

CHARLES UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE

MASTER'S THESIS

2012

Alina Isakova

CHARLES UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE  
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL STUDIES

MASTER'S THESIS

**Knowledge for Inclusion:**

**Strategies and Implementation of Social and Structural Integration of  
Refugees in the European Union through Multifaceted Orientation, Education,  
and Training Programmes**

Author: Alina Isakova  
Subject: IEPS  
Academic Year: 2011/2012  
Supervisor: Petra Levrincova, Ph.D, LL.M  
Date Submitted: 18<sup>th</sup> May, 2012

## THESIS PROPOSAL

# Master Thesis Proposal

Institute of Political Studies

Faculty of Social Sciences

Charles University in Prague



Date: 02.04.2012

Author:	Alina Isakova	Supervisor:	Mgr. <b>Petra Levrincová LL.M., Ph.D.</b>
E-mail:	alinaisakova13@gmail.com	E-mail:	petra.levrincova@gmail.com
Phone:	...	Phone:	...
Specialisation:	IEPS	Defense Planned:	June 2012

Proposed Topic:

Knowledge for Inclusion: Strategies and Implementation of Social and Structural Integration of Refugees in the European Union through orientation, education, and training programmes.

Registered in SIS: Yes

Date of registration: 13.06.2011

## Topic Characteristics:

In 2009, about 25 % (of more than 250, 000) of EU-27 asylum granting decisions resulted in positive outcome (Eurostat, 2011). The most numerous groups are coming from Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran; South Asia (Pakistan, India, China); African countries; post-Soviet space (Russia, Georgia); Balkan peninsula (Eurostat, 2010). The refugee status obtainment, however, put the path for the further line of problems and issues connected with adaptation and integration into the European society.

Although new-comers are taken as inevitable burden, it is necessary to understand that successful integration process can contribute into the resolving of certain demographic and economic challenges of the European society so its enrichment in terms of plurality and diversity.

In particular, the initial stages of adaptation and social inclusion of the refugees through education and training are being elaborated on, including the potential of the transformative education approach and its role in the process of the social inclusion of refugees

The main objective of the work is aimed to trace the presence of OETPs in theoretical framework, political discourse, and practical implementation of integration policies on different levels of the EU realm.

### **Working hypotheses:**

Hypothesis #1: Social integration can be seen as highly effective strategy and model for constructive inclusion of refugees into social realm in the contemporary European context.

Hypothesis #2. In the framework of social integration strategy in its initial stages, stress is to be made on the implementation of structural integration.

Hypothesis #3: One of the most important and inalienable components of the structural and social integration is a variety of orientation, education, and training programmes and policies during adaptation period for newcomers who have been granted a refugee status.

Hypothesis #4: Structural and social integration is a multidimensional task that requires collaboration of official and civic society actors so individuals combining top-down and bottom-up approaches, and creating a network of cooperation and support.

Hypothesis #5: Community level interaction and social capital building plays decisive role for structure/social integration process.

### **Methodology.**

The variety of approaches brings me to the necessity of the inductive conclusion, including the tool of conceptual analysis. Deductive method is being used as for drawing a parallel between a 'bigger' picture of philosophical discussion (on the morality, ethics, humanitarianism) and social integration of refugees that can be built on the certain general principles and presumptions of humanitarian ethics. Here, the method of ethical inquiry can also be applied. Method of documentary analysis is applied across the given work along with a number of case studies offered as practical evidence.

Policy cycle framework approach and social network analysis are necessary for understanding certain political developments connected with implementation of the social integration schemes that involve multiple number of actors.

Although, the paper is grounded mainly on the methods of qualitative research, limited application of quantitative methods (analysis of data; evaluation of results) are useful for the second and third parts of the work being a supplement in proving certain hypothesis posed in the work. In this case, data is mainly derived from the European Union official sources, state's official resources, UNHCR and other non-governmental agencies data gatherings.

## **Outline:**

Chapter I. Introduction

Chapter II. Integration: Theoretical Framework. Points of Advantage.

- a. Integration, Society, and State in Perspective: Conceptual Field
- b. Strategies of Integration and Social Cohesion.
- c. Successful Integration Implementation: Outcomes and Advantages for Society.

Chapter III. OETPs as a tool of social and structural integration.

- a. Social and Structural Integration in Detail: Group Peculiarities and Evaluation Prospects.
- b. Orientation, Education, and Training Programmes (OETPs): potential stages, objectives-planning, and policy design.

Chapter IV. Multidimensional Implementation of OETPs.

- a. Supra-National Level: European Union.
- b. National Level.
- c. Community Level.
- d. Media Level
- e. NGOs and International Agencies.

Chapter V. Conclusion.

Bibliography.

## References / Bibliography:

Ager A. and Strang A., 2004. Indicators of Integration. Final Report. Home Office Development and Practice Report. Home Office. Crown copyright, 2004. Available at: <<http://library.npia.police.uk/docs/hodpr/dpr28.pdf>>

Ager, A. and Strang A., 2008. Understanding Integration: A Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies* (2008) 21 (2): pp.166-191.

Ager, A. and Strang A., 2010. Refugee Integration: Emerging Trends and Remaining Agendas. *Journal of Refugee Studies* Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 589-607.

Arroyabe, E. 1999. Europe as a mosaic of identities: some reflections. In: *Cultural Identities and Ethnic Minorities in Europe*. Ed. By Turton D., Gonzales Ferreras J. Universidad de Deusto. Bilbao. 1999; pp.23-34

Boucharde, Gérard. What is interculturalism? *McGill Law Journal - Review de Droit de McGill*, 56:2, pp.436-468.

Frohnen, Bruce P. and Grasso Kenneth L., 2009. Introduction. Rights in a Multicultural Age. In: *Rethinking Rights: Historical, Political, and Philosophical Perspectives* / edited by Bruce P. Frohnen and Kenneth L. Grasso. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2009.

James, S., n.d. Human Rights Education and Transformation through Art. HURIGHTS Osaka. Available at: <<http://www.hurights.or.jp/pub/hreas/11/11HRE%20and%20Transformation%20thru%20the%20Arts.pdf>>

Mestheneos Elizabeth and Ioannidi Elizabeth, 2002 .Obstacles to Refugee Integration in the European Union Member States. *Oxford Journals. Social Sciences. Journal of Refugee Studies*. Volume 15, Issue 3, pp. 304-320.

Parekh, Bhikhu. *Rethinking Multiculturalism. Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. Second edition.

Alina Isakova

Author

Petra Levrincova

Supervisor

## DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own work, based on the sources and literature listed in the appended bibliography. The thesis as submitted is 176.642 keystrokes long (including spaces), i.e. 98 manuscript pages.

Alina Isakova

---

Signature

In, Prague, Czech Republic, 18<sup>th</sup> May, 2012



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like here to express my gratitude to my supervisor Petra Levrincova, Ph.D, LL.M. and Magda Smieszek (regional integration officier, Central Europe, UNHCR) for their expert assistance with elaboration of the given work.

## ABSTRACT

This work is an attempt to outline prospects of theoretically and practically justified refugees' integration in its initial levels through orientation and education programmes using previous and present positive experience, but also taking into consideration the letter of International Law and Human Rights, moral and ethical perspective, so direct and prospective benefits for all the parties concerned, i.e. the EU, nation-states, communities, citizens, newcomers. The main focus is on multifaceted Orientation, Education, and Training Programmes (OETPs) that are presented as one of the most significant tools of social and structural integration into state's and public spheres. Presence of OETPs is being traced in theoretical framework, political discourse, and practical implementation of integration policies at different levels of the EU realm. There is a stress on policy design, implementation, and evaluation provided by national governments and local authorities so role of civic sector, activities of UNHCR, and community level enterprises.

## CONTENTS

Chapter I. Introduction.....	12-16
Chapter II. Integration: Theoretical Framework. Points of Advantage.	
a. Integration, Society, and State in Perspective: Conceptual Field.....	17-27
b. Strategies of Integration and Social Cohesion.....	27-34
c. Successful Integration Implementation: Outcomes and Advantages for Society.....	35-41
Chapter III. OETPs as a tool of social and structural integration.	
a. Social and Structural Integration in Detail: Group Peculiarities and Evaluation Prospects.....	42-52
b. Orientation, Education, and Training Programmes (OETPs): potential stages, objectives- planning, and policy design.....	52-68
Chapter IV. Multidimensional Implementation of OETPs.	
a. Supra-National Level: European Union.....	69-75
b. National Level.....	75-83
c. Community Level.....	84-87
d. Media Level.....	88
e. NGOs and International Agencies.....	88-91
Chapter V. Conclusion.....	92-105
Bibliography.....	106-117

## Chapter I. Introduction

In 2009, about 25 % (of more than 250, 000) of EU-27 asylum granting decisions resulted in positive outcome (Eurostat, 2011). The most numerous groups of refugees are coming from Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran; South Asia (Pakistan, India, China); African countries; post-Soviet space (Russia, Georgia); Balkan peninsula (Eurostat, 2010). Of course, burden of reception is not divided equally among European states (with Spain, Greece, and Italy in the vanguard) so the final resettlement points (Nordic countries and Germany). The upcoming Common Refugee Asylum System is to decide this problem of procedural complications and burden-sharing issues. The paper is concentrating on refugees that have been already granted an official status. However, final refugee status obtainment by asylum-seekers put the path for the further line of problems and matters connected with adaptation and integration into the European society.

This work is an attempt to outline prospects of theoretically and practically justified refugees' integration in its initial level through orientation and education programmes. It is taking into consideration the letter of International Law and Basic Human Rights, moral and ethical perspective, and, obviously, direct and prospective benefits for all the parties concerned, i.e. the EU, nation-states, communities, citizens of European states, and newcomers themselves. The matter of integration is also approached from the point of social cohesion strategies applied by states in their official policies and wider theoretical perception of integration. Additionally, policy design, implementation, and evaluation provided by national governments and local authorities are of great matter as a role of civic sector, activities of international agencies so community level enterprises.

In general, integration is being reconsidered as a highly effective strategy and model for constructive inclusion of refugees into social realm in the contemporary European context. Integration can be divided into three basic stages, i.e. structural (starting from status legalization and citizenship obtainment to inclusion into the institutional aspects and structure of state's realms); social (public sphere and civil society); cultural (values transformation; acculturation; or assimilation).

Here, stress is to be made on structural and social integration into the institutional/social structures of state. In particular, the initial stages of adaptation and social inclusion of the refugees through education and training are being elaborated. Author of the present work suggests a general term – OETPs - as for Orientation, Education, and Training Programmes that can be seen as a generalized approach implying the variety of knowledge delivery/obtainment practices for integration purposes across the European Union. There are also distinctive stages suggested for OETPs, i.e. Education, or Introduction into Life; Orientation, or Introduction into Society; Civic Education, or Introduction into Action; Training and re-qualification. Every stage is complementary to certain objectives, tactics, and strategic aims of integration.

Structural and social integration with usage of OETP tool is a multidimensional task that requires collaboration of official and civic society actors so individuals combining top-down and bottom-up approaches, and creating a network of cooperation and support. Special attention is to be paid to local level of implementation so community level interaction, and social capital building. Thus, the work is aimed to trace the presence of OETPs in theoretical framework, political discourse, and practical implementation of integration policies on different levels of the EU realm.

The variety of theoretical approaches brings me to necessity of using method of inductive conclusion, including tool of conceptual analysis. Deductive method is being used as a complementary tool for drawing a parallel between a 'bigger' picture of philosophical discussion (on the morality, ethics, humanitarianism) and integration of refugees that can be built on certain general principles and presumptions of humanitarian ethics. Here, method of ethical inquiry can also be applied. Method of documentary analysis is being used across the given work along with a number of case studies offered as practical evidence of theoretical assumptions. Additionally, policy cycle framework approach and social network analysis are necessary for understanding certain political developments connected with implementation of integration schemes that involve multiple numbers of actors at diverse social and political stages.

Although, the paper is grounded mainly on methods of qualitative research, limited application of quantitative methods (analysis of data; evaluation of results) are useful for the second and third parts of the work being a supplement in proving certain hypothesis posed. In this case, data is mainly derived from the European Union official sources, state's official resources, UNHCR and other non-governmental agencies data gatherings.

In order to construct a theoretical vision of the concept of integration, wide amount of literature can be of use, although variety of approaches and suggestions can be complicated. Thus, here the general assumptions are offered by the author of the given work as a starting ground that also reflect the points on approaching the issue. Refugees' integration has been covered more extensively by researchers mainly in the end of XX and beginning of XXI century. For instance, Ager A. and Strang A. have made a significant input into the research of refugees' integration. As for orientation and education programmes for refugees, there is no much specific

literature that can be found. However, research of integration theory and practices, social cohesion strategies, refugees integration (including certain sources concentrating on the European realm) so transformative education and refugees' education – all could be of help in construction of the theoretical framework for OETPs' strategies and practices research.

In Chapter II, there is an outline of the conceptual field of integration in the context of society, state's society, and European Society of Diversity in particular. The first section of the chapter is devoted to a descriptive analysis of definition, concept, and characteristics of `integration` term that includes historical perspective so contemporary social dialogue but also gives an insight into a greater context, including phenomena of inclusion, so exclusion and discrimination as contrasting terms.

As following, strategies of social cohesion (e.g. assimilation, multiculturalism) are being elaborated in their interconnection with the phenomenon of integration. Thus, we can observe philosophical, theoretical, and strategic explanations of integration's importance. Finally, practical positive outcomes of successful integration implementation are suggested. Chapter III gives more specific information on structural and social integration of newcomer, including assessment of group peculiarities and evaluation prospects for refugee's integration (taking into consideration the experience of wider field of migrants' integration). Further, Orientation, Education, and Training Programmes (OETPs) are described in detail as an influential tool of structural and social integration of refugees into receiving society; it includes the stages of OETPs, their main objectives, and tactics so their prospective influence on social and structural integration process. Chapter IV provides an insight into multidimensional implementation of OETPs as regarding supra-national level (the European Union), national level, local and

community levels so participation of NGOs and international agencies, and media. It is also supplemented with cases presenting national integration policies (Sweden, Netherlands) so local and community projects.



## Chapter II. Integration: Theoretical Framework and Field. Points of Advantage.

### *a. Integration, Society, and State in Perspective: Conceptual Field*

In academic studies – social, political, and economic in particular – outlining definition of a term and concept that lies in the core of certain phenomenon or problem is a crucial step towards advancement of a research that hopefully would lead to enrichment of the human knowledge or resolution of an urgent issue, put the framework for future development by the following generation of scholars.

Character of the phenomenon of integration itself demands an interdisciplinary approach to the notion making its possible framework vary in different studies' prospects and angles of approach. Of course, interpretations of the term can obtain certain additional 'hues' in context of a definite field of studies, e.g. refugee studies (or migration and minority studies) that only strengthened by the fact that causes and initial reasons of people's movement differ considerably so their following reception and resettlement experience, and prospects of being on the territory of receiving state. What is necessary to understand, refugees' incorporation - as for any other social group (including groups as theoretical constructs based on a practical purpose and their characteristics) - are also of highly importance for a healthy functioning and development of society as being its inalienable part due to its physical presence on the territory of state, region, community residence etc.

For general understanding of integration per se, we should keep in mind an idea of **system and its constructing components**. At first, integration can be seen as a type of systemic

organization implying certain conditional developments as interaction of components and presence of a liaison, i.e. structure, rules, and mechanisms. Second, in case of integration all the components, groups, members are perceived like parts of a system itself meaning definite roles they play for and in this system. At the same time, we should understand that perception of integration can be derived from the point of system and its benefits, or from the point of a certain component or actor in/of the system and its advantage/disadvantage of the position in society.

Society can be understood as assembled inhabitants of a whole, e.g. state or even global population (that would bring us to more cosmopolitan point of view). The very first definition of society in Oxford English Dictionary (2009) brings us to the idea of

*“senses relating to connection, participation, or partnership”*

that can imply condition of connectedness; political alliance, political contract; participation and/or action.

In our case, **society of state** is seen as a complicated and multidimensional system which comprises certain groups and actors existing and acting inside of this system. So, we can take integration as a way and methods of organization of the society (however, we should not totally omit an idea of community or group integration that is of highly importance to the present paper as well). What is important here is presence of a certain level of organization. Obviously, it is possible to use the term for describing ANY of various types and scales of inclusion, even though we can also see it as a distinctive strategy denomination that can be contrasted to other models of interaction and systemic behaviour, e.g. assimilation, multiculturalism. In general, for society as a whole, a certain level of integration of members is a necessary condition of its very existence. Durkheim leads us even further proclaiming that society not only without regulation, effective

discipline but “*commitment of men's wills to a common objective*”, “*it is no more than a pile of sand that the least jolt or the slightest puff will suffice to scatter*” (2002, cited in Kenneth 2005, p.136). Later, we can also find Hartmann and Gerteis pointing out a deeper type of cohesion as “*cultural*” aspect that is connected with “*more normative basis for social order*” (2005, p.219). Nevertheless, this work is concentrating on initial stages of integration of newcomers/refugees, without going into depth of creation of much deeper affiliations with state and society, so identity changing.

At the same time, we should remember that society’s members themselves ARE society so they turn out to be beneficiaries of balanced integration. Emile Durkheim’s theory of social integration suggests people experiencing mental, emotional and physical benefits being a part of a bigger whole and experiencing the sense of connection (in: Berkman et al. 2000, p. 844)

Ideally, integration is a basis of functioning society that aims to bring benefit to all comprised members and groups. Integration is also a certain way of social existence, strategic approach to construction of interactions and relations in society. As to be presumed, effective integration could be derived from and resulted in: interaction and respect to presence of distinctive spheres (e.g. public and private realms) and units (groups, individuals); possibility of constructive dialogue and compromise (if not consensus); possibility of a legitimate change; and flexibility of choice. Absence of conflict is not a main indicator (also in: Turton, Gonzales, 1999, pp.20-21; Ryan, 1999, p.81) but rather there is a necessity of leverages and mechanisms of a conflict resolution. Thus, the aim is also accommodation of conflict, and prevention “*vicious, dehumanising and ‘incomprehensible’ forms of violence*” (Turton, Gonzales, 1999, pp.20-21) as its worst imaginable outcome.

In general, social integration can be postured as a very way of inclusion and participation to a balanced extent for the sake of social harmony. This work is focused on one of many parts of social 'patchwork', namely the group of refugees and their prospects of inclusion into society-recipient, moreover necessity and urgency of inclusion to happen.

Obviously, included or excluded, 'newcomers' are becoming a part of the agenda, and here important decisions are to be made as to derive maximum out of existent setting or possibility of change. To a certain extent, newcomers become part of social realm inside state and are to make a difference (directly or indirectly) reflected in present and future developments; inside state's border, changes are connected with interactions of certain individuals, groups, institutions so phenomena that involve one or more actors etc. In substantial range, it is up to state itself to guarantee positive outcomes in a row of possible changes as a bearer of certain exclusive powers: monopoly on violence or legislative and procedural decisions. Exclusion in this perspective is usually a result of systemic policies, institutional constructs, and behavioural pattern as a reaction to a high level of difference; but it can be also reinforced by absence of desire to become a part of the system or at least interact with and inside it - coming from excluded elements themselves (this fact is echoing with two-way nature of the process (also in: Korac, 2003, p.4) and importance of motivation for all the participants). The cultural and religious peculiarities become a reason of drawing inclusion-exclusion line more often. The same point is true regarding discrimination grounds. But when talking of discrimination process, we usually would mean action, behavior, or policies aimed AT a particular group or community: simply, group can exclude itself but cannot discriminate itself.

According to Eurobarometer survey, *Discrimination in the EU* (2009), Europeans see discrimination as a widespread event, that is usually based on racial or ethnic origin (61 %), age (58 %) and disability (53 %), sexual orientation (47 %) and religion or belief (39%), including multiple discrimination, i.e. based on more than one of the mentioned grounds. Discrimination is still a reality, in spite of an effort brought in by provisions of: the Charter of Fundamental Rights (especially, Article II-81 on *Non-discrimination*); Racial Equality Directive (2000/43/EC) and Employment Equality Directive (2000/78/EC); Action programme to combat discrimination (2001-2006) (Decision 2000/750/EC); EQUAL Community initiative (that, additionally, includes “*Pillar 5: To help asylum seekers to integrate*”) (Commission 14/04/2000), activities of the European court of Human Rights (from 1959) etc. – mechanisms and ‘bricks’ that are aimed at paving the grounds of European diversity.

**European Society of Diversity** in its modern sense can be traced back to the World War II and following post-colonial developments on the world map including guarantee of citizenship to ex-subject of the European states. Officially, stress has been made on anti-discrimination and anti-xenophobia (European Commission, 2012). This line was supported by the project of the United Europe and now can be found in a variety of formal documents and strategies of the European Union so they are being expressed as part of the national policies, starting from an official motto *In Varietate Concordia* (*‘united in diversity’*). *‘United in diversity’* has also become a motto of a year in 2004 and 2005 (Europe Day 2004; 2005) along with “*Europe. My favourite mix: peoples, places, cultures*” in 2010 (Europe Day, 2010), and “*Your Europe: Democracy, Dialogue, Debate*” in 2006 (Europe Day, 2006) - that reveals adherence to diversity, multiculturalism, and collaborative dialogue as an official EU approach. Additionally, we find

Article 22 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights on *Cultural, religious, and linguistic diversity* (2010/C 83/02).

The epoch of globalization made us face the fact of rising interconnectedness and mutual influences among all actors of the global scene, including states, international organizations but also NGOs, minority and diasporas groups so (especially with introduction of the human security concept) individuals themselves. Nowadays, we can claim almost impossibility of non-penetrated social unit (probably, some distantly located and protective to the 'external world' indigenous groups can become an exception). These thrilling circumstances cause universal and local changes of institutions and social structures, perceptions, identities, patterns of behaviour and interaction; they also, without any doubts, bring security and economic dangers but also considerable advantages of mutual enrichment and development. Tracing back to the roots of European 'civilization, "*cultural diversity has been an important —very likely a necessary— factor behind the amazing cultural, economic and political achievements of European civilization*", as Arroyabe puts it (1999, p.15).

From other side, we might ask if diversity itself would become 'gift' or 'plague' for society. Strengthened by Parekh who tells that "*no nation or culture is homogeneous and free of deep conflict and contestation*" (2006, p.76), the conclusion can be derived that diversity is neither but an absolute norm, a fact in contemporary societies (with certain exceptions) that are deeply influenced by migration flows, globalization, opening and widening of information space.

Of course, there is a question on the extent to which this 'ideology of diversity' can be applied to any newcomer, especially if we take into consideration difficulties and hindrances of full 'penetration' and legalization in terms of welfare European state. Is this 'inside' diversity and

plurality that is quite typical and plausible as in the context of modern developments when we are still far from common union in the cosmopolitan world society? It is hard sometimes for one to perceive differences if they ‘cross’ his/her daily routes or collide with his/her values, so it is difficult to see newcomers as a justified part of ‘fortress Europe’. Although, perceptions might change and vary from country to country, from one social group to another. However, it is evident that integration is a long-term strategy being reconsidered – in historical terms - a quite new project while building “*Europe which respects freedom and the identity of all of the people which compose it, common ‘European home’*” (The Europe Day, n.d.).

However, as the concept of diversity is not a completely new term and practice, its composition can be transformed, or rather widened embracing some new elements. Obviously, it would demand substantial efforts – in formal and informal realms.

In both realms diversity is strongly intertwined with another important strategic notion of **pluralism**. The idea of pluralism has its roots in teachings of postmodernism (Mason, 2011). In philosophical understanding, it is pluralistic conceptual relativism - opposite to monism - permitting equality of different values (Mason, 2011).

Nonetheless, it is almost impossible to make any kind of conclusions or even posture a hypothesis without any - objective (or being claimed so) or subjective - presupposition. For instance, this work is based on the presumption of ethical and moral superiority of human dignity and pursuing human rights as a universal ideal and one of the primary values<sup>1</sup>.

Discussion concentrated on value pluralism draws an ability to offer incompatible and incommensurable values structure that might lead to a situation where we have conflicting moral

---

<sup>1</sup> Value here can be defined as “*synonymous with moral rights and duties*” (Moore, 2009, p.245)

duties that cannot be put into a rank order of importance (Moore, 2009, p.245), and thus leads us to the concept of moral relativism, in both “*realist*” and “*irrealist*” visions of pluralism (Moore, 2009, pp. 246, 254). This poses a threat of absence of “*new guidance about how to live together*” (Moore, 2009, p.250). If adopting the model of moral pluralism in present times, Moore demonstrates probability of “*social organization that everyone within a given area or polity can be led either to adopt the same values or at least obey the same institution but this would lead us to impossibility of resolving conflict of values, or resorting to Hobbesian modus vivendi, and self-interest, or combination of several strategies*” (2009, p. 254). Further, the authors’ inclinations to cosmopolitan model or just appearance of new forms or principles and views on organizations in non-defined future can be observed; but as to the present situation, it is assertion of possibility to improve the ties through social integration as he claims that “*thin bases of cooperation could be modified or strengthened over time, by the creation of interpersonal and cultural ties*” (2009, p.254).

In practice it would usually mean dialogue and appearance of certain common points in social connections and structure construction. Thus, even in more philosophical perception of moral pluralism, we find use for structural and social integration building as regarding certain normative and individual liaisons suggested as a basis of a plural state of a system.

If talking about European society in particular, there is more appropriate point of referring to **political pluralism** that in some cases even can just be limited to plurality of bearers of values (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2011), accepting various groups with competing interests (Kemerling, 2011), or being incorporated into a liberal social structure “*that permits or instantiates more moral goods is better than one that instantiates fewer*” (examples can be



observed in the model elaborated by Williams, 1979 and Crowder,1994; 1998; 2002; 2007, presented by Moore, 2009, pp.253; also 254). What is extremely interesting, Parekh would name the same principle of organization as “regulative monism of classical liberalism” (2006, pp. 33-36) drawing the ambiguity of the liberal system in terms of trials to put sheer pluralism into work.

Obviously, it is impossible to claim reality of moral pluralism (relativism) in contemporary European system that nevertheless satisfies the characteristics of political pluralism as an unalienable part of liberal agenda. In this case, there is a necessity of interwoven values and opinions as Moore poses it to the issue of intra-societal cooperation, “*Similarly, political choice requires a group of people to all live by and obey (to some extent) some common set of values and value-reflecting institutions. If there is really no way to rank values or value systems, we may be unable to agree on the values that should guide our society, with potentially devastating consequences for social cooperation*” (2009, p. 245). We also find similar presumptions in Bouchard demonstrating to us advantages of “*interculturalism*”, or “*integratory pluralism*” (2011, pp. 450, 468).

As for public opinion, the notion of pluralism can be better reflected as it was outlined by Aga Khan in his speech of 25 June 2004, and emphasizing that “*the effective world of the future is one of pluralism, a world that comprehends, accepts, and builds on diversity*”.

Obviously, European societies make a great stress on diversity and pluralism but - as in any society! - there are certain ‘connecting’ elements (in this case - liberal principles), namely there is no competition of values but differentiation of certain views, perceptions, and interests in the framework of common inclusive space of public realm.

Following proclamation of the *letter of law so citizens', political and social rights* in the Declaration of Rights of Man and of the Citizen (1789), we find assertion of *liberal values* that have been and, no doubt, continue to be the very kernel of the European ideal. The same evidence follows from the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union: “*The peoples of Europe, in creating an ever closer union among them, are resolved to share a peaceful future based on common values*” (2010/C 83/02). Thus, any newcomer is not getting into a void space of public realm but the field of meaningful rules and signs that are to be respected and known (including hosting society’s culture and norms).

In general, pluralism can stand as a basic principle of social inclusion and integration of diverse groups – building their relationships on mutual respect and tolerance - into realm of society. Due to its stress on intercultural dialogue that is of high significance to implementation of structural and social integration, and vice versa: “*Respect for their culture also earns their loyalty, gives them the confidence and courage to interact with other cultures, and facilitates their integration into wider society* (Parekh, 2006, p. 196).

As evidence, we move from anti-discrimination and social inclusion towards deeper connections as perpetual social dialogue and integration. The fact is that inclusion is supposed to become an explicit process that would embrace multiple social dimensions, and demand motivation posing for all the parts involved (additionally, media dimension becomes an influential player). The process of inclusion is usually asymmetric and prolonged ‘enterprise’, especially when ‘coming to terms’ with specific cultural contradictions. Inclusion, as an opposite notion to ‘exclusion’, still differs from understanding the integration pattern as integration means more than being inside the system, more than being just included as active or totally passive part

without active connections. Integration implies connection and, most importantly, interaction within the system, and usually signifies certain independence of actors while the level of their interdependence is undoubtedly visible. Successful integration of `alien` elements can become a basis of social, economic, and political development, and - at least partially – offer key and solutions for urgent demographic and economic problems (that are to be discussed further).

As we have seen earlier, not only for a monistic view but in any case of moral and political pluralism, the issue of integration and involvement into a dialogue is an urgent step towards social harmony. As following, a special stress on social and structural integration through the **Orientation, Education, Training Programmes (OETPs)** as an important instrument of integration that can provide to newcomers ways and tools to structural and social inclusion; responding to initiation of/ starting a dialogue; participating in European society of diversity, and non-discrimination, so its legal, social, economic, and political spheres - without becoming a delinquent group, an island of ghettoization, a problem for the state so creating a `vicious circle` situation for themselves.

### ***b. Strategies of Integration and Social Cohesion.***

*Harmony is not based on the homogeneity of musical pitches but in fact requires a variety of notes that fit together and complement one another. This is not to insist that all diversity is good, but only to suggest that not all diversity is bad and that some forms can be very good indeed.*  
(Hartmann and Gerteis, 2005, p. 220)

It is impossible, talking about social integration, not to touch prominent strategies concerned with inclusion of `newcomers` into `mainstream` society and cohesion patterns that have been and continue to be exploited and implemented by variety states worldwide including Europe.

Models of inclusion can be presented by following main strategies: assimilation and multiculturalism being on opposite sides of the spectrum, or even social integration per se. Recently, there is a number of new notions has appeared mostly that can be seen as extensions and explanations of the basic models, e.g. interculturalism (Bouchard, 2011); so the structure suggested by Hartmann and Gerteis comprised of: assimilation, cosmopolitanism, fragmented pluralism, and interactive pluralism (2005).

Basically, in order to define the field we can be restricted by two main categories of assimilation and multiculturalism; and additionally, a state of social integration can be taken as an indicator of balance. There is a great dichotomy in perception of these main categories, even though their main essence can be presented and perceived similarly by most of scholars and practitioners. Bur in order to avoid controversies and clarify the very notion of social integration being central one to the present work, we have to 'shed a light' on these major concepts of inclusion/interaction inside society as a functioning and organized system.

Hartmann and Gerteis suggest in their work *Dealing with Diversity: Mapping Multiculturalism in Sociological Terms*, division into "**thin**" and "**thick**" **forces of cohesion** in society meaning procedural and cultural (values-oriented) character of social connection respectively (2005, pp. 222-223); they also reconsider individual-group differentiation as regarding to what should be considered a main 'unit'/actor of this connection. This framework can be seen an approximation for many models' creation, and be of use for the given work as orientation in the strategies' field.

We can start from the concept of '**assimilation**' (from Latin *assimilatio*; "to render similar") that is known as one of the first approaches towards relations between 'us' and 'them' in the

context of any forms of migration, minority issues etc., and a sequence of changes that can or might be brought into a receiving/hosting society that used to be seen as negative or even dangerous (Hartmann and Gerteis 2005, p. 226). In general, assimilation used to be a single approach at the dawn of migration movements. Here the context of state's single culture and feeling of belonging for the sake of national unity can be considered as a central notion – signifying not only structural and social but also full cultural integration.

Thus, national common culture - *“including common values, ideals of excellence, moral beliefs and social practices”* - is usually seen as a definitive characteristic of the assimilationist model of society (Parekh, 2006, p. 197). On political spectrum the idea is supported by conservatives, nationalists, some communitarians and comprehensive liberalism representatives who, however, can have diverse views on the degree of assimilation itself (Parekh, 2006, p. 197). Usually, as Hartmann and Gerteis pointed out, it is individual who is becoming a part of a coherent system (2005, p. 227) and state's framework. An alternative offered to a newcomer who is not willing to integrate is ethno-cultural political exclusion (Ager and Strang, 2008, pp. 174-175) that means also a structural exclusion and possibly – at least partially – social exclusion; that creates a natural pressure to assimilate, even if state does not implement additional policies in order to accelerate the process. Tracing back to the times of hellinization policies on the conquered territories by Alexander the Great to eurocentrism “in the air ” of at least first part of XX century (Parekh, 2006, pp. 61-62), nowadays assimilationism gradually has been losing its attractiveness as seen *“less politically acceptable in liberal democracies as the right to maintain cultural and religious identity and practices has been increasingly established, and the notion of the pluralist society has become transcendent”* (Ager and Strang, 2008, p. 175).

In general, its strength in Europe was shattered after the World War II, and most of the states took a line of pluralism and diversity in their official policies. On the continent, France stays a prominent example and devotion to the policies of full possible integration and assimilation into the mainstream society and culture. Although extremes of the past were eliminated, the approach that had lost its previous 'sharpness' of attitude is still popular among a group of scholars (e.g. Alba and Nee, 1997; Joppke, 1999; Brubaker, 2001) as a possible applicable option for modern societies across the world.

But as Parekh puts it, society having "a coherent and unified cultural and moral structure can rarely exist in reality; society is not a homogeneous and unified whole" (2006, p. 197). And even if it a case, assimilation model often can create a cause and precedent of social exclusion and structural exclusion sometimes basing just on the slightest difference or past background (Parekh, 2006, p. 198), not mentioning differentiation along the ethnical, religious, or cultural lines.

On other side of the spectrum are policies of multiculturalism - usually characterized by 'thin' cohesion and groups as main actors in social connections (also in: Kymlicka, 1995). The strategy had become the latest fashion and – as followed – a greatest disappointment in Europe, especially for Great Britain, Germany, and Netherlands with official policies oriented on the success that had been declared and pursued in Canada and Australia.

But if we are talking about the multicultural model as in approaching certain ethnic, cultural, and religious group in the framework of state, we should not deceive ourselves about opportunities that state - having permitted to its minorities to 'lead their own way' - would represent to the members of these minorities. Thus, multicultural politics in itself can be seen as possible prerequisite to indirect discrimination being 'called' by the minorities upon themselves

as that would be inevitable in state's structure that still presents certain social, political, economic rules to follow, so certain ways of conduct and norms. That can often lead to strengthening of exclusion tendency, and, further, presence of segregated communities that David Cameron emphasized in his speech in 2011 as a symbol of multiculturalism failure (BBC, 2011). Thus, in long term perspective, multiculturalism can cause segregation and even ghettoization but not successfully incorporated minorities, unless complementary state policies and groups' motivations are absent. In present state of affairs, state still remain a 'guardian' - posing rules and guaranteeing their fulfillment, meaning necessity of it 'leading a way' to inclusive and integrated society. At the same time, even 'thin' extent of social cohesion demands a number of factors to be sustained by; as Parekh poses it, *"At all costs a multicultural society must find ways of holding itself together long enough to enable its different communities to become used to each other and build up common interests and mutual trust"* (2006, p.207). He also suggested the principles of social cohesion (2006, p. 207-236) - that are interesting for us as offering the basis for structural and social integration - in multiculturally oriented society: *"consensually grounded structure of authority, collectively acceptable set of constitutional rights, just and impartial state, multiculturally constituted common culture and multicultural education, a plural and inclusive view of national identity"* (2006, p. 236). Thus, he concludes the necessity of structural and social cohesion supported by culture and education dimensions.

The same case we can observe under cosmopolitanism (individual-centered) or fragmented pluralism (group-centered; close to the multicultural assumptions) in Hartmann and Gerteis, where *"the macro-culture tends to be thinner and essentially procedural in nature"* (2005, p. 232).

But it can be questioned if contemporary societies are ready in their present nature and structure to move towards pure structural cohesion. In words of Gérard Boucharde, “*the impossibility of cultural neutrality of nation-states*” (2011, p. 456) so weight of importance of the state’s role can stand as reasons to define this fact. That echoes with an assumption that multiculturalism would also imply the certain level of implied and factual integration, starting from the basic structural integration in its legal embodiment to social integration into realm of social connections and intercultural dialogue; and of course it would presume an active role of state and its institutions so receiving communities and the whole host society to make their input into forms of official policies or practical activities. For practical example we could refer to Kymlicka reporting *the use of multiculturalism as a tool for integration* (2006, p.12). Canadian multiculturalism is, as Kymlicka represents it, based on the common acceptance of the liberal principles in the society (2006) and *a commitment to individual freedom* (2006, p. 14), and therefore it would imply language obtainment and inclusion objectives, and we can observe social integration pattern in striving to a constructive dialogue between minorities and authorities. Obviously, an attitude towards language obtainment and support in adaptation, and role of official authorities in its provision can vary from state to state. And, thus, it is a necessary for any state with inclusive orientation of policies, meaning practically any modern state. Multiculturalism so any other political strategy is impossible without a certain level of inclusion into the state’s structures and social milieu, “*the greater and deeper the diversity in a society, the greater the unity and cohesion it requires to hold itself together and nurture its diversity*” (Parekh, 2006, p. 196).



In Hartmann and Gerteis (2005) so in Bouchard (2011) we find an attempt to 'reconcile' diversity and unity in models of "*interactive pluralism*" and "*interculturalism*" subsequently that would bring us even closer to the case of integration. In interactive pluralism, distinct groups and cultures are present but there are also "*mutual recognition, ongoing interaction, and cross-cultural dialogue and exchange*" as inherent characteristics of the system (Hartmann and Gerteis, 2005, p. 231). Surprisingly (but evidently), there is a common trait with assimilationism can be traced as insistence on "*the importance of the macro-social boundary, thick, substantive understandings of the social whole*" (Hartmann and Gerteis, 2005, p. 233).

Similar principle of social organization and cohesion we can find in Bouchard, proponent of so-called "*interculturalism*": a path of negotiations and mutual adjustments, but with strict respect for the values of the host society as inscribed in law or constitutional texts and all while taking into account the so-called shared values of a common public culture (2011, p. 448). The main difference of Bouchard's approach is stress that is made on very presence of majority culture as more obvious, legitimate, and even necessary fact (2011); but he does not deny reality in terms of mutual acculturation and change of both (all) groups in society to a certain extent (2011, p.460) through mutual adjustment, and while retaining spirit of conciliation, balance, and reciprocity presides over the process of interaction at the heart of interculturalism (2011, pp. 454, 448).

One of the hypotheses suggested in the beginning of the paper contains a claim that integration, in particular model of social integration (according to the hypothesis), can be seen as the most appropriate model approaching newcomers, i.e. refugees, in their connection with the receiving society. This hypothesis has partly turned out to become a falsely posed assumption due

to the finding that perception of integration is much wider than just a definite model of cohesion, leading to inevitability of dealing with an issue in any possible case, and inside of framework of any contemporary model of social cohesion that we can imagine when seeking stable functioning of the state and social harmony revealed in public realm.

Obviously, we cannot imagine well-functioning society that is not integrated to a certain extent that bring us to inevitability of effort made by system/state itself so all its actors, groups, and individuals involved. The only question of any political strategy or official policy is to which extent and in which way the project of integration is being fulfilled. One could observe great amplitude of social integration programs in Netherlands since 1960-70, nevertheless the county's official policy would be perceived as multicultural till the changes of the last decade (more details are to be given in the Chapter IV).

Orientation, Education, and Training Programs (OETPs) practice is present more or less in all the European states but strategic approach would define an extent and depth so importance that is given to the issue and being reflected in formulating and implementing of official policy at official level so funding projects and collaboration with specialized institutions and NGOs; attention that is being given to research and pilot projects' launching is also can be seen as a determinant of authorities' 'involvement'.

It is evidence that fact of structural integration implementation and necessity of social integration do not leave a choice on whether or not OETPs can be appropriate. However, essential points of state's strategy will influence composition (including curriculum) and, in wider perspective, objectives of any of the programmes.

***c. Successful Integration Implementation: Outcomes and Advantages for Society.***

In order to support further importance and necessity of integration, there is a need to elaborate on advantages and possible outcomes of successful integration policies that can be seen as main reasons of their application.

**Integration as a key to: Future of Humanity (Ethical approach to integration).**

In order to outline precisely objective of this small part, there is a need to introduce a basic definition of humanitarianism, once again referring to Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford University Press, 2012):

*“Concern for human welfare as a primary or pre-eminent moral good; action, or the disposition to act, on the basis of this concern rather than for pragmatic or strategic reasons”.*

Certainly, it is not a ‘crime’ for an academic research to be penetrated at least slightly by the spirit of devotion to humanity, and protection of human dignity in spite of any characteristics or features one can bear. **Ethical perspective** of social inclusion could (and should!) necessarily occupy its place in framework of the given work, equally if talking of objectives of the European Society of Diversity, or universal pursuing of tolerance, diversity, and equality. There is a suggestion that we all during our academic search take into consideration also the letter of **Human Rights**. Moreover, vulnerability of the forced migrants/refugees can be seen as an additional and very important factor of applying ethical approach.

Ideally, such documents and appeals as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the International Covenants - on Civil and Political Rights (1966), so on the Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (also 1966), or Millennium Development Goals (2000) should form the

foundation of any official policy planned or implemented. Additionally, the Geneva Convention of 1951 and Protocol of 1967 relating to the Status of Refugees are to stay an inherent part of any decision-making connected with refugee.

Talking about the European Union, there are also some principal documents and appeals that are to be mentioned here. First of all, the Treaty of Lisbon in its reflections on the “*universal values of the inviolable and inalienable rights of the human person, freedom, democracy, equality and the rule of law*” (2007/C 306/01).

The Charter of Fundamental Rights of European Union (2010/C 83/02) is another instrument of these indispensable values’ promotion. There are certain articles that can be of greater interest to use in the context of refugees integration and human rights protection: Article 1 on *Human dignity*; Article 10 on Freedom of thought, conscience and religion; Article 14 on *Right to education*; Article 15 on *Freedom to choose an occupation and right to engage in work*; Article 18 on *Right to asylum* (including “*due respect for the rules of the Geneva Convention of 1951 and the Protocol of 1967 relating to the status of refugees*” that pursue as one of their main tasks protection of rights of asylum-seekers and refugees); Article 21 on *Non-discrimination* (connected with “*sex, race, colour, ethnic or social origin, genetic features, language, religion or belief, political or any other opinion, membership of a national minority, property, birth, disability, age or sexual orientation ; on grounds of nationality*”); Article 22 on *Cultural, religious and linguistic diversity*.

Of course, social and political reality differs from philosophical and ethical propositions outlined in the abovementioned documents and appeals standing as an unrecognizable ideal. But

we are to realize that legal instruments demand action, cooperation, and devotion for making change in lives.

**Integration as a key to: cultural enrichment of the society (Strategic approach to integration I).**

*“Among history’s great truth is that a society is only able to advance to newer horizons of greater promise when it overcomes insularity, and recognises strength in difference”.*  
His Highness the Aga Khan (speech of 25 June 2004).

As the ‘spirit of multiculturalism’ might and should be effectively combined with common sense of belonging to a certain social construct, including state; potential of all groups can be better discovered exactly in atmosphere of trust and reciprocity. The letter of intercultural dialogue paves the path to productive exchanges and mutual enrichment, expanding potential of imagination and creativity, not only at state or group level but in experiences of daily social interwoven connections and encounters.

Era of globalization is evolving rapidly, making changes visible everywhere, including inter-state and intra-state relations when the policy of “*“fortress Europe” could be the chief potential obstacle to the future economic, political and cultural strength of a united Europe*” (Turton and Gonzales, 1999, p. 16). Of course, global interconnectedness and mobility of globalization bring into agenda a number of substantial security threats (from terrorism to cyber-attacks to ‘contagious’ nature of economic and financial crises) but present state of affairs does not leave to state much choice in terms of isolationism (of course, we can always learn from experience of North Korea but we are unlikely to follow it). As Bouchard wisely noticed, globalization has also brought a tendency of blaming migrants for a flow of the intrastate social, economic, political,

and security problems (2011, p. 447). But the situation is always not a one-dimensional matter: these problems have been caused by a variety of reasons, often including wrong state and local policies, absence or lack of attention paid to properly structured and practically fulfilled integration models that are crucial for development of potential of present human capital.<sup>2</sup>

**Integration as a key to: economic development in long-term perspective (Strategic approach to integration II).**

Ongoing problem of ageing population, that Europe is to face in several decades, would lead to certain extent of demographic crisis and lack of working force (of course, in the times of rising unemployment that might seem impossible but we any state of affairs is not infinite). The UN Human Development Report (2009) offers us data on increase/decrease of working-age population, making projection by region for 2010-2050. Europe is supposed to observe 23% decrease from 0.50 to 0.36 billion, being the only region in the world that is to show “-” result. This fact is officially recognized at EU level truth.<sup>3</sup> From another side, increased competition, new technologies and new ways of working can be specified (European Commission. Justice. Stop Discrimination, 2012) as demanding for specific qualifications and diverse approaches. In this situation, there is a great advantage that can be derived from diversity that can enrich businesses by bringing different skills, experiences, ideas and perspectives (European

---

<sup>2</sup> The issue is also being discussed in the context of migrants in: Policy Plan on Legal Migration. Economic migration in the EU: the labour markets’ situation and demographic trends (MEMO/05/494).

<sup>3</sup> “Today there are four workers for each retired person, but by 2050 this number will have fallen by half. This means that in the future there will not be enough people able to work to support the retired generation and fill this ‘gap’.” (European Commission/Justice/Stop Discrimination, 2012)

Commission. Justice. Stop Discrimination, 2012), and bring a great contribution into developing of knowledge-based society (official strategy of Lisbon Treaty (2007/C 306/01)).

As for worrisome expectations of depriving the European population of jobs and opportunities, a number of studies that have been implemented to date, declare that risk is mostly connected with adaptability of the markets, and insignificant in long-term perspective (also proved in: The Authority of the House of Lords, 2008).

Moreover, Eurostat long-term demographic projections indicate that EU population growth until 2025 will be mainly due to net migration, since total deaths will outnumber total births from 2010. The effect of net migration will no longer outweigh the natural decrease after 2025 (STAT/05/48). So we can even see refugee flows as an additional income of human capital. Overall, newcomers can “*contribute contribute to the economic development as workers, entrepreneurs, consumers and tax payers*” (Europa, 2011, MEMO/11/529).

Of course, if we make a stipulation on refugees’ factor, we may notice that it is not always high-qualified middle-aged migrants that are responsive to demands of the European market but we should take into consideration several factors: 1. Presence of this human capital on the territory of the EU is to be used, and in case of certain investments can become a response to many questions (in some cases, there is also not a problem of qualifications but rather bureaucratic obstacles and discriminatory policies (also in: Mestheneos and Ioannidi, 2002)). 2. We do not observe problems of illegal migration issues as refugees have been granted an official status (or are waiting for a final decision as of an asylum-seeking procedure). 3. Vocational training or requalification courses can be combined with other orientation and education projects

on the state so local community levels in order to address the need of state, society, market, and newcomers.

Thus, once again we can certainly observe a necessity to provide if not the fastest but profound, effective, and optimised way of inclusion into society in order to bring mutual social and economic benefits.

Additional government interest lies in an ability to spend less and derive more from any activities, including the issue of newcomers, so improve and raise their complementarities with demands of market and state. The amount of finance do not always play a decisive role in the policies' effects and consequences but addressing the most important problems, right resources' allocation so adequate policy-making (that will be discussed more profound in the Chapter IV), including issues of resettlement and the OETPs projects. Thus, problem of newcomers if exists can be not eliminated but **transformed** into an advantage by rising the quality of human capital presence with use of insignificant costs.

**Integration as key to: stability in long term perspective (Strategic approach to integration III; security issues).**

The thrilling developments of recent years cannot be forgotten: youngsters' aggression in UK and France; killing of Theo Van Gogh in 2004 by a young Muslim in Netherlands; case of Breivik in Norway; terrorists' plots claimed to be discovered by police in Denmark in April, 2012 (BBC, 2012) etc. - those are just several cases that would be a sign of 'splashes' of recent instability in intercultural and social relations around Europe.



Wider definition of causes includes ghettoization, unemployment, far right political movements' rise, and also a wave of extremism and terrorism etc.; deeper causes might lie in a dimension of equal political representation absence for minorities, lack of opportunities, inaction of governments, or maybe in collision/conflict of values and morals that has been 'heated up' by global financial and economic crises. There is no space here to elaborate on probability of the above-mentioned reasons that seem all, in bigger or less extent, to contribute into growing worries about future of diverse and multicultural Europe. Once again, we see necessity of accurate and attentive approach to integration in all dimensions of state and civil society realms that would create a field of common understanding and reciprocity. Another highly important component should be connected with the assumption that rights should always be accomplished with responsibilities, respect and reciprocity - otherwise there is a great risk of vain projects of integration, including the OETPs programs for refugees and other newcomers/migrants.

## Chapter III. OETPs as a Tool of Social and Structural Integration.

### *a. Social and Structural Integration in Detail: Group Peculiarities and Evaluation Prospects.*

For purposes of the given paper, there is a necessity to outline three main stages of integration that are to be of great interest for us: **structural** (starting from status legalization and citizenship obtainment to inclusion into the institutional aspects and structure of state's realms); **social** (public sphere and civil society); **cultural** (values transformation; acculturation; or assimilation). As the work is focused on initial period of adaptation (that is not a definite time span but rather way of expressing transition of newcomers/refugees to new reality, and inclusion, integration into state and public realms, fully or partially), there is no space to analyze possibility and necessity of the last stage (cultural integration) that rather can be seen as a result of a long-term integration process and vary to a wide extent. Here, the issues of primary importance are to be touched, as without certain level and quality of structural and social integration, there is no way to derive advantages of existing human capital for state so create a harmonious environment for the sake of all actors and participants.

**Structural integration** is mainly concerned with primary inclusion of refugees into legal, political, economic, and social spheres of hosting society as alleviation of adaptation and existence in a framework of society. Legal aspects are primary concentrated on an official status granting so further long-residence permit, or citizenship granting (also in: Ager and Strang, 2004; Korac and Gilad, 2001). At the same time, obtainment of the status does not gives guarantee of full access to all the opportunities connected with it, including right to work or right to political

representation, for instance (also in: Medda-Windischer, 2004). Thus, implementation plays a crucial role here so involvement of all the official and civil sector actors.

At the same time, the awareness of basic cultural components seems meaningful as a ground for structural integration so seems simple awareness of the rights that one has; responsibilities and duties should be seen as inalienable part of official status as well (“*obligations to the state*” in Ager and Strang, 2010, p.597) - that brings us again to the importance of the OETPs as a delivery of knowledge on these duties that one bears.

But state is not a pure institutional structure; public milieu is its ‘filling’ that we are surrounded by. Refugees’ inclusion into hosting society is connected with the notion of **social integration**.

That would bring us to referring to the notions of social ‘bonds’, ‘bridges’ and ‘links’ suggested by Putnam (2000), and representing social structure of society in terms of individuals and communal interactions, and its indispensability for social harmony.

Finally, social integration in its full extent is impossible without properly organized and implemented structural inclusion. Structural integration at social level gives an opportunity to an individual, and simultaneously raises his trust and willing to cooperate with state’s institutions. If we look further, confidence in future stability and feeling of being secured (also in: Dickerson et al., n.d.) is also connected with a whole range of structural integration. In Medda-Windischer we find emphasizing importance of legal integration as a precondition for social inclusion (2004, pp. 9) but as only one of influential factors: the example on housing obtainment is offered to us - absence of legal obstacles as a first stage of success but certain procedural obstacles so social hindrances as prejudices in attitudes can become a real problem (2004, pp.10-11). Therefore, we

observe a significance of mutual respect, recognition of equality, so motivation to cooperate as from the side of state's/region's/neighbourhood's population so from newcomers' side (combined with ability to resist to a natural psychological pressure of the initial adaptation period, so openness to change and dialogue are of value as well). The above-mentioned factors are crucial for ongoing successful 'building' of social connections and bonds.

Of course, in case of ghettoisation or illegal syndicates, we can observe another type of 'bonding' but in its peculiar and dangerous to the rest of society way of social construction (also posing enormous problem to the state) (in wider context also in: Putnam, 2000). In this situation, hope for full constructive and open dialogue would be lost or become more distant and difficult to achieve creating 'vicious circle' of absence of motivation, mutual suspicion and tension.

In general, there is no questioning sequence of the implementation: both structural and social integration support should be provided simultaneously (initial 'buds' of which we preferably observe at the stage of asylum seeking procedure already). Thus, OETPs are to provide tools and mechanisms in order to gain certain results of both intertwined processes.

But in order to outline integration prospects in more particular terms, there is a crucial need to depict some definitive traits of **refugees as a group, so a concept in social and political context.**

First of all, refugees as a group do not present a homogeneous or even connected unit (also in: De Vriese, 2006). The group itself can be seen only as a scientific/theoretical concept but not political reality in terms of organization, continuous interactions, bonding, and, as follows, enjoying a substantial initial ground for political representation that might to lead to a certain

level of empowerment in a given institutional context. Among other important features, we can depict:

1. Forced character of migration: In case of refugees, they are not attracted to a country by certain stimuli or demand of labour markets but forcibly removed from their country of origin due to a number of reasons.
2. Cases of being traumatized (often) that are directly connected with the first characteristic bringing high risk of moral or physical harm connected with a special situation in which asylum-seekers and refugees find themselves, i.e. presence of “*well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it*” (Geneva Convention of 1951 relating to the Status of Refugees). In fact, this issue is also often addressed by certain policies and programs, e.g. initiative of the Swiss Federal agencies aimed at integration of traumatized refugees into society, labor market in particular (4 pilot-projects have been launched according to the information for 2010; means include not only counselling and psychotherapy but also work-integration itself) (United Nation Alliance of Civilizations, 2012).
3. High risk of victim’s complex appearance and its continuing influence on perceptions and behaviours of refugees, namely high level of suspicion and aggression, lost self-confidence and action ability, vulnerability, perpetual memorizing past developments, sometimes connected

with desire of retaliation etc. that would lead to inability to integrate themselves into a new reality.

4. Unstable position in presence (including status, economic and social reality) that is directly connected with the previous points so procedural and structural hindrances to fast inclusion into state's social, political, and economic spheres.

It is interesting that Strang and Ager have noticed shift away from treating refugees as a distinct category for integration measures, and toward establishing pathways to citizenship that include selection and fulfillment of the requirements (2010, p. 592). The shift can be seen as positive in general, especially in terms of legal and procedural implications, it can be perceived as an obstacle to success of integration during crucial period of adaptation; refugees should be perceived as a group (no matter if theoretically constructed) but the group that can be distinguished according to the certain characteristics and needs (psychological assistance; special health issues; OETPs) that - when taken into consideration - can become a key to the positive outcomes of the integration policies and practices.

Another crucial issue in the case of refugees is usual absence of official representation; even for those who have been granted an official status and count on the full range of political and social rights that are to be granted to any resident/citizen of the state. Here, the role of NGOs and international agencies (UNHCR, at the first place) is of high significance. For refugees themselves, consulting and assistance (psychological help, legal representation, even material support) should be provided. However, NGOs can mostly act in the framework of civil society and influence official policies indirectly by posing recommendations and criticism (the same role

is applied to research institutions). Thus, it is state itself as the most powerful institution in terms of legal guarantees and changes regarding refugees' protection and support – should put an effort and show an example of good will and rationality. Therefore, role and responsibility of authorities matters for primary introduction of refugees. From another side, if certain level of discrimination is connected with well-defined characteristics that we have in a case of refugee group, there is need might to arise of recognizing the group politically in order to erase inequality. But without full integration into society, fulfillment of only this provision would become futile, so it is integration that is certainly “*a central term in debates over the rights, settlement and adjustment of refugees*” (Strang, Ager 2010: 590). At the same time, in order to be able to represent themselves in public realm (formal and informal), in completely new political and social environment, newcomers have to know ‘rules of the game’, namely to be acquainted with the basic normative and legal assumption so the procedural culture of state etc. - that would bring us again to significance of OETPs as a tool of integration policy that leads to guaranteeing refugees “*a legal, financial and institutional framework within which they are given space for agency and the functional adjustment of their attitudes and skills necessary for entering the receiving society as social actors*” (Korac and Gilad, 2001, p.5).

Additionally, integration policies can never be uni-dimensional - as society is complicated structure of many realms, spheres, and dimensions. In Strang and Ager we find another argument on multi-dimensional character of integration as consequences of “*multiple and overlapping identities that forms people's relationship*” (2010, p. 602). At the same time, personal and institutional activities tend to overlap in reality and are distinguished by a high level of mutual

influence. Thus, we need to outline (and disclose further Chapter IV) dimensions that we might pay attention to as realms of policies and interactions in the case of European Union:

- Supra-national level (EU).
- State level policies, with special attention to the local implementation.
- Community level.
- Civil society.

This 'inevitable' multifaceted character of integration policies brings to an urgent call of cooperation among the bodies of state's organism - in planning, implementation, so evaluation of policies, tactics and strategies of integration.

The key measurements of success, namely indicators of integration in contemporary European society, are inalienable supplement, basis for objectives' posing. The ambiguities in evaluation can cause mistakes in decision-making in future, for instance, certain policies turn out to be a costly and futile enterprise. There is no space here for wide evaluation methods and means analysis but there is a need to depict a framework of evaluation of integration to date, and try to build a scheme for further elaboration on the case of OETPs.

First of all, we should pay attention to the application of the immigration integration achievements and indices. In spite of the distinction – especially in case of temporary migrants - general objective of integration policies aimed at immigrants or refugees is similar – inclusion with positive consequences for both 'sides': newcomers and receiving part. Nevertheless, 'starting points' differ drastically. Immigration is a result of deliberate action being preceded by decision made on a basis of certain 'pro and contra' as for the sake of benefits of the one person/ whole family (Medda-Windischer, 2004, p. 4); sometimes it also can be seen as the demand-



supply process in case of working plans and perspectives or other conditions that are seen as positive change by ‘newcomers’. Refugee migration is also a result of necessity but of another type - it usually reveals inevitability of the flight - what we can call ‘forced migration’ as in case of direct danger to the fundamental rights of the person, including life. Thus, even if integration process can be seen as successful inclusion of ‘newcomer/s’, and some strategies can be similar, definite elements vary crucially (referring to the characteristics of refugee group that have been mentioned above).

Attention to integration indices has risen from launching the Stockholm Programme (2009) that - in the area of freedom, security and justice for the period 2010- 2014 - called for "*development of core indicators in a limited number of relevant policy areas (e.g. employment, education and social inclusion) for monitoring the results of integration policies in order to increase the comparability of national experiences and reinforce the European learning process*". The European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals, in 2008 supported 7 projects as of its two of three main projects initiatives that were connected with "*development of common indicators and indexes and common European modules for migrants' integration*" (Community Actions, 2008). Additionally, such projects as Integration Barometer (from 2007) in Copenhagen, Denmark, paved the way into the indices organization (European Web Site in Integration, 2012). But these ‘enterprises’ again seem to unify the integration experience into one as of a newcomer/migrant. Of course, we cannot deny that it is simply impossible not to use ‘legacy’ of immigrants’ integration research and practices as more data and experience have been gathered; but we should always remember about fundamental differences between two groups.

Currently, the MIPEX Barometer is an example of an evaluation tools with an aim of assessing, comparing, and improving integration policies in all EU Member States, Norway, Switzerland, Canada and the USA (using more than 200 indicators and covering 7 policy areas: labour market access, family reunion, long-term residence, political participation, access to nationality, anti-discrimination, education), and creating benchmarks for performing evaluation.

If referring to more theoretical perspectives, Medda-Windischer demonstrates evaluation benchmarks - according to a classification proposed by the Council of Europe (Council of Europe 1997, p. 190) - that can be seen as coinciding with basic stages that have been outlined earlier as a framework of the given work: “*legal Indicators*, or *Indicators of Accessibility*” - to rights, goods, services and resources (as in structural integration stage); “*social indicators*”: unemployment rate, poverty rate, working hours per week, prenatal mortality rate, etc. (as in social integration stage) that author divides on sources from official statistics and personal evaluations; “*attitudinal indicators*” (at least partly can reveal indices of cultural integration stage if present) based on opinion polls and surveys. (Medda-Windischer, 2004, p. 28).

If we start talking about structural integration, Medda-Windischer outlines one of the crucial and initial points, i.e. **recognition** by state that brings not only attention but opportunity to become a beneficiary of a special policies and programmes (Medda-Windischer, 2004, p. 4). Then, as following, there are **participation and equal opportunities** that are to be provided by central and local state’s institutions (in areas of labour market, education, language, culture and social and legal integration (Medda-Windischer, 2004, p. 7)). Further, Medda-Windischer emphasizes importance of public life by virtue of certain **civic rights and civic duties**. (2004, p. 7). As citizenship is directly connected with the rights and opportunities one can obtain, she

proposed a so-called LIMIN-Index divided into two main categories of human rights (following the UN 1966 Covenants): civil and political rights and, on the other hand, economic, social and cultural rights (at the same time “*focusing on a specific policy issue allowing for different types of comparison across countries*”) (Medda-Windischer, 2004, p.12).

Ager and Strang see rights and citizenship (structural integration basis according to this work’s vision) as ‘foundation’ of integration framework that is followed by ‘*facilitators*’ (language and cultural knowledge, safety and stability) and ‘*means and makers*’ (employment, housing, education, health; social bridge, social bonds, social links) (2008). “*Citizenship and Rights*” stand for them as “*a necessary foundation for a shared understanding of what integration is and how it may be measured*” (Ager and Strang, 2008, p.173). But this area is also claimed to be the most confusing issue by as due to significant differences across states; they underline that sense of identity (as of a nation) incorporates certain values, and these are values that shape way that concept such as integration is approached; they also underline the influence of the citizenship models on the process of evaluation and types of indicators chosen (Ager and Strang, 2008, pp. 173-174).

As we see, education is stressed as one of the main means and markers of integration here so OETPs can be seen as practical ‘embodiment’ of the phenomenon. Ager and Strung make an emphasis on employment abilities’ widening through the necessary education projects but also underline the social integration implication as in “*enabling people to become more constructive and active members of society*” (2008, p.172). They also suggest some quantitative indicators in order to detect the influence and advantages brought by education processing, mainly reflecting attendance and education achievement figures for children and adults (2004, p.16). But before

actual and substantial quantitative data would be available (we should take into consideration recent appearance of official interest to integration, and especially some particular types of refugees integration, for instance) there is a sense of qualitative research that is and supposed to be done across the field. Moreover, people's factor and variety of situational backgrounds claim a necessity of this certain type of research: only recently a two-way approach to integration (Europa. Summaries of EU Legislation, 2010) and integration research has become recognized so actual work and inquiries aimed at refugees individually have supplemented the area (Korac and Gilad, 2001; Mestheneos and Ioannidi, 2002, etc.).

In general, common indicators and tools' success in the sphere of integration of refugees is still a 'young' issue that would take a long time for developing a full-scale database. OETPs have revealed themselves in a form of education importance and orientation courses' success.

***b. Orientation, Education, and Training Programmes (OETPs): potential stages, objective-planning, and policy design.***

The very start, beginning, but also continuing process of our lives in this multi-folded society are connected with education: our ability and accord - to perceive, and from the side of schooling and educational institutions - to deliver: knowledge, motivation, principle, rights, and responsibilities. So we could call education 'grey cardinal' of the modern world. Although, we can hear quite often from several social agents - politicians, representatives of special state's agencies, civil society activists etc. - of necessity to improve and to direct financing, and pay more attention to an issue - often, we hardly take education as powerful leverage of influence on minds and hearts, as it is in reality.

Additionally, education serves a transmitter of values in society and, thus, is connected with polity as one of its primary spheres, representing an interest to policy makers, so being itself a policy line and reflection of state's cultural essence. Obviously, education is embodiment of social and cultural characteristics of society but can at the same time play a part in transformation of these characteristics as a powerful ideological and intellectual tool of influence on mind, perceptions, and even beliefs of people. Education system itself is not free of cultural 'filling' so allocations of power.

For us it would mean that any programmes offered to newcomers, including simple language courses would carry certain cultural information in itself per se, including educators themselves being representatives of a receiving society. This can become one of the first - and one of the most important - contacts for newcomer's experience and future prospects in hosting society. Thus, it is an initial acquaintance with a new society that gives some primary information and impressions to newcomer. First impressions usually may become a basis of opinion building and stereotypes' creation strengthening decisive role of adaptation period. As Ager and Strang have emphasized, "*The effectiveness of integration is influenced by experiences from the moment of arrival in a new country*" (2010, p.595). Refugees are likely to encounter negative attitudes or prejudice that can be 'mitigated' by qualified psychological support (including also 'soft' measures of teachers' support) and orientation programmes.

Here, we observe an inevitability of certain principles' transmission: in case of European society of diversity, the core basis consisting of open, diverse, and equal society, lacking any discriminative or xenophobic tendencies was mentioned. Delivery of this two-folded nature - as comprising sense of belonging so principle of diversity (also in Parekh, 2006, p.196) - is to be

delivered by orientation and education programmes along with language and cultural 'acquaintances'. Thus, it means truly integrating into social milieu of society starting from respect to its values and openness to its members.

At the same time, education is also means of empowerment in the sense providing information, knowledge, and special qualifications (in case of vocational trainings provision) that also contributes to access to a permanent job that is a stipulation of stability and security in future; empowerment can be also understood in a sense of knowing one's rights and duties, and special mechanisms of fulfilling them truly (also in Amnesty International, 2011).

Usually, state provides a framework of integration (strategy, planning, financial resources etc.) with other actors involved, including active role of communities, NGOs, and international agencies. Financial input is provided by the state but it can also be financial support of certain projects by the EU agencies and bodies, so fund-raising 'harvest' supplied non-governmental agencies. The question of resources needed is not restricted only by financial means but includes potential contained in institutional framework, social networks' development, and qualifications of personnel, i.e. human resources. Of course, 'educating educators' project can become a costly enterprise but using experience from other fields and realms of education provision could be seen as a partial resolution of a problem, especially at initial stages of new pilot-projects. Additionally, human resources can be supplied by self-organized support of communities. Here, importance of academic input and qualified research is to be mentioned as a necessary step of improvement of programmes planning. The same is fair in terms of successful experience and methods applied in other communities or countries that can offer a basis for new independent local projects.

Importance of local and community enterprise is also meaningful if we take into consideration heterogeneous nature of refugee group that is reflected in diverse level and quality of education that have been obtained by newcomers before the programme<sup>4</sup>. Additionally, Dickerson et. al. outline following problems that can be encountered: 1. education continuum (gap in education years is implied); 2. complete illiteracy; 3. discrimination. (n.d., pp.17-18) - that are all to be addressed in initial strategic planning of the projects in terms of preventive measures, e.g. special trainings for teachers.

At the same time, another problem is to be addressed as referring to qualifications and certifications of studies and degrees that will give newcomers opportunity to continue their education or obtain satisfactory job in receiving state. Unfortunately, it is a usual practice for hosting country to encounter problems in qualification granting to refugee due to absence of necessary documentation and lack of knowledge of previous educational milieu that refugee is coming from (UNHCR. 2007, pp.7-9).

This paper offers coverage of the OETPs in general terms not implying group defined by particular age or sex, but main accent is made on the adult newcomers. Nevertheless, certain problems are to be addressed differently for male and female newcomers; and especially for minor refugees that are obviously the most vulnerable part of newcomers per se. The question of possibility and real impact, chances of adults' capacity transformation through education has recently appeared on the agenda of community projects so adaptation programmes for refugees (e.g. Christopher et.al., 2001; Goulah, 2008; Magro and Ghorayshi, 2011; UNHCR, 2011) but we cannot talk about overall tendency yet, rather of an alternative to mainstream programming. From

---

<sup>4</sup> At the same time, here another function of education is to be of use, namely selective function that can become a necessary tool in the process of orientation programme.

one perspective, *life-long education* is not a completely new concept, especially for European states that pay a lot of tribute to its potential improvement of competitiveness and innovation (European Commission, 2011a). The truth is that in contemporary world of globalization, we inhabit the circle of ever-growing and developing social networks that require our perpetual transformation according to new trends and demands of present times. Refugees endure even much pressure having become 'freshers' in receiving society, and usually facing a necessity of obtaining at least one (e.g. language) or more new skills that certain programmes are able to develop. That makes a necessity of psychological support even more urgent.

The last but not the least component for the success of the programme is motivated 'students' and motivated teachers:

*"...all the modern techniques of presentation, discussion and persuasion, fashionable as they are (and so reminiscent of classical Rhetoric) count for nothing if they are not animated by a sincerely good will (the Sophists were the first technicians in communication, but they did not achieve a better or more enduring polis). Without good will, all these techniques become cheap tricks, marketing at its most ephemeral"* (Arroyabe, 1999, p.27).

**Motivating** should be certainly addressed in all educators' and learners' curricula, so probably in specific workshops, and in media activities. Ager and Strung have also mentioned necessity of certain knowledge of cultural background of refugees by hosting community members that demand interest and motivation from their side (2004, p.19). As for refugees themselves, motivation 'stirring' should be included into the very core and basic orientation programmes as for any further 'learning enterprises' along with a number of other project's objectives. We can presume that motivation can be also influenced by so-called *culture in education* (Weerd et.al,



2005, p.III) that would consist of: “*classroom climate, teaching methods, assessment methods, opportunities to participate in and have an influence on school, opportunities to participate in the community through school*” (Weerd et.al, 2005, p.III). These elements can also lay a foundation for transformative education approach (also in: Robertson, 1996 cited in Christopher et. al., 2001, p. 135). Moreover, the whole success of education process is dependent on the abovementioned components. In general, accurate and precise objectives can also contribute into positive outcomes of any project.

Here, there is a need to present in detail an influential tool that is a part of integration process in all its instances, i.e. **Orientation, Education, and Training Programmes** as author of the present paper has defined the tool in general terms for easier orientation. OETPs is a abbreviation that has been offered as to define a wide range of Orientation, Education, and Training programmes being one of the most powerful tool of structural and social integration of newcomers/refugees into a receiving/hosting society. There are certain types, or stages of OETPs suggested (but not all of them are to be applied for a single individual’s integration) that can become a path for gradual inclusion and deeper integration of refugee into political, economic, and social realms of society. As follows:

- **Education, or Introduction into Life.**
- **Orientation, or Introduction Into Society** (including language courses, introduction into culture and tradition of the recipient country, institutional and social ‘rules’, and basic normative code);
- **Civic Education, or Introduction into Action** (including Human Rights and citizenship course);

- **Training** (i.e. vocational training and specialized programmes).

As it was noticed before, processes of structural and social integration cannot be divided from each other in practice, and therefore, they are being fulfilled in any of suggested stages simultaneously. In some extent, the process of cultural can be also implemented. As we find it in Hussain and Miller, “Civic nationalism has a cultural component” (Kymlicka 2001, p.244 cited in Hussain and Miller, 2006, p.5-6). But in case of the EU, it is usually indirect (but inevitable) implications that are certainly not included – at least directly - into official objectives and tasks frame. Thus, we are to elaborate on structural and social integration, and, in particular, on the role of OETPs in the process. Overall, it is objectives and tasks we would build on in order to provide the distinction between potential stages and types of OETPs that is to be presented here.

### **1.Education, or Introduction into Life.**

Article 22 of the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (1951) on *Public education* declares:

*“1. The Contracting States shall accord to refugees the same treatment as is accorded to nationals with respect to elementary education.*

*2. The Contracting States shall accord to refugees treatment as favourable as possible, and, in any event, not less favourable than that accorded to aliens generally in the same circumstances, with respect to education other than elementary education and, in particular, as regards access to studies, the recognition of foreign school certificates, diplomas and degrees, the remission of fees and charges and the award of scholarships”.*

In spite of the clear legal framework and usual education-oriented policies, the issue is one of the highly complicated regarding newcomers, mostly due to heterogeneous nature of the group, so a certain level of structural and social discrimination. First of all, certain amount of refugees that are being accepted into the European Union can reveal low level of literacy or education background<sup>5</sup> – these gaps are to be covered with initial education programmes that can also play a selective function in defining the next level necessary for a newcomer.

Second dimension to be covered in the frames of these project is children's education that is even more difficult matter in terms of 'catching up' – or literally starting from 'zero' - with school/university programmes in foreign language and ability to become a part of a studying milieu (this topic would demand another thesis work due to its importance and wide implications). For some EU countries, e.g. Italy, there is a serious problem as for a special approach to migrant pupils in education (MIPEX, 2012a).

As follows, women's education should be paid attention as in terms of empowerment and equal rights provision.

**2.Orientation, or Introduction into Society** (including language courses, introduction into culture and tradition of the recipient country, institutional and social 'rules', and basic normative code).

---

<sup>5</sup> Surprisingly, I did not manage to find data available on literacy rates of refugees and asylum-seekers in EU. But even sheer logic here can help as in spite of the growing literacy rates worldwide, in the period of 2000-2004, there were around 771 million illiterate adults worldwide with 98.4% of them living in developing countries (UNESCO, 2006) – for 2009, the global illiteracy rate still remained on the number of 793.1 million people (UNESCO, 2011)-and some, of course, cover conflict zones, namely *of 25 countries with the worldwide lowest adult literacy rates in 2000-2004 (below 50%) 12 are countries with conflicts or emerging from conflicts* (UNESCO, 2005: 20/21 cited in Hanemann, 2005, p.5); *additionally, of the 25 countries with the lowest levels of female adult literacy, 10 are either experiencing armed conflicts or recovering from it*<sup>5</sup> (Kirk, J., 2004, p.1 cited In Hanemann, 2005, p.5 ). However, illiteracy should not be taken as an overall tendency that can easily lead to formation of certain stereotypes and prejudices as, for instance, refugees from Balkan countries can enjoy a very high level of education and intelligence (The World Bank, 2012).

As Ager and Strang suggested, language and cultural knowledge “*facilitate social connection, both with other communities and with state and voluntary agencies*” (2004, p. 19). They have also included “*practical information for daily living (e.g. regarding transport, utilities, benefits etc.)*” (2004, p. 19) - that can be outlined as institutional and social rules; additionally, information of “*paperwork*” organization and available “*services*” should be delivered to refugees, that would also “*reduce initial stresses*” (Dickerson et.al., n.d., p.11). Of course, “*customs and expectations*” of hosting society should be disclosed (Ager and Strang, 2004, p.19) as for easing primary contacts with receiving community.

Overall, refugees should be able to contemplate difference in culture, respect it, and have an insight into understanding of its basic values and norms. As Arroyabe put it, “*differences in values may translate into serious difficulties when attempting to communicate with people who do not share one's own*” (1999, p. 24). So, orientation project is to mitigate this ‘menace’ of communication, and give refugees an ability to understand and to learn meaning an ability of inclusion and further integration and dialogue with hosting society.

Additionally, vulnerability of newcomers is to be addressed specifically in these first/ orientation programs in terms of motivating their openness and feeling of confidence, proving to them importance of these first steps in new reality that is contribution to the future. Moreover, first-line orientation programmes can fulfill a selective function (as in schooling) revealing abilities and skills of learners as for potential directing them to participation in training projects.

Most of European states offer introduction programmes to the newcomers. Moreover, they are compulsory in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece and Netherlands (Isakova, 2010). E.g. in the Netherlands, most of refugees used to or are covered by the integration course;

therefore,  $\frac{3}{4}$  of them could speak Dutch without difficulty after the course completion (VluchtelingenWerk Nederland, Dutch Council of Refugees, 2012).

### **3. Civic Education, or Introduction into Action (including Human Rights and Citizenship courses).**

**The Human Rights programme** is oriented mostly at structural integration of refugees through making them to know their rights and responsibilities in a state and society, and ability to exercise and protect them in a due manner and with certain opportunities provided. At the same time, there is a certain component of social integration present if we think of its wider perception: *“the true, universal source of human rights is not an abstract vision of atomistic individuals, but rather a rich diversity of social connections and identities”* (Frohnen and Grasso, 2009, p.16).

Thus, once the “veil of ignorance” (Rawls, 1999, p.118) is lifted, both individual and society would benefit - at least, in ideal terms - from one’s active participation and true integration into the state and public realms. Moreover, *“active participation is an empowering process which enables people to claim their rights by influencing the decisions that affect their lives”* (Amnesty International, 2011).

Special attention the notion of Human Rights Education has started to be given from the year 1995 and the UN Decade for Human Rights Education. Before, the issue had been addressed in 1953 with the UNESCO Associated Schools Program. Amnesty International defines Human Rights Education as a *“is a deliberate, participatory practice aimed at empowering individuals, groups and communities through fostering knowledge, skills and attitudes consistent with internationally recognized human rights principles”* (Amnesty International, 2012).

Three main human rights education models were suggested by Felisa Tibbits. Additionally to *awareness* (including common approaches and values related) and *accountability* (in the sense of legal and political environment), human right education can also fulfill certain *transformational* functions as in its psychological implications (especially for women and minor refugees so traumatized individuals) (Tibbits, 2002).

Here, **rights** can be seen as a granted opportunity that can become a tool of individual empowerment in terms of one's confidence and sense of security (that brings us to eliminating the victims' complex as well). At the same time, **delivering sense of responsibility** is an unalienable part of the agenda: "*Enjoyment of these rights entails responsibilities and duties with regard to other persons, to the human community and to future generations*" (The Charter of Fundamental Right of the European Union, 2010/C 83/02).

Finally, in regard to this dimension **central role of individual** in the EU society – "*at the heart of its activities*" - is to be emphasized as a bearer of rights so responsibilities in the system of *freedom, security and justice* of the European countries (The Charter of Fundamental Rights of European Union: 2010/C 83/02).

The notion of **individual** is strongly tight with a notion of **citizenship** implying membership in a specific nation-state and the formal rights and obligations that this membership entails but also involving status and identity (Gilbertson, 2006). Most importantly, nation-states can set and control the parameters of this membership (Gilbertson, 2006) – that brings us again to an unbreakable role of state's policies.

In general terms, as Ager and Strang express it, "*the aim of citizenship course is to familiarize the newcomer with aspects of 'us' that we assume are different from 'them'*" (Ager and Strang,

2010, p.593) - that again would evolve around understanding of inclusion/exclusion and prospects of integration into a state like its member, its part, its citizen. Also, the connection of citizenship with rights and responsibilities should be delivered so state's values and concepts of belonging (Ager and Strang, 2008).

Weerd et.al. in their extensive report *Indicators for Monitoring Active Citizenship and Citizenship Education* have suggested basic *indicators for active citizenship* (including various kinds of political participation and organization activities) (2005, p.II) so they divided the education framework into certain categories: “*transfer of knowledge (background, facts, functions), transfer of attitudes (political efficacy, trust, and interest), transfer of values (tolerance, non-violence, acknowledging rule of law and human rights), transfer of skills (critical reading, debating, writing, critical listening, emphatic skills, social skills)*” (2005, p.III)– that can offer us an exhaustive structure for successful citizenship course organization.

As for launching certain projects of citizenship education, programmes promoted by the European Union can become a source of support and ideas for the pilot projects and community enterprises (Citizenship Education at School in Europe by Eurydice, 2005; NECE – Networking European Citizenship Education from 2004; Migration Citizenship Education from 2007 etc.). In 2004, during its EU presidency the Netherlands supported the idea of civic education as a cornerstone of integrated society.

**4. Training (i.e. vocational training and specialized programmes)** is reconsidered as one of the most significant elements of integration as providing to refugees special ‘equipment’ of knowledge and skills that are necessary for entering the labor market or launching their own enterprise, community projects etc.

As Ager and Strang put it: “Vocational training and further education are thus usually considered as key aspects of integration to the extent that such measures foster employability either in general terms or through enhancement of specific language or work skills” (2008, p. 171). Permanent job means not only stable income but guarantees a sense of confidence in one’s future and feeling of security that are so important for newcomers’ psychological state that, in its turn, would make them more open and easygoing in connections and daily communication – building ground for social integration.

Around the EU we can find certain successful projects aimed at training and qualification improvements. For instance, the ‘stair model’ project in Denmark (2003-2006) aimed at integration into labour market: it included 3-6 months of orientation course, traineeship phase, work phase with salary subsidized by municipality, and final regular job obtainment (Handbook on Integration, 2007, p.58).

Except improving qualifications in the jobs of higher education, there is also a possibility of specialized trainings: for instance, in Italian municipality of Forli the refugees get to select among training courses that include garment maker-seamstress, weldercarpenter, fibreglass worker, and administrative assistant; in Rome the same programme, Integra, offers a selection of electrician, carpenter, refrigerator technician, cook and bartender (Handbook on Integration, 2007, p.54).

Another important component of the OETPs is using of **art** (painting, music, literature etc.) as for addressing certain tasks in education creating more relaxed and interesting atmosphere in the classroom. This tool is also priceless when working with children, also helping them to process negative experience and interact freely (James, n.d.).



According to Mezirov, “*The ultimate goal of transformative learning is to assist learners in assessing their current perspectives and approaches to life and, through education, to provide an opportunity to change these perspectives and approaches*” (1991 cited in Christopher et. al., 2001, p. 134). Thus, we can apply this approach not only to sphere of vocational training but also to civic education and even orientation programmes as in widening the horizons of perspectives of newcomers, their view on certain values and customs. In wider term, we can talk about special courses aggrassing finance management, health and eating culture etc. (Christopher et. al., 2001).

In Taylor we find division of the transformative process into three steps, namely obtaining *critical awareness*, *revision of belief system* and *expectations (including more integrative perspective)*, and finally adoption of *behaviors more consistent with their renewed perspective* (1997 cited in Christopher et. al., 2001, p.135). Here, I would put remark regarding ambitiousness of the project from the first sight – we should not reconsider complete ‘reshaping’ of an individual but rather changing his certain perception and approaches, increasing his openness to new environment, developing potential for integration, and at the same time increase in the sense of security – “*an empowered sense of self, an increase in self-confidence in new roles and relationships*” (Courtney et al., 1998; Taylor, 1997 cited in Christopher et. al., 2001,p. 135).

Christopher et.al. also indicate several extra activities that are to be mentioned here as an additional component into traditional ‘mainstream’ education style, they are: *hands-on activities (e.g., food preparation, simple household repairs, household cleaning problems)*; *videotaping (e.g., videotape mock job interviews and offer positive feedback and suggestions for improvement)*; *group activities (e.g., in-class family meetings to identify strengths and set family*

*goals*); *group games*; *role-playing* (e.g., *role-play negative and positive scenarios for dealing with anger in parent-child relationships*); and *narrative* (e.g., *telling real-life stories to illustrate principles of effective parenting*) (2001, p.136). Other tools that can be seen as supplement to traditional teaching are possibly outdoor activities and interest clubs creation.

Thus, we face here a necessity to almost ‘embrace un-embraceable’ meaning achievement of various tasks and objectives that will lead to constructive process of structural and social integration of newcomers. At the same time, we should remember that OETPs should receive an extensive support from state and community institutions so be mutually supplemented by other institutional and social improvements - then we can talk of positive consequences of OETPs.

An outcome and success of any education programme so general objectives of OETPs are obviously needed to be evaluated as for analysis and bringing improvements into programmes and projects. Medda-Windischer R. in her work offers us several definitive components of success for policies’ strategies: innovative, making a difference, having a sustainable effect, and showing a potential for replication (2004, pp. 14-15). She has also noticed importance of reckoning any evaluation with regard to cultural variation and variation in the target group so a particular political and institutional environment (2004, p.15). Thus, recognizing programme’s potential and particular context, we can still take it as a model for other projects.

No doubt that success of OETPs, or any of distinctive project, can be reflected in above-mentioned indicators suggested by Medda-Windischer, namely legal, social, and attitudinal indicators (2004, p. 28). The complication here is a number of factors of influence that can be reflected in these indicators besides OETPs as, for instance, lower level of structural discrimination or openness of labor market etc. (more information on a variety of indicator can be

found in MIPEXa, 2012). Therefore, we will face a necessity of aligning the indicators so providing additional qualitative research as in form of interview and questionnaires that might reflect direct and indirect changes in attitudes and overall perception by refugees of their roles and future perspectives<sup>6</sup>. We might also be interested in influence of a particular programme as for urgency of some particular task/tasks as regarding to group peculiarities and hosting society features. Here, local evaluation that is of the most importance for us – we will definitely resort to *programme records* as well as *local surveys* (Ager and Strang, 2004, p.19), or try to organize them properly in order to get as qualitative research so – in time - quantitative indicators.

Ager and Strange suggested several indicators for evaluation of the success of programmes aimed at language and cultural knowledge improvements. At first, they have outlined practical indices that include numbers showing attendance of language class, so availability of interpretation service (for communication with public sector), and also knowledge of local services and practices, access to English(in that case) language media sources and knowledge customs, culture and history of refugee communities within non-refugee local population (Ager and and Strang, 2004, p.19). Second level of indicators – policy level – consists of two core indicators: language fluency at satisfactory level among refugees within two years of receiving refugee status, and *proportion of people living in areas of significant refugee settlement who feel that local ethnic differences are respected and valued (Ibid.)*.

Obviously, these indicators can become a good start for qualitative and quantitative resources gathering, except this list cannot be seen as a complete one. We can face a necessity of adding **before/after indicator** for finding out the potential influence of language and culture knowledge

---

<sup>6</sup> That brings us again to the *two-way* approach to integration (Europa. Summaries of EU Legislation, 2010), including changes in integration research tendencies (Korac and Gilad, 2001; Mestheneos and Ioannidi, 2002, etc.).

programme, for instance, in case of resorting to a special interpreting service and media resources' access. At the same time, knowledge of culture should be reflected reciprocally for receiving society representative (i.e. local inhabitants) so for refugees – that would become an evidence of social and cultural exchange as an indicator of social integration. Additionally, for successful integration it is not only language knowledge matters but certain cultural and normative 'preparedness' that facilitate orientation and communication, signifying structural and social integration of refugees.

# Chapter IV. Multidimensional Implementation of OETPs.

Life is not lived in a single dimension.

Putnam

## *a. Supra-national level (EU)*

In order to define an actual place of and stress on a certain policy, we inevitable have to observe the wider framework of the field. In this case, defining the place and perspective of the OETPs on the European agenda, there is an additional necessity to look at the asylum policy and integration policy prospects – at least in short – in the context of the European Union.

As for the basis, obviously, the Geneva Convention of 1951 and the Protocol of 1967 relating to the status of refugees and the full respect of the Charter of Fundamental Rights are the parts of the common agenda.

Common vision has officially started to be formed with appearance of the Shengen group in 1986: simply, common borders demand certain level of policy unification, including migration and asylum policies (Sigona, 2005, 115-116). In 1993, the Maastricht Treaty put a foundation of the ‘three pillars’ structure in which ‘third’ pillar was “Justice and Home Affairs” that is to include migration and asylum policies (Ibid.). It is necessary to underline here that immigration policies have been always ‘ahead’ in the common policies decision and attracted more attention (especially, regarding to what is important to us, integration dimension) comparing to the refugees’ issues. To my mind, it is also connected with a great flow of labour migration inside and outside of the European Union starting from 1960s, and causing further on shaping of a new permanent minority groups on the territory of member-states, therefore demanding increasing of

the immigrants' contribution into the society. At the same time, the refugee flows are not becoming less but even more intense as in connection with recent Arab revolutions, protest in Syria, flames of war in Sudan etc.

The distinction of two categories – in term of integration - has come into official and political discourse in XX century, before we can observe a unified 'migrant' option, either legal or illegal. Further, in 1996, the March communitarianisation of immigration and asylum policy was approved by votes of all the EU members, except the UK and Denmark (Zetter et al, 2002; Stevens, 2004 in: Sigona, 2005, p. 116) (the last one has been choosing an 'opt-out' quite often regarding the issue – for instance, Denmark is not participating in the projects of European Refugee Fund and European Integration Fund – there is a preference for national and local enterprises so community projects funded by the government (Handbook on Integration, 2007, p. 83)). With the treaty of Amsterdam coming into power in 1999, *immigration and asylum was switched to the first pillar*, the measure that were to be arranged first include protection, asylum procedure, and reception (Sigona, 2005, p.116).

As follows, we need outline main stages: the Tampere program (1999 to 2004: rules for family migrants; long-term residence access, launching the Common European Asylum System); the Hague Program (2004 to 2009: mechanisms for exchanging information for coordination of national integration; plus the network of National Contact Points); adoption by the Council in 2005 of the Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the EU (Council Document 14615/0415), and by the Commission A Common Agenda for Integration (COM(2005) 389) (In: Isakova, 2010).

Additionally, we can observe striving to exchange of the successful practices as it was laid down in the *Council Decision of 5 October 2006 on the establishment of a mutual information mechanism concerning Member States' measures in the areas of asylum and immigration* (European Commission, 2006, 2006/688/EC).

What is important for us, special attention in the last document was given in the Common Agenda for Integration to needs of vulnerable groups among refugees (including special approach to education and training). Once again, it also underlined the harmonization of legal standards for protection and asylum procedure as a main objective supplemented by practical cooperation, solidarity and shared responsibility of the EU countries (COM(2005) 389) – that is also true about “The Overarching Objectives of the CEAS” putting a ground for the first phase of the Common Asylum European System.

Additionally, we find the part 2.4.2. *Integration* in the Green Paper on the future Common European Asylum System (European Commission, 2007a, COM (2007) 301) that also suggests addressing *specific needs of refugees* (attention is given to housing and social services so work entitlement) and *the most vulnerable asylum seekers*. It may be presumed that we can see education as a part of *social services* category and definitely as one of the *special needs*. Unfortunately, there is no direct mentioning of any kind of special orientation and training level in the high-level documents regarding the common policies direction.

The Stockholm Program for 2010-2014 (2010/C 115/01) went further and expressed necessity of integration measures along with importance of education indicators (In: 6.1.5. *Integration - in 6.1. A dynamic and comprehensive migration policy*). What is noticeable is that integration is

taken as regarding to all the newcomers – ‘migrants’. In general, the Stockholm Programme can be seen as an official road map for the period till 2012 in common policies of the EU.

More precise reference to the OETPs we can find in *A Common Agenda for Integration - Framework for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals in the European Union 2005* (COM/2005/0389) stating, “*Basic knowledge of the host society’s language, history, and its institutions is indispensable to integration; enabling immigrants to acquire this basic knowledge is essential to successful integration*”.

That gives us an insight in rather absence of detailed reference to OETPs in field of asylum. Although, general directions and stressing the role of education, from one side, and special measure aimed at refugees and their initial orientation and training programmes from another offer a basis for policy design, implementation, and evaluation on the ‘lower’ levels of governing and social organization.

For better understanding of the EU bottom-up political process one should also take into consideration the so-called **Lamfalussy Process** – consists of 4 "stages" legislature implementation: the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union; special committees; national coordination regulators; compliance and enforcement of the new rules and laws (in: Isakova, 2010). Furthermore, these strategies can be reflected through representation in national strategies. Thus, the *Common Basic Principles on the Integration* are mostly in some measure incorporated into the national-states programmes. The Spanish Strategic Plan on Citizenship and Integration delivers the full version, and in Ireland all the potential projects financed by the Immigrant Integration Fund should reflect the CBP as well (European Commission, 2007b, COM (2007) 512) (in: Isakova, 2010).



In the end, we can find in the Stockholm Programme (2010/C 115/01) reliance on the multidimensional character of integration, *“Integration is a dynamic, two-way process of mutual interaction, requiring not only efforts by national, regional and local authorities but also a greater commitment by the host community and immigrants”*.

Here, we also find an appeal for development of structures and tools for knowledge exchange and coordination with other relevant policy areas, such as employment, education and social inclusion (2010/C 115/01). Effective and well-supported practical cooperation (including the Asylum Support Team deployment) is emphasized among the main principles of the European policies of Asylum (European Commission, 2011b).

Benchmarks used for implementing successful integration strategies are clearly described in the “Handbook on Integration for Policy-Making and Practitioners” (the latest third edition was launched in 2010), as effective practices of informational exchange.

Case. 90% of the EUF financial assets is relocated to the national government in support national programmes and achieving common European objectives. For example, 8.6 million Euro was granted to Czech Republic for a period of 2008-2013; among the objectives: support of the State Integration Programme (including Czech language classes for *asylum seekers and for persons benefiting from subsidiary protection* (Europa, 2008).

Beyond strategy-building and benchmarking, there is a organizational and financial support provided to member-states and certain projects and enterprises through such bodies as the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals and European Refugee Fund (both institutions are the part of "Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows" structure that also comprises the External Borders Fund and the Return Fund). The ERF among other matters co-finances actions aimed *“to support the empowerment of and acquisition of skills by refugees, including language training”* (European Commission, 2011c).

Comparing to the year 2008, in 2010 we can observe the tendency of widening as a spectrum of dimensions (including integration processes) so the actors participating - more national-level NGOs and specialized research institutions comparing with official states' agencies and ministries representing the most of the participators.

It can be presumed that financial and economic crises put another crucial question on the agenda preventing authorities of the member-states to continue active participation but at the same time we can imply change in the grant allocation policies on the EU level. Obviously, changed/widened character of actors and institutions participating gave an opportunity of perceiving the picture from a variety of angles that can explain amplification of the topics on the agenda (European Refugee Fund, 2008; European Refugee Fund, 2010).

Education was considered as one of the main priorities as in European Refugee Fund grant allocations in 2010; in particular, inclusion and developing of children's potential through the educational system of the hosting country. However, there were no projects connected directly with education during the adaptation period so transformative education programmes aimed at the adult population. Special attention was given to the children's access and integration into the system of education. Overall, refugee minors are given a stable 'care' from the EU projects' side (European Refugee Fund, 2010). Young migrant population is also obtaining the attention of the European Fund for Integration of Third-country nationals (European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals, 2009) so the women empowerment (European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals, 2008).

Among the related projects, I would like to notice the *IMPACT Integrating Migrants through the Provision of Adaptability and Competence Training* under the leadership of National Institute

of Adult Continuing Education (NIACE- England and Wales), UK (European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals, 2007, JLS/2007/EIFX/CA/1058). Thus, we can certainly conclude support by the EU of education and training programmes on the community projects' funding level.

In general, at the EU level we find the outline of common strategy and principles of cooperation that can lay down a foundation for future policies' development, also through community projects support. As for the supra-national level, another matter of importance is to attract attention to certain issue so present a pace and 'destination' of policies implementation. Thus, regarding to OETPs we find mainly general instructions and framework of integration (including reference to overall migrant integration) that can become a foundation for certain objectives' interpretation and implementation. Hopefully in future, with widening the common asylum policies' sphere, we will observe more thorough scheme as referring to orientation, education, and training in their role for integration.

***b. State level policies.***

State as a bearer of exclusive power and controller of certain resources plays a crucial role for the matters of integration of refugees. First, it is state authorities granting a special status of refugee to a newcomer according to a final decision of an asylum procedure. Second, as it has been mentioned before, the very structural integration of refugees starts with this status and opportunities that it gives (so duties it demands) – that Ager and Strang describes as “*the relationship between the frameworks of rights and the process of integration*” (2010, p.595). Third, newcomers are to seek support from the state taking as a 'solution' – “*to enable them both to preserve their distinctive cultural identity and to overcome the socially and economically*

*marginal position they generally occupy in relation to the labour market, access to health, education and other public services and to local and national political institutions*” (Turton and Gonzales, 1999, p. 11); including also material support from the state at the very beginning of their ‘new’ life. But not only material support matters – policies undertaken at the national level can influence refugees’ position as if providing a place for them in the state’s structure and support inside the institutional framework. Additionally, as Parekh expressed it, “*state plays a vital role in fostering a sense of justice and common belonging*” (Parekh, 2006, p. 209). Fourth, state’s policies itself are tool of public influence in reflecting an official position and general attitudes, e.g. “*policy, emphasizing limitation and control, undermines integration by communicating a negative message to the public that refugees are damaging to society. This negativity in turn powerfully conflicts with policy aimed to promote the integration of those who are granted refugee status*” (Ager and Strang, 2010, p.595). Thus, we observe the two-fold connection in state reflecting historical tradition and modern public attitude but at the same time being able to influence public opinion. Not only government but certain political parties (e.g. ultra-nationalists’ opposition) can become a power in people’s opinion change/construction.

The pressure of integration demands varies among member-states as to the final resettlement policies. The countries that are and perceived to be the main refugees ‘receivers’ (Spain, Greece, Italy) are not usually turn out to become a ‘final destination’ of resettlement – here we find the Nordic countries and Germany (Italy can also be seen as bearing considerably high level of final resettlement; among the Eastern European countries, leader is Czech Republic (MIPEXa, 2012)). In general, integration is receiving substantial attention from the EU states, including the very state institutions’ level, e.g. existence of the Danish Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and

Integration Affairs, the Commission for the Integration of foreigners in the Czech Republic, 'Immigration Observatory' of Portugal etc. Additionally, an important issue for us here would be the whole policy cycle framework, including policy design, implementation, and evaluation.

**Policy design** is evidently influenced by a general political strategy towards newcomers (in particular, strategies that it was mentioned in Chapter II: assimilationism, multiculturalism, social integration). We have already revealed that OETPs are necessary in case of any strategic approach to integration but its design and planning would vary. Strategy itself is also grounded in the previous policies towards newcomers (so minorities). At the same time, the very 'experience' of state in dealing with 'others' as regarding to historical record would matter.

Thus, regarding OETPs, policy design is usually located in the mainstream of the integration policies for refugees, or even for wider category of migrants/newcomers. It is strongly connected with political strategy and wider perspective of the official authorities reflected in state's political orientations, policy planning, amount of financing and control, launching new project, attention given to the recommendations offered by non-governmental or supranational structures.

Proper **implementation** of the planned policies is a crucial part of OETPs success. As connected with the previous step, we should be aware of "snowball effect": Winter argues that a highly important role for the implementation process plays factor of policy formation process and policy design, so "*the roots of implementation problems can be found in the prior policy formulation process*" (2006, p.151). Winter himself suggests that diversified political representation in the authoritative structures, including minorities representatives, can be helpful (2006, p.151).

Case. The Ballerup integration council, Denmark (one of 73 local integration councils in under the Ethnic Minority Council). Function: advisory for the Minister of Refugee, Immigration and Integration affairs. Composition: council includes 10 members representing ethnic minorities, two

members representing the local council, two members representing day-care and school boards, and one member each representing sports clubs, the elderly council and the youth council. Format: monthly meetings; ad hoc working groups; an annual weekend seminar; coordination with the city's Social Liaison Committee and the Coordination Committee responsible for employment and the labour market; cooperation with volunteer counselling and a centre for ethnic minorities (Handbook on Integration, 2007, p.74).

However, we should remember that implementation of policies is also strongly dependent on actual public attitudes at the moment so local policy-‘delivering: role of good governance is highly significant but not overwhelming. Winter himself suggested a joint model - ‘mixing up’ bottom-up and top-down approaches (2006, p.151) – as the best solution of implementation results. He assumes that in local policies performances, it is street-level bureaucrats’ “*attitudes toward policy instruments, target population, and their workload*” shape a situation (Ibid.). In case of OETPs, we can elaborate on: managers of the project, specialists working on the curriculum and programmes, teachers.

Thus, as O'Neill argues, “the government should lead, but successful integration depends on the contributions of all sectors of society, including public bodies, community and religious leaders, the education system, voluntary organizations, employers and trade unions” (2001, in: Ager and Strang, 2008, p.175-176).

Case. The Spanish Integration Fund since 2005 aimed to provide support to the integration policies at regional and local level (budget: 182.4 million Euros in 2006). Format: funding is directed to the Autonomous Communities (regions) if they cover 30% co-financing; allowance for special influx; 40% of the money are to be spent directly by municipalities. In fact, 50% of funds are assigned to education, covering reception programmes in schools (Handbook on Integration, 2007, p.82).

Local initiatives has become a norm around Europe – being complementary to the principle of subsidiarity – revealing ability of local and municipal authorities to address specific issues in

their areas, including integration of refugees and OETPs. There are also precedents of EU-local level cooperation and inter-local cooperation.

Case 1. Eurocities, a network of 128 large European cities. *'Contribution to Good Governance concerning the integration of immigrants and reception of asylum seekers'*. Format: inclusive work on the charter that contains general principles for how to approach integration, as well as more specific codes of conduct relating to the delivery of key services (Handbook on Integration, 2007, p.72).

Case 2. 'Integra', Italy, EQUAL project. Format: local integration roundtables in seven municipalities (continue beyond the project and have also been emulated by other municipalities), including National Thematic Table and Local Integration Tables (local authority and include representatives of employment offices, vocational training agencies, trade unions, asylum seekers and refugees, and other local partners). Practical achievements: 'Integra' provides refugees and asylum seekers with language training, skills audits, job orientation, apprenticeships and other services to facilitate their access to the labour market; the identification of representatives within each institution and the establishment of the networks are seen as a positive result (Handbook on Integration, 2007, p.73-74).

Case 3. The competition *'Successful integration is no coincidence: strategies of local integration policy'*, initiated by the German Ministry of Interior and the Bertelsmann Foundation Format: competition based on the several main questions: *'Where do our local communities stand today with regard to integration? What strategies have they pursued? And what successes have they had?'* Result: 1. Several smaller communities were represented in the group of 23 finalists (of 107 contributions); finally awarded prizes to four local authorities of different sizes. 2.Ten recommendations for a successful local integration policy were developed and published on the basis of the competition with an extensive documentation of the local communities' experiences, and further distributed to local authorities in Germany, and an English summary has also been produced (Handbook on Integration, 2007, p.76).

Thus, local enterprise can be highly effective for OETPs objectives implementation but it demands substantial strategic and material support by state, so motivation for the local communities.

Regarding **evaluation** of the state policies, the role is given not only to official state institutions but also to academia so special NGOs and international agencies that are to balance state's mistakes and attract its attention through recommendations and analytical reports.

Obviously, state's policies play meaningful role for integration issues as through policy design, implementation, and evaluation. At the same time, implementation and evaluation of certain policies is strongly dependent on 'lower' levels of state institutional hierarchy, local and

municipal levels in particular. At present moment, more resources and instruments of OETPs provision are still located in ‘hands’ of national governments, although without the support of ‘upper’ and ‘lower’ levels, several efforts in implementation, evaluation, and design risk become futile.

Here, two cases of national integration policies are offered in their relation to refugees’ integration and OETPs dimension.

#### Case 1: Sweden

Sweden is characterized by absence of integration policies till 1970s. In 1975 the three basic principle were adopted as a ground for a new integration policies: *equity (the same rights as the indigenous population)*; *freedom of choice by the individual (whether someone wishes to adopt the Swedish culture or not)*; and *cooperation* (Westin 2004 in: Valenta and Bunar, 2010). This marked the transition of the country to the policy of multiculturalism, inclusive society, and, of course, equal support for all by the welfare state. Further, we observe the influence of economic slowdown and crisis in 1990s (Valenta and Bunar, 2010, p.468) that led to deterioration of situation of the most vulnerable parts of the population, and therefore, stipulated deeper integration routes. As according to the Governmental proposal, the move *from multiculturalism for immigrants to a cultural pluralism for everyone* with an aim of presenting integration as a common issue of the whole society (Sodergran 2000; Dahlstedt 2005 in: Valenta and Bunar, 2010, p.469). In 1991, certain recommendations to the municipalities were made regarding their work in framework of introduction programmes (Valenta and Bunar, 2010, p. 471); in general, the role of the central government for OETPs policies design is high.

Currently, the extensive programmes on orientation and training are undertaken (Ibid, p.472), including stress on the *human capital enhancing measures* (Ibid, p.472). The central government *demands from all governmental institutions present in the municipalities (the unemployment office, the general social insurance office, etc.) that they participate in the integration efforts together with the local authorities*. Additionally, in order to obtain financing individual introduction plan should be presented by a municipality *for every refugee, signed by the municipality representatives and the refugee* (SOU 2008, p. 58 in: Valenta and Bunar , 2010, p.473). However, the plan is not legally compulsory (some municipalities see the investigation on every special individual as costly (SOU 2008: 102)) (Valenta and Bunar, 2010, p. 473).

Nowadays Sweden is ranked by MIPEX as the most successful country regarding integration issues and anti-discrimination policies, and addressing the specific needs of every individual (including orientation courses and language programmes, and schooling matters) (MIPEX, 2012b).

#### Case 2: Netherlands

Netherlands is certainly a country with a long history of migration (for 2007, 20 % of the population were immigrants or children of immigrants), especially large flows the country received after the collapse of the colonial system so with a flow of temporary workers (Focus Migration, 2007). Initially, the country was more than just respectful to the needs and cultural peculiarities of newcomers; that was also reflected in services provision in their native language (Focus Migration, 2007). On the official level there is a distinction between *allochtonen* (at least one parent who was born outside the Netherlands) and *autochtonen* (natives) (Focus Migration, 2007). But the welfare system has been always of in assistance to newcomers and refugees.

*Until the 1970s, the Netherlands lacked an integration policy*: in the beginning of 1980s introduction of minority policies had place that was bearing clear multicultural character, including consultative councils for ethnic minorities at the local and national level and mother tongue teaching in primary schools, and appearance if the first Muslim and Hindu schools (Focus Migration, 2007). But in the 1980s and 1990s with the welfare states facing a crisis, the



political focus shifted to socio-economic integration, importance of learning Dutch erected so responsibility of newcomers for their successful integration (Focus Migration, 2007). However 'vulnerable' pupils at school are still getting support from the Ministry of Education (Handbook on Integration, 2007, p.18). An official political line has changed: multiculturalism policies having been undertaken by the authorities faced a decline in XXI century (also in: Joppke, 2003). After attacks of September 11, the ultra-nationalist started getting a voice of influence, especially the Pim Fortuyn's List party (also in: Focus Migration, 2007). Although this 'splash' did not last more than several years, the voices of nationalism are still heard so the public attitudes are divided. In general, integration is seen as an inevitable and necessary process.

According to the law on the civic integration of newcomers (Wet Inburgering Nieuwkomers, WIN) in 1998, 600 hours of language and societal orientation classes should be taken. In 2004, Netherlands has become a 'headliner' of the citizenship education priority as in the course of its EU presidency. Further, the Civic Integration act came into force on January 1, 2007: the civic integration basis was called to be 'prepared' before actual arrival of people to the Netherlands (Government of Netherlands, 2012a).

Dutch society and values are central in the modern approach to integration (Government of Netherlands, 2012b) that has completely abandoned multiculturalism and division into specific groups among newcomers but integrated individuals (Government of Netherlands, 2012c). The Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations is currently in charge of the policies.

As for asylum seekers, orientation and integration centers run by COA (The Dutch central agency for the reception of asylum seekers) were aimed at introductory programmes (language course and social and career orientation) of 3 months duration (Ministry of Work and Social Affairs, 2006, p.7). Further, the start of the training was transferred to the period prior to refugees arrival (from several weeks to 4 days) - Cultural Orientation (CO) Training Prior to Resettlement provided by the COA with the logistical support of IOM in the camps (Global Human Rights Defence, 2010). The potential refugees were offered information on: general facts about the Netherlands and its society; history and political structure; living in Dutch society; document processing and preparing for travel; travel and transit; housing (reception centers to municipality); education and health care services; rights and obligations; employment and money management; cultural adaptation (International Organization for Migration, 2011). According to the Global Human Rights Defence, *the majority of the participants considered the information they were given in this short amount of time sufficient* (2010). According to the Dutch Council of refugees (independent NGO, active from 1979, comprises 7.000 volunteers and 600 paid employees being active in 90% of all local council districts), most of refugees in the Netherlands used to or are covered by the integration course;  $\frac{3}{4}$  of them could speak Dutch without difficulty; additionally, education and training courses were offered to the newcomers (VluchtelingenWerk Nederland, 2012). According to MIPEX, Netherlands ranks 5<sup>th</sup> with policies 'slightly favourable for integration' (MIPEXc, 2012).

Both countries are characterized by shift of their integration strategies from multiculturalism to deeper inclusive approach to inclusive society and integration. Integration policies' change was reflected on the policy planning and implementation s regarding to refugees' integration. The 'vulnerable' groups of population, including refugees, are still under a great surveillance of both welfare states – but with more full-inclusive attitude.

Sweden is an example of successful integration policies and extensive programmes regarding the OETPs dimension. The role of human capital enhancement is seen as crucial stipulating a range of training programmes. As an example of welfare state, it demonstrates central role of governmental structures; nevertheless, strong stress is made on the role of municipalities, local policies, and individual approach to every newcomer.

Netherlands is another example of a successful welfare state is making a primary stress at orientation and civic education programmes that are aimed to create strong level of social integration into the inclusive society based on common rules and valuing an individual approach. Both countries pay great attention to initial orientation and language-learning process, and local implementation process so cooperation with NGOs and international agencies.

In general, level and nature of integration policies so presence of OETPs elements in these policies vary considerably among the EU countries. It brings us to the idea of successful practices exchange between countries of the European Union.

Case. NGO Network of Integration Focal Points (coordinated by the European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE) and Caritas Europa; from June 2005). Project: policy briefing on good practice exchange in the sphere of refugees/migrants integration in Europe. Format: 33 non-governmental organisations in 23 European countries. Additionally, it received financial support from the European Commission (INTI preparatory Actions 2004) until 2006 (Caritas Europa, 2012).

As for practices exchange, we need to keep in mind influence that certain national and state peculiarities, characteristics, and factual developments during successful programme can influence result. Bouchard suggests to pay attention to: 1. identity argument, and historical heritage; 2. history and custom; 3. accommodation of minorities to the majorities; 4. legal argument: value of antecedence; 5. level of diversity; 6. symbolic foundation; 7. principles behind ad hoc precedence (Bouchard, 2011, p.451-456). Mestheonis and Ioannidi underlined also the importance of background as for differences related to the: welfare systems, citizenship rights for refugees, bureaucratic processes, socio-cultural contexts (2002, pp.317-318). We also may keep in mind non-static nature of political development, i.e. perpetual changes on the political scenery. However, certain elements of cultural/traditional background are hard to eliminate at once. In addition, certain policies and specific legal provisions are performed and implemented in and, consequently, they can be seen as successful practices only in some particular contexts. In selecting successful policies and provisions due consideration is to be given to the cultural, social and historical context of society in question and the political and economic constraints of their implementation (Medda-Windischer R., 2004, p.15). To conclude, basic analysis can pay attention to the following factors: history; ethnical composition; state policies (citizens, minorities, immigrants, refugees); presence/absence of vocational opposition; cooperation of state dimensions and actors; discriminative practices; -actual policy design; policies' implementation; background factors; factual developments, changes, and constraints during implementation; - results and evaluation. Analysis is certainly needed also from the side who intends to implement the practice.

### *c. Community Level*

The European society is based on the principle of individualism being one of its main cornerstones. Nevertheless, what is obvious - from subsidiarity principle to daily communication – is “*communities' involvement in cultural, political and economic flows at the local, national and global level*” (Husband, 1999, p.88).

Community level is given a great attention in the European Union policies. As for the European Refugee Fund, its budget for 2008-2013 of 638 million Euros was distributed to the Member State (90 %) and Community Action (10%) (Europa, 2008). Additionally, the ERF Community actions are seen as a promotion of practical cooperation between EU States' administrations (European Commission, 2011c). Community level integration has become one of the main priorities of the year 2012 according to grants awarded by the European Fund for the Integration of Third-country Nationals.

Community interaction is not just simple confidence in one's neighbours but rather action for the sake of what Putnam called *generalized reciprocity* (2000, p.20-21), common benefit on the local level, namely the level embracing our daily lives. Froghnen and Kennen said that “*our communities are in the nature of our being... that they result from a combination of duty, rational choice, emotional attachment, habit, and an instructive drive toward community, rather than merely agreement and consent*” (2009, p.23). They also lead us to the idea of inherent value of social networks (Ibid.) so does Putnam in terms of social capital value (2000).

As Claude S. Fischer, a sociologist of friendship, has noted, "Social networks are important in all our lives, often for finding jobs, more often for finding a helping hand, companionship, or a

shoulder to cry on" (cited in Putnam, 2000, p.20). Additionally, James S. Coleman highlighted the social context of education (Putnam, 2000, p.19).

Putnam himself expressed the idea of education being the key to both greater tolerance and greater social involvement (2000). Thus, it would lead us to the idea of importance of education – in our case education in terms of OETPs – for integration into community but also importance of communities themselves for provision of faster integration, and possibly organizing certain orientation/education classes for newcomers. Of course, it would depend on nature and characteristics of community itself, its connections' density and mutual support indicators. However, Putnam calls us to make a distinction between *bridging* (or inclusive connections) and *bonding* (or exclusive connections) in community (2000, p.22). *Mobilized solidarity* can render a great “*social and psychological support*” but also “*bolsters our narrower selves*” (Ibid.) creating precedent of high-level exclusion and impossibility of penetrate for newcomers at the first place. Here, the importance of *bridging* (Putnam, 2000, pp.22-23) reveal itself. Organization of newcomers into their own closed groups and low level of bridging can easily lead to ghettoization and further low possibility of wider social integration even in one neighbourhood (also in: Putnam, 2000). Thus, as Putnam concludes, “*Networks and the associated norms of reciprocity are generally good for those inside the network, but the external effects of social capital are by no means always positive*” (p.21). I see it as an implication for structural and social integration of greater extent meaning newcomers inclusion not simply into community but by the means of community integration being included into the whole structural and social realm of state as through community.

Dickerson et.al. so Ager and Strang (2010) highlight the role of host communities that is highly significant for refugees. First, there is experience of their first 'real' contacts (I presume that evaluation of OETPs success should be provided in the form of community level interaction analysis). As Ager and Strang pointed out, it matters in terms of confidence to build up language skills and local knowledge (2010, pp.598-599).

But sometimes precedents of cross-cultural communication become rare so Ager and Strang suggest *a proactive strategy to create spaces for meeting and exchange* (2010, p.599).

Case. 'Local Exchange and Trading Systems' (LETS), Netherlands. Aim: encourage reciprocal interaction combining 'sympathy' and 'pragmatic' grounds. Format: system of bartering for goods and services that allows asylum seekers (not eligible for formal employment) to work and exchange value with the established community (Smets and ten Kate, 2008, in: Ager and Strang, 2010, p.599).

Further ability of refugees to volunteer at local organizations and become more involved in civic life becomes an important step in integration process (Dickerson et.al., n.d.). In general, interaction plays a great role for mutual cultural enrichment so contribute to creation stable bonds and connections. As example suggested by Losi and Strung shows us, community would stand for protection of refugees in case of presence of these ties as happened in Scotland or Malta (2010, in: Ager and Strang, 2010, p.598).

Second, community initiatives can be seen as continuation or supplement to the state's official policies, or become a cradle of new ideas and approaches as shows us the case above, as it happened in Netherlands. Certain initiatives could be also organized in terms of OETPs practices.

Additional factors of community success is participation of 'former' refugees (Dickerson et.al., n.d.). However, research provided by Ager and Strang in 2004 revealed that this point can be situational (in: Ager and Strang, 2010, p.597). Nonetheless, certain persons – usually charismatic and communicative group leaders - can become a 'uniting chain' that is necessary for

the first steps in the process of transformative education and wider integration. Respect of their opinion and perceptions, so their behavioural patterns can be a crucial factor in changing negative attitudes or reluctance to participate in the program.

Case. 'Migrants integrate Migrants' (2002-2004, Ostwestfalen-Lippe, Germany), the EQUAL project. Format: a network of female immigrant mentors to provide professional orientation for young immigrant women leaving school; traineeships or other forms of support to the mentees; providing special certificates (Handbook on Integration, 2007, p.61).

Another factor presented by Dickerson et.al. (n.d.) so Ager and Strang (2010, pp. 596-597) is presence of family and family support. Obviously, family become a resort of security and an 'island' of confidence and comfort. Although, Ager and Strang have warned about over-reliance on family (2010, p.597).

Obviously, community level creates direct interaction that means closer and more personal connections for both representatives of hosting society so newcomers/refuges. Individual and small group interaction creates a precedence of revealing much clearer certain 'omissions' in hosting society and refugees' knowledge, experience, and perceptions. That puts community level as a highly important dimension of research and practical experiments in terms of addressing much precisely certain level of adaptation, education, and qualification of refugees through specific community projects and enterprise that can be seen as widened and modified – in according to local demands – policies of OETPs.

Further, it is a need to outline other important actors at the state's scene, namely NGOs, international agencies, and media.

#### **d. Media**

It is impossible not to mention role of media in creation the environment free of xenophobic attitudes and discrimination practices. Mainstream media can stand as tool of national policies; at the same time, certain media sources can be seen as a source of constructive criticism of policies drawbacks (nevertheless, some media actors and sources can create a tension through promotion of ultra-right nationalistic views).

There is no direct connection between OETPs provision and media activities even though certain media agents can participate in newcomers' education. Additionally, media orientation should be included into a wide extent of OETPs topics, in particular into the section of civic education.

#### **e. Civil Sector: NGOs and international agencies.**

For social networks developing and agents' cooperation in the framework of cross-dimensional approach, NGOs and international agencies (UNHCR, Amnesty International, ECRE) play a role of high importance. NGOs can fulfil the function of advocacy, promotion/campaigning organisations (also in: Handbook on Integration, 2007, p.26), become valuable sources of research, recommendation and constructive criticism of the official policies. *“NGOs are usually established for a particular cause or interest, for example when there is felt to be a gap in government policy or service provision. They often deliver targeted services to specific immigrant or refugee groups. Such services are sometimes seen as short-term ‘stop gap solutions’ because they are typically project-based and dependent on time-limited donor funding”* (Handbook on Integration, 2007, p.25). We also can elaborate on idea of extensive ability of fund-raising by NGOs, although usually own sources of NGOs are limited.



Case 1. START, the German Hertie Foundation (overall resources comprise 800 million Euros in assets and a 25 million annual Outlay; the foundation funds START with 5.5 million Euros). Format of foundation: model projects on integration, cooperation with several partners on implementation (more than 20 foundations, ministries of education, municipalities, private individuals, companies, clubs and associations are now involved in START – through scholarship funding and volunteering). Format of the programme: grants to 15-18 year old immigrants in form of a stipend of 100 Euros/month; involves into an intensive programme of coaching, excursions etc. Result: 160 youths were covered in 2005, up to 300 - in 2006 (Handbook on Integration, 2007, p.85).

Case 2. 'European Programme for Integration and Migration' (EPIM) collaborative effort of ten European foundations. Format: grants available to European-level NGOs and to European networks of nationally-based NGOs; consultations in Member States (2006-2007) (Handbook on Integration, 2007p.86).

Case 3. The European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE) (from 1974) that consists of about 70 organizations in 30 countries including the EU member-states. Format: research; recommendations; strengthening contacts of the European NGOs. Specific project: INTI, funded by the European Union. Format: preparatory actions promoting the integration in the EU Member States of people who are not citizens of the EU; dialogue with civil society, integration models, seek out and evaluation of best practices; networking. (Handbook on Integration, 2007, p. 83-84).

UNHCR as one of the most prominent proponents of the refugees and asylum-seekers protection has a strong connection with EU and its member-states, “promoting *respect for international protection norms in EU law and policy*” and providing a wide range of strategic suggestions and recommendations on present and future policies being and to be implemented, including integration and refugees’ education, through diverse reports, proposals, and observations. (UNHCR, 2012a). UNHCR also makes a great stress on facilitating local integration so durable solutions that are to be found (UNHCR, 2012b). Additionally, it realizes assistance to the refugees located on the territories of these countries through the support ‘on the ground’ through its country offices so regional offices in Belgium, Hungary, Italy, Sweden, Spain (UNHCR Global Appeal, 2012-2013 in: UNHCR, 2012b). Not once in its recommendation and observations, UNHCR has been attracting attention to OETPs, including Recommendations to the European Ministerial Conference on Integration on *Integration of Beneficiaries of*

*International Protection in the European Union* (UNHCR, 2010); *UNHCR Note on Refugee Integration in Central Europe* (UNHCR, 2009); *Education Strategy 2012-2016* (UNHCR, 2012c) etc. In *Refugee Education: A Global Review*, there is an official vision of UNHCR expressed as to “[e]nsure the right to education for all people of concern to UNHCR by achieving universal primary education and creating increased opportunities for post-primary education (secondary, vocational training, non-formal and adult education) with special focus on girls, urban, and protracted situations” (UNHCR, 2009c, p. 4 – In: UNHCR, 2011. p.24).

Case. Guide for Asylum Seekers, 2005. Information and Orientation (UNHCR, 2005) aimed at, starting from the first contact with the French administration, to offer to anyone willing to ask for asylum in France essential legal and practical information. Languages: French, English, and Russian. Useful information: the asylum procedure in France, its juridical status, the steps asylum seekers should take and the rights they may benefit from (right to stay and welfare rights in particular); organisations that can offer assistance to asylum seekers throughout the chosen asylum procedure.

As to conclude, state still stays the most influential actor in defining integration policies’ line although its efforts are being inevitably crossed with practices and activities of other actors. State still remains the main receiver and provider of financial resources aimed at integration projects, OETPs in particular. However, strategic planning, implementation level and evaluation efforts cannot be complete without participation of the EU institutions so local and community-level actors. Additionally, NGOs and international agencies play a highly significant role being complementary agents to other main players on the scene of integration. NGOs are also able to provide individual support and consulting. Refugees groups in every country are heterogeneous in nature that demands an accurate individual approach that can be granted only at local and community levels as representation of closer interaction and connections.

Finally, multidimensional structure does not presume exceptionally vertical way of cooperation but rather presents a model of social networks where every actor is connected and mutually supplementary for another.

## Chapter V. Conclusion

This paper presents an attempt to attract attention and explain importance of refugees' integration in the European Union mainly through qualitative research methods as for bringing an additional insight into this complicated issue, in particular structural and social integration of refugees. The work is focusing on so-called OETPs – denomination suggested by the author in order to define programmes of Orientation, Education, and Training that stand as one of the most influential tool of newcomers' integration into receiving society.

Here, the basic framework was constructed, i.e. theoretical basis for integration (basic explanation of integration in the system), field of integration (society of European state/European realm) and actors (EU, state, community, NGOs, newcomers), explanation of necessity of integration, main objectives posed – structural and social integration achievement, tool – OETPs, and finally normative and practical details of planning, implementation, and evaluation of the process.

I. Society of state is perceived as system and its constructing components: integration can be seen as a type of systemic organization implying certain conditional developments as interaction of the components and presence of a liaison, i.e. structure, rules, and mechanisms of cooperation. In this case, all the components, groups, members are perceived like parts of the system itself implying diverse roles they play for and in the system.

From theoretical point of view, the work shows that both for monistic views, moral pluralism and political pluralism, the issue of integration and involvement into a dialogue is an urgent step towards social harmony.

Society of state is a complicated and multidimensional system that demands a certain level of organization of groups and actors existing and acting inside of system. Its members themselves ARE society so they also turn out to be beneficiaries of its proper organization and functioning. Education in its different implications has always been a powerful tool of transmitting knowledge and revealing normative and cultural characteristics of society – that leads us to importance of OETPs for newcomers/refugees from the initial stages of their being on territory of state.

II. Here, we are talking precisely about state's society and a European state in particular. For the European Society of Diversity that reveals adherence to diversity, multiculturalism, and collaborative dialogue as an official EU approach, integration can be seen as a long-term prospective. Political pluralism is an unalienable part of liberal agenda that more than certainly demands presence of connecting' elements (in this case - liberal principles), i.e. there is no competition of values but differentiation of certain views, perceptions, and interests in the framework of common inclusive space of public realm. There is fact of building relationships on mutual respect and tolerance as a basis of intercultural dialogue and wider social dialogue in general as one of indicators of society's integration.

Although the concept of 'fortress Europe' still retains its power to a certain extent, the notion of diversity is inherent to it: so practice and its composition can be transformed, or rather widened embracing new elements (e.g. newcomers).

In spite of inevitable facts of discrimination and exclusion that newcomers may face in European society, attention and action of receiving state and society so their own motivation to become a part of a bigger whole are in force of changing present drawbacks. At the same time, integration means more than being inside the system, more than being just included as a passive

part. Integration implies connection and, most importantly, interaction within the system, and usually signifies certain independence of actors while the level of their interdependence is undoubtedly visible.

III. From theoretical and strategic perspective, we can divide intra-state connection into "thin" and "thick" forces of cohesion that would explain division into strategies of assimilation, multiculturalism etc. that indicate certain official approaches and state's policies towards integration. Multicultural politics in itself can pose a risk of indirect discrimination being 'called' by the minorities upon themselves as that would be inevitable to avoid meeting with state's structure that still presents certain social, political, economic rules to follow, so certain ways of conduct and norms. That can often lead to strengthening of exclusion tendency, and, further, presence of segregated communities. Thus, even multiculturalism would imply a certain level of factual integration, starting from basic structural integration in its legal embodiment to social integration into realm of social connections and intercultural dialogue.

For Europe, times of assimilation policies so blind 'obsession' with multiculturalism are over, and more and more policies are oriented onto integration as a denominator of a balance between cohesion and peculiarity. In fact, the only question of any political strategy or official policy is to which extent and in which way the project of integration is being fulfilled.

IV. Successful integration of 'alien' elements can become a basis of social, economic, and political development, and - at least partially - offer key and solutions for urgent demographic and economic problems. Integration is presented as a key to future of Humanity. Ethical approach to integration implies the European Society of Diversity; universal pursuing of tolerance, diversity, and equality; turning to the letter of Human Rights; and taking into consideration

vulnerability of the forced migrants/refugees. From strategic points, there are matters of cultural enrichment of the society, stability in a long term prospects, and economic development in long-term perspective (solution for the ongoing problem of ageing population, contribution into developing of knowledge-based society of diversity that can enrich businesses by bringing different skills, experiences, ideas etc.).

In general, we can perceive integration as a benefit for state – improving organization and providing active citizens that bear the whole extent of rights and responsibilities to state. Receiving society, in its turn, can enjoy the results brought by social harmony and proper social, political, and economic organization, at the same time getting access to cultural enrichment and secure social milieu. Newcomers/refugees are to obtain access to rights and opportunities of the state.

V. Structural integration is mainly concerned with primary inclusion of refugees into legal, and political, economic, and social spheres of hosting society as alleviation of adaptation and existence in a framework of society. Legal aspects are primary concentrated on official status granting so further long-residence permit, or citizenship. At the same time, obtainment of status does not guarantee of full access to all the opportunities connected with it. Thus, implementation plays a crucial role here so involvement of all the official and civil sector actors. OETPs can become a powerful tool of adaptation of newcomers in the state and lead to their action/reaction on the path to structural and social integration.

Additionally, awareness of basic cultural components seems meaningful as a ground for structural integration so seems simple awareness of the rights that one has; responsibilities and duties should be seen as inalienable part of official status as well.

However, state is not a pure institutional structure; public milieu is its 'filling' that we are surrounded by. Refugees' inclusion into hosting society is connected with the notion of social integration.

Finally, social integration in its full extent is impossible without properly organized and implemented structural inclusion. Structural integration at social level gives an opportunity to an individual, and simultaneously raises his trust and willing to cooperate with state's institutions. If we look further, confidence in future stability, overcoming victim's complex and psychological pressure of the past are also connected with a whole spectrum of social so structural integration (additionally, 'building' of social connections and bonds can ease structural integration). In general, there is no questioning sequence of the implementation: both structural and social integration support should be provided simultaneously. Thus, OETPs are to provide tools and mechanisms in order to gain certain results of both intertwined processes.

VI. Integration policies and OETPs in particular would demand addressing special needs and characteristics of refugees: forced character of migration, cases of being traumatized, high risk of victim's complex, unstable position in presence (including status, economic and social reality). Refugees should be perceived as a group (no matter if theoretically constructed) but the group that can be distinguished according to certain characteristics and needs (legal assistance, psychological assistance; special health issues; OETPs) that - when taken into consideration - can become a key to the positive outcomes of the integration policies and practices. That is also to be reflected in indicators of integration as a basis for objectives' posing. Main indicators reflect the success in structural, social, and cultural integration, including positive/negative attitudes of newcomers and receiving society. For research and analytical purpose, the findings and strategies



of immigrants' integration can be used although considering diverse nature and characteristics of both groups. Language, cultural knowledge, and qualifications provided by OETPs are seen as important tools of integration and to be observed and enhanced through mainly qualitative research and practical improvements, at least at the present moment.

VII. Obviously, education is embodiment of social and cultural characteristics of society but can at the same time play a part in transformation of these characteristics as a powerful ideological and intellectual tool of influence on minds, perceptions, and even believes of people. Education system also bears cultural information in itself per se, and becomes the first contact experience for newcomer's (also connected with a demand of qualified teaching personnel). In general ORTPs are to deliver - knowledge, motivation, principle, rights, and responsibilities; play a role of means of empowerment in the sense of providing information, knowledge, and special qualifications. Vulnerability of newcomers is to be addressed specifically in these first/ orientation programs in terms of motivating their openness and feeling of confidence, proving to them importance of these first steps in new reality that is contribution to the future. Moreover, first-line orientation programmes can fulfil also a selective function (as in schooling) revealing abilities and skills of learners as for potential directing them to participation in training projects.

VIII. There is a range of Orientation, Education, and Training programmes being one of the most powerful tool of structural and social integration of newcomers/refugees into a receiving/hosting society. Here, I suggest an approximate scheme of OETPs stages:

- **Education, or Introduction into Life:** standartization of refugee experience and qualifications up to state's benchmark and normative. The issue is highly complicated regarding refugees, mostly due to heterogeneous nature of the group, so a certain level of structural and social

discrimination; additionally certain amount of refugees that are being accepted into the European Union can reveal low level of literacy or education background. Children's education is even more difficult matter in terms of 'catching up' – or literally starting from 'zero' - with school/ university programmes in foreign language and ability to become a part of a studying milieu.

- **Orientation, or Introduction into Society:** includes language courses, introduction into culture and tradition of the recipient country, institutional and social 'rules', and basic normative code. This stage gives to newcomer necessary basic knowledge that eases his structural and social integration into hosting society.

- **Civic Education, or Introduction into Action** (including Human Rights and citizenship course). **The Human Rights programme** is oriented mostly at structural integration of refugees through making them to know implications of resident and citizenship status, rights and responsibilities connected with this status, and ability to exercise and protect them in a due manner and with certain opportunities provided. Most importantly, rights should always be accomplished with responsibilities, respect and reciprocity - otherwise there is a great risk of vain projects of integration, including the OETPs programs for refugees and other migrants. At the same time, in order to be able to represent themselves in public realm (formal and informal), in completely new political and social environment, newcomers have to know 'rules of the game', namely to be acquainted with the basic normative and legal assumption so procedural norms of state etc. Additionally, the **central role of individual** in the EU societies is to be delivered to newcomer.

- **Training** (i.e. vocational training and specialized programmes): provides to refugees special 'equipment' of knowledge and skills that are necessary for entering labour market or launching

their own enterprise, community projects etc. Refugee flows are an additional income of human capital that is already present on the territory of the EU, and in case of certain investments can become a response to many questions without addressing problem of illegal migration. Thus, there is a need in vocational training or requalification courses can be combined with other orientation and education projects on the state so local community levels. In fact, *life-long education* is not a completely new concept, especially for European states that pay a lot of tribute to its potential in improvement of competitiveness and innovation.

Thus, we face here a necessity to almost ‘embrace un-embraceable’ meaning achievement of various tasks and objectives that will lead to constructive process of structural and social integration of newcomers. At the same time, we should remember that OETPs should receive an extensive support from state and community institutions so be mutually supplemented by other institutional and social improvements - then we can talk of positive consequences of OETPs. Success of OETPs can never be guaranteed by one institution or actor so integration policies are certainly multidimensional - as society is complicated structure of many realms, spheres, and dimensions.

IX. In case of the European Union, we have political guideline in form of certain decisions and recommendations provided by the EU institutions; national policies’ and programmes’; community level; NGOs’ assistance. Additionally, there is a family support and personal experience that fall into the scheme.

European level is focused on provision of general directions, including stress on the role of education and special attention to refugees (especially, the minors) and their initial orientation and training programmes that give to member-states an orientation and recommendation in their

OETP policies, grounds for policy design, implementation, and evaluation. It may be presumed that we can see education as a part of *social services* category and definitely as one of the *special needs* of the *vulnerable parts* of society.

EU line is also defined through support and funding of certain national and community projects by such institutions as the European Refugee Fund and the European Fund for Integration of Third-country nationals. For ERF, education was considered as one of the main priorities in grant allocations in 2010; in particular, inclusion and developing of children's potential through the educational system of the hosting country. However, there were no projects connected directly with education during the adaptation period so transformative education programmes aimed at the adult population. Overall, refugee minors are given a stable 'care' from the EU projects' side (European Refugee Fund, 2010).

In general, at the EU level we find the outline of common strategy and principles of cooperation that can lay down a foundation for future policies' development, also through community projects support. Regarding to OETPs we find mainly general instructions related to the issue in the framework of integration (including wider migrants' integration field): the actual elaboration of this tool is up to member-states.

X. State as a bearer of exclusive power (including monopoly on violence or legislative and procedural decisions) and controller of certain resources plays a crucial role for the matters of refugees' integration: in granting a special status/citizenship, providing opportunities and material support, so the very structural framework of economic, social, and political relations – policies undertaken at the national level can influence refugees' position as if providing a place for them in the state's structure and support through the institutional framework. Regarding OETPs,

policy design is usually located in the mainstream of the integration policies for refugees, or even for wider category of migrants/immigrants. It is strongly connected with political strategy and wider perspective of the official authorities reflected in state's political orientations. Thus, **policy design** is evidently influenced by a general political strategy towards newcomers, and provides a basis for further **implementation** of the planned policies. In general, all European countries have certain national projects aimed at refugees' integration and connected with OETP structure, although the range of attention to the issue, collaboration with special NGOs, control, and funding can vary depending on the scope of newcomers so official policies and state's peculiarities.

Essential points of state's strategy will influence composition (including curriculum) and, in wider perspective, objectives of any of the programmes. Orientation, Education, and Training Programs (OETPs) practice is present more or less in all the European states but strategic approach would define an extent and depth so importance that is given to the issue and being reflected in formulating and implementing of official policy so funding projects and collaboration with specialized institutions and NGOs; attention that is being given to research and pilot projects' launching is also can be seen as a determinant of authorities' 'involvement'.

Role of good governance, however, is not the only decisive factor but also local implementation, public attitudes, actor's motivation so community participation play essential roles. At present moment, more resources and instruments of OETPs provision are still located in 'hands' of national governments, although without the support of 'upper' and 'lower' levels, several efforts may become futile.

For exemplary case studies, two countries were taken as one of the most successful cases of integration policies. Sweden is a positive example of integration policies and extensive programmes regarding the OETPs dimension. The role of human capital enhancement is seen as crucial one stipulating a wide range of training programmes. As an example of welfare state, it demonstrates central role of governmental structures; nevertheless, strong stress is made on the role of municipalities, local policies, and individual approach to every newcomer.

Netherlands is another example of a successful welfare state that is making a primary stress at orientation and civic education programmes that are aimed to create strong level of social integration into the inclusive society based on common rules and valuing an individual approach.

Both countries pay great attention to initial orientation and language-learning process, and local implementation process so cooperation with NGOs and international agencies.

Local initiatives have become a norm around Europe revealing ability of local and municipal authorities to address specific issues in their areas, including integration of refugees and OETPs. In fact, local enterprise proved to be highly effective for OETPs objectives implementation but it demands substantial strategic and material support by state, so motivation of the local communities. Regarding **evaluation** of the state policies, the role is given not only to official state institutions but also to academia so special NGOs and international agencies that are to balance state's mistakes and attract its attention through recommendations and analytical reports, they can also deliver certain problem regarding refugee group, represent the needs of newcomers, or participate in fundraising.

XI. The role of NGOs and international agencies (UNHCR at the international level, ECRE at the European level etc.) is of high significance. However, NGOs can mostly act in the framework of

civil society and influence official policies indirectly by posing recommendations and criticism (the same role is applied to research institutions). Not once in its recommendation and observations, UNHCR has been attracting attention to OETPs.

NGOs can also participate in public opinion ‘shaping’ so do the media actors. In case of mainstream media, they can stand as tool of national policies; at the same time, certain media sources can be seen as a source of constructive criticism of policies drawbacks (nevertheless, some media sources can create a tension through promotion of ultra-right nationalistic views). There is no direct connection between OETPs provision and media activities even though certain media agents can participate in newcomers’ education so media orientation should be included into the wide extent of OETPs topics, in particular into the section of civic education.

XII. Multidimensional structure does not presume exceptionally vertical way of cooperation but rather presents a model of social networks where every actor is connected and mutually supplementary for another.

XIII. As refugees groups in every country are heterogeneous in nature that demands an accurate individual approach that can be granted only at community level as representation of closer interaction and connections. Community is also becoming a realm of their first contacts and application of new skills obtained. Community-level interaction plays a great role for mutual cultural enrichment so contribute to creation stable bonds and connections creating closer and more personal connections that can become meaningful for both representatives of hosting society so newcomers/refuges. At the same time, structural and social integration of greater extent means newcomers inclusion not simply into community but by means of community integration being included into the whole structural and social realm of the state.

Individual and small group interaction creates a precedence of revealing much clearer ‘omissions’ in hosting society and refugees’ knowledge, experience, and perceptions. That puts community level as a highly important dimension of research and practical experiments in terms of addressing much precisely certain level of adaptation, education, and qualification of refugees through specific community projects and enterprise that can be seen as widened and modified – in according to local demands – policies of OETPs.

XIV. In general, mutual exchange of successful strategies and practices is one of the main stipulations of policies success. In the European format, the Lamfalussy process, subsidiarity principle, non-vertical character of informational exchange and consultations, social networking – are the aspects of this exchange. Obviously, recent widened character of actors and institutions participating gave an opportunity of perceiving the picture from a variety of angles that can explain amplification of the topics on the agenda.

Additionally, the fact that level and nature of integration policies, its practices are not universal and equally valued in all member states so presence of full-range OETP projects in these policies vary considerably among the EU countries, brings us to the idea of successful practices exchange between countries of the European Union that stands as a necessary and important step towards success of integration, although institutional and cultural peculiarities of states should be taken into consideration.

In general, cooperation at official, practical, and academic level - implying extensive information and experience exchange and constructive dialogue - is the only way towards resolving major problems and aims of structural and social integration into state’s and public



realms due to multidimensional and interconnected nature of the matter and variety of actors' involved.

# Bibliography

## Primary Sources:

Ager A. and Strang A., 2004. Indicators of Integration. Final Report. Home Office Development and Practice Report. Home Office. Crown copyright, 2004. Available at: <<http://library.npia.police.uk/docs/hodpr/dpr28.pdf>>

Ager, A. and Strang A., 2008. Understanding Integration: A Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies* (2008) 21 (2): pp.166-191.

Ager, A. and Strang A., 2010. Refugee Integration: Emerging Trends and Remaining Agendas. *Journal of Refugee Studies* Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 589-607.

Alba, R. and Nee, V., 2005. *Remaking the American Mainstream. assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. First Harvard University Press paperback edition, 2005.

Arroyabe, E. 1999. Europe as a mosaic of identities: some reflections. In: *Cultural Identities and Ethnic Minorities in Europe*. Ed. By Turton D., Gonzales Ferreras J. Universidad de Deusto. Bilbao. 1999; pp.23-34

Berkman L.F. et al. From social integration to health: Durkheim in the new Millennium. *Social Science & Medicine* 51 (2000) 843-857. Available at: <<http://www.ulb.ac.be/esp/psd/foresa/Durkheim.pdf>>

Boucharde, Gérard. What is interculturalism? *McGill Law Journal - Review de Droit de McGill*, 56:2, pp.436-468.

Brubaker, R., 2001. The return of assimilation? Changing Perspective on immigration and its Sequels in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* Vol. 24 No. 4 July 2001; pp. 531-548. 2001 Taylor & Francis Ltd. Available at: <[http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/brubaker/Publications/21\\_Return\\_of\\_Assimilation.pdf](http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/brubaker/Publications/21_Return_of_Assimilation.pdf)>

Christopher S., Dunnagan T., Duncan S. F., Paul L. Education for Self-Support: Evaluating Outcomes Using Transformative Learning Theory. *National Council on Family Relations*, Vol. 50, No. 2 (Apr., 2001), pp. 134-142. Available at: <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/585855>>. Accessed: 25/02/2012 12:03.

Council of Europe, 1997. *Measurement and Indicators of Integration*, Strasbourg: COE; 1997.

De Vriese, Machtelt, 2006. Refugee livelihoods. *A review of the evidence*. EPAU/2006/04, February 2006. UNHCR, Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit. Available at: < <http://www.unhcr.org/4423fe5d2.pdf> >

Delanty, Gerard. Social Integration and Europeanization: The Myth of Cultural Cohesion. *Yearbook of European Studies* 14 (2000). Available at: < [http://ceses.cuni.cz/CESES-141-version1-2\\_2\\_\\_Delanty\\_Europeanization\\_and\\_Identity\\_2000.pdf](http://ceses.cuni.cz/CESES-141-version1-2_2__Delanty_Europeanization_and_Identity_2000.pdf)>

Dickerson A. , Leary K., Merritt B., Goldman D. Z., n.d. Performance Measurement for Refugee Integration Programs Prepared for Church World Service, Immigration and Refugee Program, New York, New York School of Public Policy University of California, Berkeley. Available at: < [http://www.churchworldservice.org/site/DocServer/Performance\\_Measurement\\_for\\_Refugee\\_Integration\\_Programs.pdf?docID=3924](http://www.churchworldservice.org/site/DocServer/Performance_Measurement_for_Refugee_Integration_Programs.pdf?docID=3924)>

Durkheim, Emile ,1997 [1951]. *Suicide : a study in sociology*. The Free Press, 1997,

Frohnen, Bruce P. and Grasso Kenneth L., 2009. Introduction. *Rights in a Multicultural Age*. In: *Rethinking Rights: Historical, Political, and Philosophical Perspectives* / edited by Bruce P. Frohnen and Kenneth L. Grasso. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2009.

Gilbertson, Greta, 2006. *Citizenship in a Globalized World*. Fordham University . January, 2006. *2002-2012 Migration Policy Institute*. Available at: Migration Information Source, <<http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?id=369>>

Goulah, J., 2008. Transformative world language learning: An approach for environmental and cultural sustainability and economic and political security, 4(1), 6-23. Available at: [http://www.coe.uga.edu/jolle/2008\\_1/transformative.pdf](http://www.coe.uga.edu/jolle/2008_1/transformative.pdf)

Handbook on Integration, 2007. *Handbook on Integration for policy-makers and practitioners*. Directorate-General, Justice, Freedom and Security. Written by: Jan Niessen and Yongmi Schibel of MPG. European Communities. May 2007, Sec.ed. Available at: <[http://www.qec-eran.org/projects/handbook\\_Integration\\_2007\\_en.pdf](http://www.qec-eran.org/projects/handbook_Integration_2007_en.pdf)>

Handbook of Public Policy Analysis. Ed.: Frank Fischer, Gerald Miller, Mara S. Sidney - Political Science - CRC/Taylor & Francis, 2007

Hanemann, U., 2005. UNESCO Institute for Education, Hamburg, Germany. March, 2005. Available at, link from: <[http://www.google.cz/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=6&ved=0CGAQFjAF&url=http%3A%2F%2Fportal.unesco.org%2Feducation%2Ffr%2Ffiles%2F43180%2F11327100211Hanemann\\_Literacy\\_conflict.doc%2FHanemann\\_Literacy\\_conflict.doc&ei=LHaqT--](http://www.google.cz/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=6&ved=0CGAQFjAF&url=http%3A%2F%2Fportal.unesco.org%2Feducation%2Ffr%2Ffiles%2F43180%2F11327100211Hanemann_Literacy_conflict.doc%2FHanemann_Literacy_conflict.doc&ei=LHaqT--)>

tML3sga1vbnnBA&usg=AFQjCNEFSJwj38BtVQXQnXc8943WzAbR9w&sig2=VRmjgvFAxMr16nbZf0y1bQ>

Hartmann, Douglas and Gerteis, Joseph, 2005. Dealing with Diversity: Mapping Multiculturalism in Sociological Terms. *Sociological Theory*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (Jun., 2005), pp. 218-240. Published by: American Sociological Association.

Hussain A. and Miller W., 2006. *Multicultural Nationalism. Islamophobia, Anglophobia, and Devolution.* Oxford University Press, NY.

Isakova A., 2010. *Social Integration Process in the European Union: Principles and Further Implementation.* Assignment completed for: Public Policy class, academic year 2010/2011. Charles University, Prague.

James, S., n.d. *Human Rights Education and Transformation through Art.* HURIGHTS Osaka. Available at: <<http://www.hurights.or.jp/pub/hreas/11/11HRE%20and%20Transformation%20thru%20the%20Arts.pdf>>

Joppke, C., 1999. *the Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State: Theory and Practice.* *The British Journal of Sociology* 2004 Volume 5 Issue 2. London School of Economic and Political Science 2004. Available at: <<http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/socialchange/research/social-change/summer-workshops/documents/theretreatofmulticulturalism.pdf>>

Kemerling, 2011. *The Philosophy Pages* by Garth Kemerling. *A Dictionary of Philosophical Terms and Names. Pluralism.* [online]: < <http://www.philosophypages.com/dy/p5.htm>>

Kenneth A. and Kenneth D.A., 2005. *Explorations in Classical Sociological Theory: Seeing the Social World.* Pine Forge Press. 2 November of 2005.

Korac M., Gilad L., 2001. *Dilemmas of Integration: Two Policy Contexts and Refugee Strategies for Integration.* Final Report of a comparative study of the integration experiences of refugees from former Yugoslavia in Rome and Amsterdam. December 2001. Available at: < <http://dev.wecreatedesign.co.uk/rsc/files/Dilemmas%20of%20Integration.pdf>>

Korac, M., 2003. 'Integration and how we facilitate it: a comparative study of settlement experiences of refugees in Italy and the Netherlands', *Sociology* 37 (1). Pp.51-68. Available at: <[http://roar.uel.ac.uk/jspui/bitstream/10552/665/1/Korac,%20M.\(2003\)%20Sociology%2037\(1\)%2051-68.pdf](http://roar.uel.ac.uk/jspui/bitstream/10552/665/1/Korac,%20M.(2003)%20Sociology%2037(1)%2051-68.pdf)>

Kymlicka, Will, 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, Will, 2006. Testing the Bounds of Liberal Multiculturalism? For distribution to the 2006 Trudeau Foundation's Conference on Public Policy "Muslims in Western Societies", November 16-18, 2006.

Magro and Ghorayshi, 2011. Adult Refugees and Newcomers in the Inner City of Winnipeg: Promising Pathways for Transformative Learning. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives – Manitoba, February 2011.

Mason, 2011. Value Pluralism. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. (First published Tue , Jun 20, 2006; substantive revision Fri, Jul 29, 2011), [online]: < <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/value-pluralism/>>

Medda-Windischer R. Benchmarking Diversity and Integration. The LIMIN-Index (Legal Indicators on Minority Integration). European Academy of Bolzano/Bozen (Italy).(Paper prepared for the 13th Nordic Migration Conference Integration of Refugees and Asylum Seekers National Plans and Programs - Perspective for Social Inclusion. The Academy for Migration Studies in Denmark (AMID). Aalborg, 18-20 November 2004).

Mestheneos Elizabeth and Ioannidi Elizabeth, 2002 .Obstacles to Refugee Integration in the European Union Member States. Oxford Journals. Social Sciences. Journal of Refugee Studies. Volume 15, Issue 3, pp. 304-320.

Moore Matthew J. Pluralism, Relativism, and Liberalism. Political Research Quarterly, Vol. 62, No. 2 (Jun., 2009), pp. 244-256. Published by: Sage Publications, Inc. on behalf of the University of Utah. Available at: < <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27759865> .Accessed: 06/03/2012 13:04.

Oxford English Dictionary, 2012. Third edition, September 2009; online version: March,2012. Oxford University Press, 2012. < <http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/view/Entry/272189>>

Parekh, Bhikhu. Rethinking Multiculturalism. Cultural Diversity and Political Theory. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. Second edition.

Putnam, R., 1993. The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life. American Prospect, 13, pp.35–42.

Putnam R., 2000. Bowling Alone. The Collapse and Revival of American Community. Simon & Shuster Paperbacks, NY. Ch. 1: Thinking about Social Change in America, pp.15-31.

Rawls, John (1999). A Theory of Justice. Harvard University Press.

Renan, Ernst. What is a Nation? (English Translation) (Originally : Qu'est-ce qu'une nation? Lecture delivered on 11 March 1882 ,Sorbonne.). Available at: < [http://www.cooper.edu/humanities/core/hss3/e\\_renan.html](http://www.cooper.edu/humanities/core/hss3/e_renan.html)>

Ryan, S., 1999.(University of Ulster). In: Cultural Identities and Ethnic Minorities in Europe. Ed. By Turton D., Gonzales Ferreras J. Universidad de Deusto. Bilbao. 1999; pp. 81-86.

Sigona, N. (2005) "Refugee Integration(s): Policy and Practice in the European Union", Refugee Survey Quarterly, 24; pp.115-122.

Tibbits, F. Emerging Model of Human Rights Education. Appeared in Issues of Democracy, March 2002. [online]: <[http://www.hrea.org/index.php?doc\\_id=558](http://www.hrea.org/index.php?doc_id=558)>

Turton, David (University of Oxford) and González, Julia (University of Deusto), 1999. Introduction. In: Cultural Identities and Ethnic Minorities in Europe. Ed. By Turton D., Gonzales Ferreras J. Universidad de Deusto. Bilbao. 1999; pp.9-21.

UN Human Development Report, the, 2009.Overcoming barriers: Human mobility and development. For the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Available at: <[http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR\\_2009\\_EN\\_Complete.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_2009_EN_Complete.pdf)>

UNESCO, 2006. Literacy for Life. Education for All Global Monitoring Report, 2006. UNESCO, 2005 (Published in France). Available at: <<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001416/141639e.pdf>>

UNESCO, 2011. Adult and Youth Literacy. UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2011. UIS Fact Sheet, September 2011, No. 16. Available at: <<http://www.uis.unesco.org/FactSheets/Documents/FS16-2011-literacy-en.pdf>>

UNHCR, 2011. Refugee Education: A Global Review. Sarah Dryden-Peterson (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto). November, 2011. Available at: <<http://www.unhcr.org/4ebd3dd39.pdf>>

Valenta, Marko and Bunar, Nihad, 2010. State Assisted Integration: Refugee Integration Policies in Scandinavian Welfare States: the Swedish and Norwegian Experience. Journal of Refugee Studies, 2010, 23(4); pp. 463-483.

Weerd M. de, Gemmeke M., Rigter J., Rij C. van, 2005. Indicators for Monitoring Active Citizenship and Citizenship Education. Final Report. Research Report for European Commission/ DG EAC. Regioplan. Amsterdam 13 December 2005. Available at: <[http://ec.europa.eu/education/pdf/doc280\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/pdf/doc280_en.pdf)>

Winter Soren C., 2006. Implementation. In: "Handbook of Public Policy". Edited by B.Guy Peters and Jon Pierre. SAGE Publications,2006. P.151

#### Secondary Sources:

Action programme to combat discrimination (2001-2006). Decision 2000/750/EC. European Commission, 2000.

Aga Khan, His Highness the. Speech of 25 June 2004. Available at: <<http://www.pluralism.ca/activities/events.html>>

Amnesty International, 2011. Human Rights Friendly Schools. Transforming Communities Through Human Rights Education. Amnesty International, November 2011. Available at: <<http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/POL32/007/2011/en/d24e882b-3ee2-4d7f-aa42-7350ecfa8772/pol320072011en.pdf>>

Amnesty International, 2012. Human Rights Education. [online]: <<http://www.amnesty.org/en/human-rights-education>>

Authority of the House of Lords, 2008. The Economic Impact of Immigration. Volume I: Report . 1st Report of Session 2007–08. Ordered to be printed 18 March 2008 and published 1 April 2008. London : The Stationery Office Limited.

Caritas Europa, 2012. [online]: <<http://www.caritas-europa.org/code/EN/migr.asp?Page=432>>

Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, the. 2010/C 83/02. Official Journal of the European Union.30.3.2010. C 83/389 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, the. 28 July 1951, 189 U.N.T.S. 150.

Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, the. (Déclaration des droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen). Approved by the National Assembly of France, August 26, 1789.

Employment Equality Directive, the. 2000/78/EC. European Commission, 2000.

Eurobarometer, 2009. Discrimination in the EU in 2009. Fieldwork May-June 2009.Report Publication November 2009. Special Eurobarometer 317. European commission. Available at: <[http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs\\_317\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_317_en.pdf)>

Europa, 2008. European Refugee Fund 2008-2013 – Czech Republic. IP/08/1863. Brussels, 1 December 2008. Available at: <<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/08/1863&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>>

Europa, 2011. Eurobarometer on Migrant Integration. MEMO/11/529. 20/07/2011. Available at: <<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/11/529&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>>

European Council, 2010. The Stockholm Programme – An Open and Secure Europe Serving and Protecting Citizens. 2010/C 115/01. Official Journal of the EU, C 115/1; of 4.5.2010. Available at: <<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2010:115:0001:0038:EN:PDF>>.

European Union, 1995-2012. Europa. Summaries of EU Legislation. Communication from the Commission to the Member States of 14.04.2000 establishing the guidelines for the Community initiative EQUAL concerning transnational cooperation to promote new means of combating discrimination and inequalities in connection with the labour market [C(2000)853 - Official Journal C 127 of 05.05.2000]. Available at: <[http://europa.eu/legislation\\_summaries/employment\\_and\\_social\\_policy/equality\\_between\\_men\\_and\\_women/c10237\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/employment_and_social_policy/equality_between_men_and_women/c10237_en.htm)>

European Union, 1995-2012. Europa. Summaries of EU Legislation, 2010. Common framework for the integration of non-EU nationals. Available at: <[http://europa.eu/legislation\\_summaries/justice\\_freedom\\_security/free\\_movement\\_of\\_persons\\_asylum\\_immigration/114502\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/justice_freedom_security/free_movement_of_persons_asylum_immigration/114502_en.htm)>  
European Commission, 2000. EQUAL Community initiative. 14/04/2000.

European Commission, 2005. A Common Agenda for Integration - Framework for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals in the European Union 2005. COM/2005/0389. Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social committee and the Committee of the Regions. Available at: <<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52005DC0389:EN:NOT>>

European Commission, 2006. 2006/688/EC. Council Decision of 5 October 2006 on the establishment of a mutual information mechanism concerning Member States' measures in the areas of asylum and immigration. Available at: <<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32006D0688:EN:NOT>>

European Commission, 2007a. GREEN PAPER on the future Common European Asylum System (presented by the Commission). COM (2007) 301, final. Commission of the European Communities. Brussels, 6.6.2007.

European Commission, 2007b. COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL



COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS Third Annual Report on Migration and Integration Brussels, 11.9.2007.COM(2007) 512 final.

European Commission, 2008. Education & Training 2010. Main policy initiatives and outputs in education and training since the year 2000. Lifelong Learning: Education and Training policies. Coordination of Lifelong Learning Policies. European Commission, Education and Culture. February, 2008.

European Commission, 2010. Handbook on Integration for Policy-Making and Practitioners, 3d edition. April 2010. Directorate General Justice, Freedom and Security. Available at: <[http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/UDRW/images/items/doc1\\_12892\\_168517401.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/UDRW/images/items/doc1_12892_168517401.pdf)>

European Commission, 2011a. The Lifelong Learning Programme: education and training opportunities for all. [online]: < [http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/doc78\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/doc78_en.htm)>

European Commission, 2011b. Home Affairs. Asylum. [online]: [http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/policies/asylum/asylum\\_intro\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/policies/asylum/asylum_intro_en.htm)

European Commission, 2011c. *The European Refugee Fund*, [online]:<[http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/refugee/funding\\_refugee\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/refugee/funding_refugee_en.htm)>

European Commission, 2012. Justice-Tackling Discrimination-Legislation. 03.02.2012. < [http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/law/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/law/index_en.htm)>

European Commission, 2012/Justice/Stop Discrimination. Diversity in the EU. Available at: <[http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fdad/cms/stopdiscrimination/diversity\\_in\\_the\\_eu/?langid=en](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fdad/cms/stopdiscrimination/diversity_in_the_eu/?langid=en)>  
European Council on Refugees and Exiles Policy Papers, the. Available at: < [http://www.ecre.org/resources/Policy\\_papers](http://www.ecre.org/resources/Policy_papers)>

European Council on Refugees and Exiles, Good Practice Guide on the Integration of Refugees in the European Union. Community and Culture, September 1999. Available at: < <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4652fdd05.html> >

European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals, 2007. Community Actions Selected Projects. Directorate B : Immigration and Asylum. Unit B.4 : Financial Support - Immigration and Asylum. Available at: < [http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/integration/projects\\_2007\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/integration/projects_2007_en.pdf)>

European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals, 2008. Community Actions Selected Projects. Directorate-General for Justice, Freedom and Security. Available at: <[http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/integration/projects\\_2008\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/integration/projects_2008_en.pdf)>

European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals, 2008. Community Actions Selected Projects. Directorate B : Immigration and Asylum. Unit B.4 : Financial Support - Immigration and Asylum. Available at: <[http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/integration/projects\\_2008\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/integration/projects_2008_en.pdf)>

European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals, 2009. Community Actions Awarded Projects. Directorate B : Immigration and Asylum. Unit B.4 : Financial Support - Immigration and Asylum. Available at: <[http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/integration/summaries\\_eif\\_ca\\_2009\\_awarded\\_projects.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/integration/summaries_eif_ca_2009_awarded_projects.pdf)>

European Fund for the Integration of Third-country Nationals , 2010. FTS Publication preview - Grants Awarded. DG : HOME / Financial Year : 2010 / Programme: European Fund for the Integration of Third-country Nationals. Available at:< <http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/integration/grantsawarded2010.pdf>>

European Refugee Fund, 2008. Community actions - List of grants awarded. Available at: <[http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/refugee/call\\_10161/ca\\_awards\\_2008\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/refugee/call_10161/ca_awards_2008_en.pdf)>

European Refugee Fund, 2010. FTS Publicatio Preview - Grants Awarded. DG : HOME / Financial Year : 2010. Programme: European Refugee Fund. 21/06/2011. Available at: <<http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/refugee/1grantsawarded2010.pdf>>

European Union Asylum Law and Policy. Available at: <<http://www.unhcr.org/pages/4a0d667c6.html>>

Europa.Europe Day, 9 of May. European Union, 1995-2012.[online]: < [http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/9-may/gallery\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/9-may/gallery_en.htm)>

Europa. What is Europe Day? European Union, 1995-2012. [online]: <[http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/9-may/euday\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/9-may/euday_en.htm)>

European Web Site on Integration, 2012. [online]: < [http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/en/practice/details.cfm?ID\\_ITEMS=3728](http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/en/practice/details.cfm?ID_ITEMS=3728)>

Eurostat, 2005. STAT/05/48. Population projections 2004-2005. EU25 population rises until 2025, then falls. European Union, 1995-2012. 08/04/2005. Available at: <<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=STAT/05/48&format=HTML&aged=1&language=EN&guiLanguage=fr>>

Eurostat. Asylum statistics. European Commission. Available at: <[http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics\\_explained/index.php/Asylum\\_statistics](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Asylum_statistics)>

Eurostat, 2010. Table 1 origin asylum seekers EU27 EFTA 2008-2009. European Commission, 2010. Available at: <[http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics\\_explained/index.php?](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php?)

title=File:Table\_1\_origin\_asylum\_seekers\_EU27\_EFTA\_2008-2009.JPG&filetimestamp=20101116155533>

Eurostat, 2011. Asylum statistics. European Commission, 2011. Available at: <[http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics\\_explained/index.php/Asylum\\_statistics](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Asylum_statistics)>

Eurydice, 2005. Citizenship Education at School in Europe. Available at: <<http://www.moec.gov.cy/programs/eurydice/publication.pdf>>

Focus Migration, 2007. Country Profile, Netherlands. By: Evelyn Ersanilli. No.11, November 2007. Available at: <[http://focus-migration.hwwi.de/typo3\\_upload/groups/3/focus\\_Migration\\_Publikationen/Laenderprofile/CP11\\_Netherlands.pdf](http://focus-migration.hwwi.de/typo3_upload/groups/3/focus_Migration_Publikationen/Laenderprofile/CP11_Netherlands.pdf)>

Geneva Convention of 1951 and Protocol of 1967 relating to the Status of Refugees.

Global Human Rights Defence, 2010. From the Himalayas to the Lowlands: in Search of peace and Happiness. Experience of Butanese refugees in the Netherlands. Authors: Jenny Lundström, Ariane den Uyl. Available at: <[http://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/pdf-bibliotheek/Rapporten\\_Vlw/Buthanese-rapport.pdf](http://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/pdf-bibliotheek/Rapporten_Vlw/Buthanese-rapport.pdf)>

Good Practice Guide on Integration of Refugees in European Union, the. The European Council on Refugees and Exiles. [online]: <[http://www.ecre.org/resources/Policy\\_papers/516](http://www.ecre.org/resources/Policy_papers/516)>

Government of Netherlands, 2012. Civic Integration. [online]: <http://www.government.nl/issues/integration/civic-integration>

Government of Netherlands, 2012b. Integration policy based on Dutch values. Press release/17-06-2011. Available at: <<http://www.government.nl/documents-and-publications/press-releases/2011/06/17/integration-policy-based-on-dutch-values.html>>

Government of Netherlands, 2012c. Integration policy. [online]: <<http://www.government.nl/issues/integration/integration-policy>>

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the, 1966. 16 december. United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 993, p. 3. UN General Assembly.

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the, 1966, 16 December. United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 999, p. 171 and vol. 1057, p. 407 . UN General Assembly.

International Organization for Migration, 2011. Facilitating Integration Through Cultural Orientation. Available at: <<http://www.iom-nederland.nl/dsresource?objectid=4941&type=org>>

Migration Citizenship Education, 2012. [online]: <<http://www.bpb.de/veranstaltungen/netzwerke/nece/>>

Millennium Development Goals, the, From 2000. (Additional information: [online] < <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/bkgd.shtml>>)

Ministry of Work and Social Affairs, 2006. Ministry of Work and Social Affairs (Seville Refugees Centre)/ENARO Exchange Program to The Netherlands, 2006. Carmen Martagón. May 2006. Available at: <<http://www.enaro.eu/documents/enaro-netherlands-carmen-s06.pdf>>

MIPEX 2010 Indicators. Available at: <[http://www.mipex.eu/sites/default/files/downloads/mipex\\_indicators\\_2010.pdf](http://www.mipex.eu/sites/default/files/downloads/mipex_indicators_2010.pdf)>

MIPEX, 2012a. MIPEX Integration policy Index. [online]: <http://www.mipex.eu/use>

MIPEX, 2012b. Migrant Integration Policy Index. Sweden. [online]: <http://www.mipex.eu/sweden>

MIPEX, 2012c. Migrant Integration Policy Index. Netherlands. [online]: <http://www.mipex.eu/netherlands>

NECE, 2012. Networking European Citizenship Education. [online]: <<http://www.bpb.de/veranstaltungen/netzwerke/nece/>>

Policy Plan on Legal Migration. Economic migration in the EU: the labour markets' situation and demographic trends (MEMO/05/494). European Union, 1995-2012. Available at: <<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/05/494&format=HTML&aged=1&language=EN&guiLanguage=en#fn1>>

Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, the. 4 October 1967, 606 U.N.T.S. 267.

Racial Equality Directive, the. 2000/43/EC. European Commission, 2000.

Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, signed at Lisbon, 13 December 2007. 2007/C 306/01.

United Nations Alliance of Civilizations, 2012. Integration - Building Inclusive Societies (IBIS). [online]: < <http://www.unaoc.org/ibis/2010/05/21/integration-of-traumatized-asylum-seekers/> >

Universal Declaration on Human Rights, the. December 10, 1948.

UNHCR, 2005. Guide for Asylum Seekers, 2005. Information and Orientation. Available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/topic,4565c22553,4565c25f677,3e70c4a64,0,UNHCR,,.html>>

UNHCR, 2007. Note on the Integration of Refugees in the European Union. UNHCR, May 2007. Available at: <<http://www.unhcr.org/463b462c4.pdf>>

UNHCR, 2009. UNHCR Note on Refugee Integration in Central Europe. Budapest, April 2009. Available at: < [http://unhcr.org.ua/img/uploads/docs/11%20UNHCR-Integration\\_note-screen.pdf](http://unhcr.org.ua/img/uploads/docs/11%20UNHCR-Integration_note-screen.pdf)>

UNHCR, 2010. Integration of Beneficiaries of International Protection in the European Union. Recommendations to the European Ministerial Conference on Integration, Zaragosa. 15 and 16 April 2010. Available at: <<http://www.unhcr.org/4bcc61b59.html>>

UNHCR, 2012a. Working with the European Union. [online]: <<http://www.unhcr.org/pages/4dd12ad46.html>>

UNHCR, 2012b. 2012 Regional Operations Profile – Europe Working environment. [online]: <<http://www.unhcr.org/pages/4a02d9346.html>>

UNHCR, 2012c. Education Strategy 2012-2016. Summary. January, 2012. UNHCR. Available at: < <http://www.unhcr.org/4af7e71d9.html>>

VluchtelingenWerk Nederland, 2012. Dutch Council for Refugees. English. [online]: <http://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/english/english.php>

World Bank, 2012. Literacy Rate, adult total (% of people ages 15 and above). Available at: <<http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.ADT.LITR.ZS>>

BBC, 2011 State multiculturalism has failed, says David Cameron. 5 February 2011. Available at: <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-12371994>>

BBC, 2012. Available at:<<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-17873218>>

THE CUMMINGTON STORY. National Archives and Records Administration. U.S. Information Agency. (1982 - 10/01/1999). // <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OimU5k67P6o>