
# Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper

## Building stronger, more united communities

A submission from the British Academy

**June 2018**

For further information, contact:

Barbara Limon

b.limon@britac.ac.uk

## Introduction

1) The British Academy is the UK's national academy for the humanities and social sciences. A Fellowship of over 1200 of the country's leading academics, the Academy received its Royal Charter in 1902. It exists to promote and speak up for its disciplines, and awards funding to researchers at all career levels.
2) The humanities and social sciences provide a critical lens through which Government and society can address the wide-ranging challenges we face today. From security to health, climate and demographic change and technology, the humanities and social sciences can provide a crucial means of focusing on the issues facing our world and offer solutions to seemingly intractable problems.
3) The British Academy has a strong track record in bringing both the expertise of our fellowship and insights from our academic disciplines to bear on questions of social integration and cohesion and is pleased to respond to this consultation.
4) We are currently exploring social integration, drawing on the full breath of our expertise in the humanities and social sciences, as part of our current work on the nature of Cohesive Societies. This work investigates the wider aspects and forms in which societies are sustained or weakened.
5) This response builds on recent work by the British Academy, most notably the '*If You Could Do One Thing*…' publications from December 2017 which the Green Paper references. We have also drawn on evidence from two large workshops held during Winter-Spring 2018 to consider the challenges of measuring social integration and the current state of quantitative evidence on social cohesion in Britain. We also consulted all of the disciplines within our Fellowship, from archaeology and languages, through to psychology and geography, when preparing this response.
6) This response represents the views of the British Academy, and not one specific individual.

**Q1: We define integrated communities as communities where people - whatever their background - live, work, learn and socialise together, based on shared rights, responsibilities and opportunities. Do you agree with our definition?**

As we state in our "If you could do one thing…" publication[1] we favour a **multidimensional** and **multileveled** view of integration. A range of different definitions of integration have been used by both public bodies and the academic community and our concern is that the definition proposed is too narrow.

A central idea across successful interventions is that of 'equal participation in a group or institution'. Whilst people in communities might have shared opportunities this does not necessarily mean they enjoy equal participation. The definition of an integrated community should not be constrained to living, working and learning together, although these may certainly be some of the means by which communities are formed[2].

Other potential avenues for integration by participation involve **civic and political engagement**. Both 'integration' and 'community' are better viewed in more expansive terms as emerging from creative social and cultural interactions, rather than shaping how these interactions take place in advance – people do not work, live and socialise together because they are inherently integrated, rather they become integrated because they live, work and socialise together.

It is also important to remember that people in community are also bound together in difference, not in sameness. Literally, 'community' means not just living together but 'giving together', and it is precisely because everyone is different that each has something to give.

[1] British Academy 2017, "If you could do one thing…" , Local actions to promote social integration key lessons, https://www.britac.ac.uk/publications/if-you-could-do-one-thing-local-actions-promote-social-integration

[2] Key references: John Dewey 1966, Democracy and Education [original 1916], New York: Free Press, Chapter 1; Gert Biesta 2013, The Beautiful Risk of Education, Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, Chapter 2; Roberto Esposito 2012, Terms of the Political, New York: Fordham University Press, Chapter 4; Tim Ingold, 2018, Anthropology and/as Education, London: Routledge, Chapter 1; Tim Ingold, 2018, Anthropology: Why it Matters, Cambridge: Polity, Chapter 2.

Integration has **historical**, **social** and **psychological** components that can often be wider and deeper than specific places or territories. There are also ways to characterise integration **behaviourally**, such as treating each other with mutual respect, voluntary and charitable activity, and actions that promote social inclusion. Given the importance of language skills and given that communication is the basis for all social life (see Q9 A&B for more detail) it is essential to include an explicit recognition that integration involves the capacity to share understanding through **communication**.

We welcome the distinction drawn between integration and assimilation, as we recognise that healthy communities can contain extremely diverse subcommunities. But we would add the requirement that members should be able to communicate with one another even if this requires bilingual or multilingual language skills. Multilingual communities are common across the world, and we should not assume, as the Green Paper appears to, that intercommunal communication necessarily requires a single dominant language. In many communities, multilingualism is prevalent.

The definition also pays little attention to the important issue of generational divides, which may well cross cut or compound ethnic and gender segregation. The continuity of any integration strategy depends in part on its being sustainable within and across generations over time, and this aspect requires considerably more attention in the strategy. It is also curious that class inequality has not been explicitly addressed as a significant barrier to social integration. Finally, it is noted that social integration also involves people's sense of having a shared environment, and therefore biophysical/environmental issues may also play an important role in the success of social integration strategies.

In summary, we suggest that the definition should be elaborated to include:

- age
- social class
- location

- background and heritage
- communication
- equal opportunities
- mutual respect

**Q2: We believe that the varied nature and scale of integration challenges means that tailored local plans and interventions are needed to tackle the issues specific to particular places. Do you agree?**

The Academy completely agrees with the need to tailor interventions. The question is how best to bring that about. Ted Cantle[3] argues that local plans will help to build a new language of integration and if they are based around the lived experience of people in local communities they are more likely to succeed.

Many of the examples of successful intervention projects featured in our social integration reports used 'place' to shape their work very effectively[4]. However, it is important to recognise that not all communities are place-based, particularly in the digital age. Even in the case of place-based communities, there can be different conceptions of 'the local', ranging from neighbourhoods comprising only a few streets to major cities. People can exist in psychological and virtual communities that are as, or more, compelling for them than the face-to-face neighbourhoods and localities that surround them. These psychological communities may involve individuals who are dispersed across or between large geographical areas, and many may rarely, if ever, meet face to face. It is therefore important that any proposed interventions adequately take account of the local circumstances.

This consideration must include attention given to political and public service infrastructure which may be uneven. Some important institutions such as police force areas may not align with local authority boundaries for example. It must also

[3] British Academy 2017, "If you could do one thing…" , Local actions to promote social integration essay collection page 8, https://www.britac.ac.uk/publications/if-you-could-do-one-thing-local-actions-promote-social-integration

[4] See in particular refugwee case study British Academy 2017, "If you could do one thing…" , Local actions to promote social integration case studies page 35, https://www.britac.ac.uk/publications/if-you-could-do-one-thing-local-actions-promote-social-integration

recognise that local plans should be sensitive to diversity, difference and disagreement. It is a mistake to assume that 'local' means 'homogeneous' or 'consensual'.

We therefore doubt the worth of a focus that is exclusively on local plans and initiatives. A multi-layered approach, including the national level, is likely to be necessary (an example may be that local strategies may not be feasible for addressing the unaffordability of housing, which may disproportionately affect, or result in spatial concentration of, particular groups at a local level).

Local initiatives need to be consistent with national legislation (for example on hate crime or forced marriage) and one should not rule out the possibility that new national initiatives (perhaps involving new national resources for local initiatives, new legislation in order to develop general powers to tackle emerging problems) will be needed. There may also be an important role for leadership at a national level, paralleling the Green Paper's emphasis on local leadership, to provide a national narrative and vision of the future.

**Q4: The Green Paper proposes that we need to build the capacity of our leaders to promote and achieve integration outcomes. Do you agree?**

Whilst we welcome the measures set out in the Green Paper, the majority of these focus on a top-down approach and we would stress the need to develop and support leadership within communities, which would complement this approach.

Leadership involves more than expecting or requiring leaders to implement strategies or outcomes. To be successful, leaders must usually be regarded by their members as strongly representative of their values, interests and views - to embody and protect some central aspects of their group's identity. In some cases, this may prove to be at odds with the idea of integration. For leaders to broker bonds with other groups they must first be trusted and trustworthy, and second be willing and able to innovate and reach out to the other groups.

The relevant audiences for leaders include not just their 'own' communities but also those with which they may seek closer integration. A powerful, but difficult, way that leaders can build the bridges required for social integration is by demonstrating their understanding and willingness to accept certain parts of the values or objectives of the other groups. Their capacity to do so requires support both for the skills and the opportunities that are required.

**Q5: The Green Paper proposes measures to support recent migrants so that they have the information they need to integrate into society and understand British values and their rights and responsibilities. Do you agree with this approach?**
The first key lesson in our 'If you could do one thing' report is that "social integration is a two-way process". Thus, we welcome any measures to improve integration which would benefit all communities, both newly arrived and resident. We would suggest that is it important not to see integration entirely as an accommodation to pre-existing structures as it denies migrants a creative or genuinely participatory role in the process.

In particular, the purpose and use of the Life in the UK test should be changed. At present it provides few if any clear benefits for migrants, and rather seems to serve more as a token means of indicating to others that immigrants are required to take steps to know their new country and integrate in to it. This seems more like an initiation rite than a useful learning experience.

It would better achieve this outcome by focusing more on behaviour, skills, attitudes and practical knowledge – ensuring that a new migrant can navigate their environment, rather than having learned a particular set of facts. This could include measures as practical as what the accepted rules are around queuing for a bus and is likely to be of more use than the ability to recall the names of historical or sporting figures.

Some of our Fellows question the concept of 'fundamental British values', as it is not clear that any of these are uniquely British. The concept might be better reframed as

'fundamental values that Britain respects'. The test could also better help migrants by acknowledging that xenophobia exists and providing advice on how to act when faced with it.

Migrants to Britain should to be able to retain links with their culture of origin. This should not be viewed as in contradiction to a desire to assist integration but rather as one of several measures to help migrants understand British values and their rights and responsibilities in this culture while engaging in a new and creative adaption process.

Finally, policy in this area must avoid being seen as paternalistically involving only disadvantaged communities. More advantaged communities and the wider British establishment have an equal responsibility for understanding and participating in social integration. And, relatedly, 'two-way' also must be about settled cultures and communities accepting the need to change in light of immigration. Integration is also hampered when it is assumed that only immigrants need to adapt, and not receiving communities.

**Q6: The Controlling Migration Fund was constructed to deal with the short-term migration pressures and associated costs that local authorities can encounter. Do you think it adequately achieves this objective?**

The problem of unexpected and uneven migration pressures clearly requires both local and national coordination, as well as cooperation between contiguous local authorities. The question of value for money therefore needs to be addressed in the context of whether the expenditure meets needs both within and across local authorities (that is, whether the local authority boundary is a useful or functional way to address the problems, as well as whether the resources are used in the most effective way for both medium and long term objectives). An evaluation of the Fund by National Audit Office should help to establish if it has worked well in achieving its objectives and might point to how it could be improved.

**Q7: The Green Paper proposes measures to ensure that all children and young people are prepared for life in modern Britain and have the opportunity for meaningful social mixing with those from different backgrounds. Do you agree with this approach?**

The National Audit Office evaluations of the National Citizen Service indicate that its approach has been successful. Other types of action, such as the work across schools and prisons by the Anne Frank Trust, have also been successful. Some of these approaches have been subjected to robust evaluation and therefore are good examples of effective and defensible strategies[5].

In order to better understand the impact of educational structures on social integration it would be valuable to directly measure the social (not just educational) effects of educational structures that both actively and passively segregate children by social categories such as faith, ability or aptitude, income or geographic criteria, and to map the opportunities for contact and mixing in localities with different educational arrangements and proportions of schools of different types.

Whilst the focus within the Green Paper is on school education, we would argue that education to support integration is not only needed for young people, but for people of all generations, and it must be sustained. It is important that the education strategy includes multi- and inter-generational approaches to ensure that the strategy is effective, enduring and inclusive.

A more generous definition of social mixing is also needed – this could be virtual, as long as meaningful communities of practice can be identified, but it could also mean mixing with children and adults from different backgrounds from the same or related ethnic communities. It should not be automatically assumed that mixing means inter-ethnicity.

[5] Abrams**,** D., Swift, H.J., & Mahmood, L. (2016). *Prejudice and unlawful behaviour: Exploring levers for change.* Research report 101. London: Equality and Human Rights Commission. ISBN 978-1-84206-677-5. https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/research-report-101-prejudice-and-unlawful-behaviour.pdf

**Q9(a)The Green Paper proposes a number of measures to improve the offer for people to learn English. Do you agree with this approach?**
**Q 9(b)Do you have any other suggestions on how we can improve the offer for people to learn English?**

We agree strongly with the proposals contained in Chapter 4, and are particularly pleased to see the intention to develop a national strategy for England, following the proposals by NATECLA (National Association for Teaching English and other Community Languages to Adults)[6], who have much expertise to offer in this area.

There is substantial research evidence that communities can sustain multiple languages and that all individuals benefit cognitively from speaking two or more languages. We would also argue that attempts at encouraging people to learn English should not be at the expense of devaluing or attempting to restrict use of native languages.

It is also important to remember that individual choices about learning and using languages are heavily influenced by two considerations which often conflict:

- instrumental: how useful will the language be?
- integrative: how far does the learner identify with the language's community?

The Green Paper does not appear to explore the psychological pressures which prevent individuals from learning English despite the obvious benefits. Research on ethnolinguistic vitality shows clearly that people's commitment to maintain their heritage language reflects its crucial status as embodiment of a central social identity. That identity may be perceived as threatened by the dominance of the host community's language, English. Reducing this psychological threat is therefore an important part of enabling people to embrace the second language.

It is important to address attitudes in the wider monolingual English-speaking community, which can feel threatened by subcommunities speaking other languages. Integration requires change in the wider community as well as in the

[6] http://www.natecla.org.uk/news/834/Towards-an-ESOL-Strategy-for-England

subcommunities. For integration to be successful English speakers will need to believe that subcommunities need not threaten the native English majority, that loyalties can be complex and multiple, and that tolerance and patience are more productive than intolerance and anger. Social interaction requires accommodation by both parties, and therefore a part of the strategy for language must include visibly supporting the English speaking community to understand better how to communicate with other language users.

The larger target should be a bilingual subcommunity where everyone speaks at least one language in addition to English, and where everyone is able to sustain their desired level of emotional commitment (loyalty) to all their languages – i.e. their motivation is integrative rather than purely instrumental. Such communities exist all over the world, and already exist in many cities.

It would also be helpful to distinguish more clearly between **language** and **literacy**. The distinction is important for two reasons:

- Literate and illiterate students need very different kinds of ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) teaching. Literacy is best taught in relation to the first language rather than tied to a second language, so it would be better to teach literacy first in relation to the first language rather than combining it with English.
- The literacy gap isn't restricted to migrant communities, but is a much more pervasive weakness in our society. According to an OECD report[7], 7 million adults in England have such poor literacy that they struggle to read the instructions on a bottle of aspirin; this figure puts England at the bottom of the list of OECD countries. It is likely that the figure includes the much smaller one (of 770,000 or 850,000, depending on the source) for non-English speakers, so the literacy challenge calls for joined-up action by the agencies responsible for ESOL and for English speakers.

[7] https://www.oecd.org/skills/piaac/The_Survey%20_of_Adult_Skills_Reader%27s_companion_Second_Edition.pdf

Funding for ESOL is a major issue, and we are concerned by the impact that reductions in funding for ESOL are having. A House of Commons paper[8] reports that funding for ESOL courses halved from 2010 to 2017, despite increased calls on migrants to learn English.

There is a high level of willingness to learn and improve English among migrants which is clearly demonstrated by waiting lists for ESOL courses that are longer than ever before,[9] and in some cases can be as long as three years[10]. Refugee Action also points out that a young mother who wants to attend an ESOL course needs childcare support which is not on offer[11]. English language provision is also very limited for those with disabilities or who are deaf.

Given these previous reductions in funding we question whether the proposed amount of £10 million over five years will be adequate to meet the aspirations of the Green Paper. Given the need for a stable professional supply of expert ESOL teachers, uncertainties around funding are problematic. A more predictable funding regime could motivate ESOL learners by offering the possibility of a career as a professional bilingual ESOL teacher.

As far as language is concerned, interventions are divided between two totally separate fields of activity: for school children (EAL = English as an Additional Language) and for adults (ESOL = English for adult Speakers of Other Languages). Both these have professional associations NALDIC (National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum) and NATECLA (National Association for Teaching English and other Community Languages to Adults) respectively.

[8] https://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/CBP-7905

[9] http://www.natecla.org.uk/news/850/Progress-made-towards-national-ESOL-strategy-but-more-needs-to-be-done

[10] https://www.refugee-action.org.uk/6179-2/

[11] For example see the case study of Xenia, where one factor in their success was that they made childcare available to enable people to attend. British Academy 2017, "If you could do one thing…" , Local actions to promote social integration case studies, https://www.britac.ac.uk/publications/if-you-could-do-one-thing-local-actions-promote-social-integration

Both of these associations bring together volunteers with an enormous amount of enthusiasm and expertise, including research-based advice on teaching. However, teaching English to speakers of other languages is challenging, and especially so for teachers who have little training in linguistics. Both kinds of English teacher (EAL and ESOL) should be recognised as a specialised profession with a proper career progression to encourage them to stay in the profession.

One approach might be to be more explicit about having a goal of 'integration, not assimilation' by supporting the teaching of community languages (including literacy). Many minority communities already run 'Saturday schools' where children learn their heritage language, but these are run and paid for by local volunteers who often have no expertise in teaching, let alone this particular kind of teaching. If support was made available, including training for teachers, this would build confidence in the older generation. This approach could also open doors to ESOL via the Saturday schools, with a funded bilingual ESOL teacher (preferably from the local community) providing both bilingual teaching and a model for the intended target of the teaching. This approach could potentially grow the body of professional bilingual ESOL teachers able to work not only in Saturday schools but also in the other initiatives listed in the Green Paper. This possibility could provide strong motivation for monolingual adult learners looking for rewarding work.

**Q10: The Green Paper proposes measures to ensure that people, particularly those living in residentially segregated communities, have opportunities to come together with people from different backgrounds and play a part in civic life. Do you agree with this approach?**

Yes, these opportunities are important, but they would benefit everyone, not just immigrant communities. As some of the examples featured in our "If you could do one thing…"[12] reports highlight, some of the most successful local actions offered something to both the settled and incoming communities.

[12] British Academy 2017, "If you could do one thing…" , Local actions to promote social integration key lessons, https://www.britac.ac.uk/publications/if-you-could-do-one-thing-local-actions-promote-social-integration

Some of the Fellows consulted for this response suggested that the concept of place invoked in the question appears over-simplified. A clearer statement of how residential segregation works within and between social classes would avoid the sense that the 'measures' mentioned in this question are likely to be directed paternalistically at segregated poorer, immigrant communities rather than equally segregated richer, white communities.

Is it also important to note that 'place' acts not as a static, bounded and geographically constraining feature of social life but rather as a creative and progressive social process defined by multiple, complex and overlapping identities and interactions in constant states of becoming. We need to avoid restricting our definitions to involve only fixed or pre-determined spatial units[13].

**Q11: The Green Paper proposes measures to provide tailored support to people, especially those who may not currently be active in the labour market, to build their confidence and skills to take up employment. Do you agree with this approach?**

We agree that this is a valuable approach. There are case studies which demonstrate that this approach[14] has been helpful to young people. However, it is important to recognise, firstly, that there may be a range of reasons for inactivity. Economic inactivity among older Muslim women may have different causes and solutions from that of 'discouraged workers' who have tried but given up looking for work. Different approaches will be needed. Secondly, the evidence shows clearly that the problems are not restricted to the economically inactive. As the Green Paper emphasises, unemployment rates can be much higher among minorities than the average for the white British population. Field experiments, including recent ones from 2017, show that equally-qualified applicants from ethnic minorities have to make more applications than white British applicants in order to receive a positive

[13] See the British Academy's Where We Live Now set of reports on place-based policymaking - aligning the design and resourcing of policy at the most appropriate scale of place, in order to develop meaningful solutions, which improve people's lives. https://www.britac.ac.uk/where-we-live-now

[14] See in particular Moving On Up in British Academy 2017, "If you could do one thing…" , Local actions to promote social integration essay collection page 76, https://www.britac.ac.uk/publications/if-you-could-do-one-thing-local-actions-promote-social-integration

response from employers. While it will be important to build the confidence and skills of the people affected, it is also important to ensure that they do have equal opportunities both in the labour market and in training, e.g. for apprenticeships. Unequal treatment of minority applicants therefore needs to be tackled (more work could be done to assess the usefulness of name-blind applications for example). The Fair Employment programme in Northern Ireland is a model of an effective scheme for tackling this kind of issue.

**Q12: The Green Paper proposes measures to encourage integration and resist divisive views or actions. Do you agree with this approach?**

We support measures to reduce prejudice and discrimination and measures that improve the situation of protected characteristics and other vulnerable groups in society. There is still more to be done to assess the relative contribution of different strategies[15], including the challenge of having potentially inconsistent messages emerging from inclusion-focused strategies to reduce prejudice, discrimination and hate crime, and from prevention/security focused strategies to tackle extremism. Integration is prevented by divisive views and actions, which cut across society, can be deeply embedded, and are strongly related to narrow understandings of nationhood. A wide spectrum of response required, and long-term, careful thinking in tacking prejudice and discrimination.

**Q 14. The Green Paper proposes core integration measures for national and local government to focus on. Do you agree these are the right measures?**

While many of the proposed integration measures are undoubtedly valuable, there are a number of important omissions and in some cases a lack of clarity about what exactly is being measured, and what the rationale is for each measure.

[15] Abrams, D., Swift, H.J., & Mahmood, L. (2016). *Prejudice and unlawful behaviour: Exploring levers for change.* Research report 101. London: Equality and Human Rights Commission. ISBN 978-1-84206-677-5. https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/research-report-101-prejudice-and-unlawful-behaviour.pdf And, Walters, M.A., Brown, J. & Widlitzka, S. (2016*). Causes and motivations of hate crime*. Research report 102. London: Equality and Human Rights Commission, ISBN 978-1-84206-678-2

The Green Paper proposes thirteen indicators. Eight are focused on measuring individual behaviour and attitudes and five focus on aspects of institutional arrangements. Seven are to be measured at both local and national levels, and six at local level only. The institutional indicators are particularly problematic. As is made clear in the Green Paper, they all need to be refined in the light of policy developments, and this is reasonable. However, the rationale for them is not altogether clear and should be clarified in advance.

One might have expected that the chosen indicators would directly measure the key elements of the definition of integration which is being proposed – namely "communities where people – whatever their background – live, work, learn and socialise together, based on shared rights, responsibilities and opportunities". In practice the first indicator looks at none of these but at an important barrier to integration, namely English language proficiency. The second indicator looks at whether people are aware of their shared rights and responsibilities; indicator 3 tries to capture whether people live, work and socialise together while indicator 4 seems to be geared to measuring opportunities for contact. Indicator 5 tries to capture whether young people socialise together at school; indicator 6 looks at education and training opportunities, while indicator 7 looks at employment support but not at other opportunities or barriers for working together.

Other barriers, such as discrimination in the housing and labour markets or other forms of social exclusion (deriving perhaps from poverty or economic deprivation) are omitted entirely. There is a partial mismatch between indicators and concept, as well as inconsistent treatment of opportunities/barriers and outcomes. And there are further puzzling aspects which we discuss further below.

Our suggestion would be to have separate indicators which concern both the key 'outcomes' in the definition, and the key barriers towards achieving these outcomes. The outcome indicators might therefore cover:

- Living together
- Working together

- Learning (in school, college and university) together
- Socialising together
- Participating together in civic activity
- Commitment to shared responsibilities
- Awareness of shared rights
- Mutual respect
- Public engagement and participation/sense of the commons

The barriers might include:

- Fluency in English
- Rates of unemployment (since unemployment will prevent working together) or perhaps rates of discrimination or rates of economic participation
- Rates of school exclusion and of staying on in school, college, apprenticeship and university, and of NEET. Perhaps the indicator should look at ratios of acceptances to applications to establish whether there is equal treatment.
- Rates of poverty and deprivation (likely to be a major factor in residential segregation)
- Electoral registration (likely to be related to civic engagement)
- Cultures of identity and belonging

For all indicators, we strongly recommend using or building on existing measures, particularly those which are used in the Race Disparity Audit (which should be encouraged to develop the local granularity of their measures).

**Our more detailed comments on the indicators are as follows:**

We consider first the indicators measuring individual attitudes, skills and behaviour. These are in general reasonably clear and, because they are intended to be measured at the individual level, can realistically be measured through new or existing survey measures.

***Indicator (1) English language proficiency.*** We would suggest that existing measures such as those contained in the OECD's PIAAC survey of adult skills (which has

already been conducted nationally in Britain) would provide a valuable baseline for English language proficiency. We also notice that ESOL provision will only be monitored 'among the most isolated groups'; surely there is a need to monitor all ESOL provision?

***Indicator (2) Awareness of shared rights and responsibilities.*** As column 5 of the indicator rightly says, there is no established national dataset for this indicator. It is not entirely clear whether this indicator is intended to be primarily one of knowledge about rights and responsibilities or of commitment to those principles. It is also rather unclear what particular rights and responsibilities are intended to be measured.

***Indicator (3) type and diversity of social networks (friends etc.).*** The questions in the former Citizenship survey could provide a good baseline for measuring social ties. It might be better to focus on measuring social ties or contacts rather than networks themselves, which is a much more demanding measurement exercise. It is also unclear whether the measure is intended to focus on horizontal ties between different ethnic groups or whether vertical ties between different social strata are also included. If the aim is to cover friends, colleagues, neighbours and online contacts, this in effect amounts to at least four indicators. We are concerned that this may be over-ambitious.

***Indicator (4) Type and context of social mixing between groups.*** It is not entirely clear how this differs from indicator 3. If it is intended to capture opportunities for social mixing, then this might perhaps better be regarded as an institutional measure. (E.g. a major driver of mixing is the composition of the local community – but this is a property of the area itself not of an individual). Perceptions of opportunities could be measured at the individual level, but there is considerable evidence that perceptions of, e.g. neighbourhood composition, can be seriously in error and may tell us more about individuals' prejudices than about actual opportunities. The purpose and scope of this indicator needs to be clarified.

***Indicator (5) social mixing in segregated schools.*** It is not entirely clear why this indicator is limited to segregated schools as the evidence shows that, even within ethnically diverse schools, social mixing across ethnic boundaries can be quite limited. Furthermore, it might be better to regard this as another domain of indicator 3. Nor is it clear why this indicator is to be measured only at a local level whereas indicator 3 is national as well.

***Indicator (6) Access to education and training opportunities among the most isolated groups.*** It is not entirely clear what the force of 'the most isolated groups' is. For example, Black Caribbeans are not socially isolated, and yet appear to be seriously under-represented in apprenticeship training. They also have very high rates of NEET (NEET has been shown by the NAO to have major implications for a wide range of integration-related outcomes). NEET should be a key indicator. Another crucial indicator should be school exclusion, which has major scarring effects, and may well be an important driver of lack of integration. Again, it is not clear why this is to be measured only at a local level, since there might be national policy implications.

***Indicator (7) Access to employment support for the most isolated groups.*** Again, it is not immediately apparent why isolated groups would be the focus to the exclusion of say, Black Caribbeans. Nor is it clear why this indicator focusses on employment support rather than on actual rates of employment and of unemployment. Unemployment disparity is mentioned throughout the report, and in the Prime Minister's preface, and yet does not appear as an indicator in its own right. Perhaps there is an assumption that lack of employment support is the principal barrier to employment, but this is not to our knowledge well-evidenced. There is also evidence on the extent of racial discrimination in employment which then undermines integration and employment support is unlikely to be able to make up for discrimination by employers. Since unemployment rates are readily available from existing data sources, these would appear to be an important and practical inclusion (eg from the Race Disparity Audit). Unemployment has been shown to be a major

driver of a wider range of important outcomes, and is likely to be a major driver of lack of integration.

***Institutional indicators – indicators (8) to (13).***

As column five of the table makes explicit all six institutional indicators need to be refined in order to make them measurable in practice. However, it is not clear to us exactly what the objectives for these indicators are. Are these perhaps intended not as direct indicators of integration outcomes but as indicators of policy inputs, designed to help evaluations of the success of the policy interventions being proposed in the Integration Strategy? If this interpretation is correct, it might be better to make this explicit and to present these six indicators in a completely separate table. However, it is not clear to us how the policy evaluation would proceed. Is it intended for example that the change in the outcomes in the areas with new interventions would be compared with the change in outcomes in matched but non-intervention areas? If so, with only five intervention areas, how could one demonstrate convincingly that the intervention was successful? We wonder if it might be better simply to state at this stage that rigorous evaluations (of a form yet to be decided) would be undertaken of the major policy interventions.

***Indicator (8) better coordinate of local English language support provision.*** It is unclear how 'better coordination' maps on to the specific proposals in chapter 4 on 'what are we are going to do?'. Is it intended to refer to the coordinated referral service proposed in chapter 4? But then many other proposals are put forward in chapter 4. Is it the intention to evaluate these too? Or is indicator 8 intended to be merely illustrative at this stage?

Our concern is that an indicator such as 'better promotion of integration in schools' is open to rather different interpretations. It also has unfortunate normative connotations or is perhaps circular and is simply a restatement of the individual level indicator 'social mixing among pupils in segregated schools'? In effect, to provide a measurable indicator at the institutional level, one needs to have a good

empirical understanding of the drivers of social mixing among pupils in segregated schools.