target setting and evaluation, leadership, promoting diversity within administration, governance co-operation, working with partners, and empowering migrants.

www.integratingcities.eu

LeCiM (Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion) was a mainstreaming project aimed to improve education and vocational training actions for migrants carried out in medium-sized European cities. Local partnerships were established in Budapest, Catania and Santander, to transfer good practices from Berlin, Bologna and Dunkerque. Preliminary research was conducted and a working group was set up for research activities and to develop research grids in order to select case studies. A research study was carried out based on interviews with stakeholders from the six country locations.

The **MiStra** project aimed to involve policy makers, local authorities and public and private stakeholders in initiatives directed at the integration of policies and targeted interventions for the social inclusion of migrants, Roma and other minorities, identified as good practices at European level.

The project provided the transfer of four good practices, from the cities of Dublin, Berlin, Vienna and Bologna, in four target cities, Taranto, Burgas, Prague and Budapest. The four best practices were chosen, based on previous experiences of successful social inclusion.

http://www.mistraproject.eu/

MRIP (Migrants, Rights and Integration Project) was developed by ENAR and began its work in 2009. The MRIP partnership was made up of ENAR member organisations in Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus,

Italy, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. They were asked to identify projects taking place in their countries which would be amenable to a peer review and which would cast some light on the ways in which integration has been addressed. The aim was to obtain insight into: the way project plans were formulated, issues addressed, viewpoints of key stakeholders, and the extent to which migrants themselves were involved to provide leadership and direction in the work. Case studies of best practice were chosen by ENAR member organisations and subject to peer review.

http://www.enar-eu.org

The **OPENCities** Monitor is a new city benchmark developed by BAK Basel Economics on behalf of the British Council. The OPENCities Monitor is a collaboration and learning tool to measure city openness, defined as 'the capacity of a city to attract international populations and to enable them to contribute to the future success of the city'. It is based on 53 indicators of city openness that have been grouped into eleven areas: migration, freedom, barriers to entry, international events, international presence, education, international flows, infrastructure, quality of living, standard of living and diversity actions.

Data was gained from a large number of official sources (international, national, regional or city statistics) and information gathered from a wide range of other sources (embassies, private and public organisations). The cities are undergoing a constant process of benchmarking within their 'league' of comparable cities, and cases of best practice are developed from this benchmarking process.

http://www.opencities.eu

References

Akhavan, S. and Lundgren, I. (2010) 'Midwives' experiences of doula support for immigrant women in Sweden: A qualitative study', *Midwifery,* November 2010.

Anthias, F. (2013) 'Moving beyond the Janus face of integration and diversity discourses: towards an intersectional framing', *The Sociological Review*, 61: 323.

Bittman, T. (2011) 'Mentoring for migrants. Labour market integration of migrants in Austria: An example of a significant and effective integration model?' MA Masters Thesis in Advanced European and International Studies 2010–2011, Centre International de Formation Européenne.

Bücker-Gärtner, H. (ed.) (2011) *Europe Needs Innovative Ideas to Integrate Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities: Challenges and Creative Activities in Education and Civil Society (a Comparison of Five European Countries)*, Report of an International Seminar March 13th to 25th 2011, Sweden: Linnéuniversitet Kalmar/Växjö.

Collett, E. (2011) *Immigrant Integration in Europe in a Time of Austerity.* Transatlantic Council on Migration, Migration Policy Institute.

Centre for Strategy and Evaluation Services (CSES) (2013) *Study on Practices of Integration of Third-Country Nationals at Local and Regional Level in the European Union.* Brussels: European Union, April 2013.

Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (2009) *The Role and Potential of Local and Regional Authorities in the EU Framework for the Integration of Immigrants.* Brussels: European Union, April 2009.

CLIP Network (2006a) 'Cities for local integration policies. Draft Concept Paper for the Module on Housing'. Input for the first meeting of technical experts of the CLIP Network 11/12 September 2006, Dublin. Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

CLIP Network (2006b) *Integration of Migrants: Contribution of Local and Regional Authorities.* EF/06/22/EN Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Cities of Migration (2012a) *Good Ideas from Successful Cities: Municipal Leadership on Immigrant Integration.* Toronto: The Maytree Foundation.

Cities of Migration (2012b) *Practice to Policy: Lessons from Local Leadership on Immigrant Integration.* Toronto: The Maytree Foundation.

Commission of the European Communities (2007) *Third Annual Report on Migration and Integration*, *Communication from the Commission to the Council, The European Parliament, The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions,* Brussels, September 2007.

DIVE (2010) *Cities Accommodating Diversity: Findings and Recommendations from the Peer Review Project. DIVE Final Report*. Brussels, Eurocities.

European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) (2005) *Migrants, Minorities and Housing: Exclusion, Discrimination and Anti-discrimination in 15 Member States of the European Union.* Vienna, EUMC.

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) (2008) *Community Cohesion at Local Level: Addressing the Needs of Muslim Communities Examples of Local Initiatives.* Vienna, FRA.

Federal Ministry of Social Affairs Vienna. (2008), *Austrian Report on Strategies for Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2008-2010.* Federal Ministry of Social Affairs, Vienna, September 2008.

Gidley, B. (2014) 'Integration: rescaling and re-placing', in Anderson, B. and Keith, M. (eds) *Migration: The COMPAS Anthology*, COMPAS: Oxford.

Intercultural Cities (2013a) *The Outcomes and Impact of the Intercultural Cities Programme 2008– 2013.* Brussels, Council of Europe.

Intercultural Cities (2013b) 'Guidance for city policy-makers with good practice examples', *Joint action of the Council of Europe and of the European Commission.* Brussels, Council of Europe.

Jones, H. and Gidley, B. (2013) *Transnational Soup: Translating Local Integration Policies Across Borders*, London Urban Salon.

Jones, H. (2012) *AMICALL Country Report: United Kingdom.* Oxford, COMPAS, April 2012.

Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion (LeCiM) (2012) *Learning Cities for Migrant Inclusion Model Report: Dunkerque, France.* Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.

Migrant and Refugee Communities Forum (MRCF) (2011) *Migrant Communities and the 'Big Society' Struggling to Belong in the Age of Austerity.* London, Migrant and Refugee Communities Forum, March 2011.

Migrant Inclusion Strategies in European Cities (MiStra). (2013a) *Model report: Dublin, Ireland.* Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.

Migrant Inclusion Strategies in European Cities (MiStra). (2013b) *Model report: Berlin, Germany.* Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.

Nonchev, A., and Tagarov, N. (2012) *Integrating Refugee and Asylum-seeking Children in the Educational Systems of EU Member States.* Sophia, Center for the Study of Democracy.

OECD (2009) 'Managing highly-skilled labour migration: a comparative analysis of migration policies and challenges in OECD countries', *OECD Employment, Labour and Social Affairs Working Paper,* 79.

Open Society Foundations (2011) *At Home in Europe Project. Muslims in Marseille: Findings and Recommendations.* Open Society Foundations.

Open Society Foundations (2012) *At Home in Europe Project. Living Together: Projects Promoting Inclusion in 11 EU Cities.* Open Society Foundations.

Phillimore, J., Goodson, L., Watts, J. and Waddington, S. (2009) *The European Refugee Fund (ERF) II 2005–2007: an evaluation of ERF II 2007*. Croydon, Home Office.

Piekut, A., Rees, P., Valentine, G. and Kupiszwski, M. (2012) 'Multidimensional diversity in two European cities: thinking beyond ethnicity.' *Environment and Planning-Part A* 44(12): 2988.

Pogliano, A. (2012) *AMICALL Country Report: Italy.* FIERI, April 2012.

Ponzo, I., Gidley, B., Roman, E., Tarantino, F., Pastore, F. and Jensen, O. (2013) *Researching Functioning Policy Practices in Local Integration in Europe: A Conceptual and Methodological Discussion Paper.* International Training Centre of the International Labour Organization.

Ramalingham, V. (2013) *Integration: What Works? Research Report*. London, Institute of Strategic Dialogue.

Spencer, S. (2011) *The Migration Debate*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Uitermark, J., and Duyvendak, J. W. (2008) 'Citizen participation in a mediated age: neighbourhood governance in the Netherlands'. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32(1): 114-134.

URBACT II (2010) *Integration and Inclusion Case Study Summaries URBACT II.* OpenCities.

Vertovec, S. (2007) *New Complexities of Cohesion in Britain: Super-Diversity, Transnationalism and Civil Integration.* London, Commission on Integration and Cohesion.

Waddington, S., Phillimore, J. and Goodson, L. (2008) *The European Refugee Fund (ERF) ll 2005–2007: An Evaluation of ERF II 2006*. Croydon, Home Office.