

## ***10 Local Actions to Promote Social Integration***

For full publication go to

<https://www.britac.ac.uk/sites/default/files/British%20Academy%20YCDOT%20Essays.pdf>

### **Essay One:**

#### ***A Proposal for Local Integration Plans***

**Ted Cante CBE, Director the iCoCo Foundation, UK**

#### **1. Introduction**

There is no integration policy in the UK at present – no vision or objectives, no programme or targets and no monitoring of the state of integration over time. The Coalition Government produced a document (which civil servants were not allowed to call a strategy) *Creating the Conditions for Integration* which stated that the ‘Government will only act exceptionally’ and saw no reason to introduce any specific initiatives<sup>1</sup>. Clearly, this is something that the Government later regretted, having appointed Louise Casey four years later to conduct a review of integration<sup>2</sup> following a series of concerns, such as the school ‘Trojan Horse’ affair, a rising level of extremism, and growing anxiety over immigration. However, despite strong recommendations from Casey and an All-Party Parliamentary Group<sup>3</sup> to develop integration, the Government is yet to respond<sup>4</sup>.

To be fair to the present Government, there has never been much by way of integration policy and practice. The assumption was that integration would occur naturally over time. Indeed, there was resistance from those who feared that integration really meant assimilation. However, the lack of support or encouragement for integration was exposed in 2001 by the Independent Review Team’s report<sup>5</sup> on the disturbances in Northern towns and found that White and Asian communities were living in ‘parallel lives’ with little contact between them – and little by way of mutual understanding, trust, or tolerance. Tensions were never far beneath the surface.

---

<sup>1</sup> DCLG, (2012) *Creating the Conditions for Integration* (London: DCLG )

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/7504/2092103.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7504/2092103.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> The Casey Review of Opportunity and Integration London: DCLG

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-casey-review-a-review-into-opportunity-and-integration>

<sup>3</sup> All-Party Parliamentary Group on Social Integration *Integration Not Demonisation* London: House of Commons

[http://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/themes/570513f1b504f500db000001/attachments/original/1504379228/TC0016\\_AAPG\\_Integration\\_not\\_Demonisation\\_Report.pdf?1504379228](http://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/themes/570513f1b504f500db000001/attachments/original/1504379228/TC0016_AAPG_Integration_not_Demonisation_Report.pdf?1504379228)

<sup>4</sup> A recent statement by the Savid Javid, Secretary of State suggested that the response would be forthcoming by the end of 2017

<sup>5</sup> Cante T. (2001) *Community Cohesion: Report of the Independent Review Team (The Cante Report)* London: Home Office

From 2001 onwards, Community Cohesion offered a way forward. It took little from the previous 'multicultural' policies, other than suggesting that it was necessary to improve equal opportunities.

What was quite new to UK policy was that community cohesion sought to find ways that communities could get on well with each other, break down barriers and avoid tensions. This made it a much more proactive concept than 'integration' which had never had an agreed definition let alone programme. Community cohesion advocated that people should interact with each other, to build strong and positive relationships between people from different backgrounds - in the workplace, in schools and within neighbourhoods. It also meant promoting a sense of belonging for all communities, creating an appreciation of difference, whilst investing in commonalities.

Community cohesion programmes were highly localised and did take full account of the local context. However, community cohesion programmes were designed to bring groups together and reduce tension – they were not plans for integration.

The opportunity now exists for the development and implementation of local integration plans, building on the earlier experience of community cohesion, but also reflecting on the new political and social context. This is therefore proposed as the most effective means of promoting integration.

## **2. Learning From The Community Cohesion Approach**

Local Integration Plans (LIPs) can borrow a great deal from the approach taken by community cohesion, but will need to go further in a number of important respects

A brief review of the community cohesion approach will help to determine the direction for the new LIPs.

Some of the most notable and useful features community cohesion programmes<sup>6</sup> are:

- For the first time, they began to engage the majority community who were struggling to come to terms with change - programmes were no longer simply focused on minorities.
- They were devised to promote interaction between a range of groups to dispel prejudices and undermine stereotypes. Intercultural contact could no longer be left to chance and institutional barriers had to be removed
- Though they began on the basis of improving relations between different ethnic and faith groups, it was soon used to change perceptions of all other areas of difference – for example, intergenerational, disabilities, gender, social class, sexual orientation.
- They were also locally focused, tackling the differences and tensions that were evident in each particular area and making the interventions relevant to them

---

<sup>6</sup> For a fuller discussion of community cohesion programmes see Cantle T., (2008) *Community Cohesion: A New Framework for Race and Diversity*. (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan) pages 171-233.

- they did consider how the institutional barriers could be reduced, especially in respect of ensuring equality of opportunity and tackling discrimination

A variety of agencies implemented the community cohesion programme and would be able to assist with LIPs. These included:

- Specially created voluntary sector bodies, funded by government or by philanthropists
- Local government and other statutory bodies, such as the police, health service and social housing agencies – but these were not special programmes, they were to be built into their everyday, or ‘mainstream’ services.
- Schools – they were a key focus, for both the students and their families
- The private sector – a number of employers established cross-cultural programmes and developed mixed teams for the first time (also helping the equality programme)
- Faith groups worked with their members and developed inter-faith initiatives

It is also useful to consider their approach in more general terms<sup>7</sup>.

Firstly they tried to change attitudes in a more general way. This included creating a sense of belonging by developing a positive story for all groups and promoting a series of new images of diversity right across the community. Campaigns like ‘One Leicester’ were championed in most cities. These were also presented through the press and media and many attempts were made to rebut negative stories about minorities, even to the extent of using ‘myth-busting’ programmes. And they also continued with positive action to tackle inequalities

There was some resistance at first - people were understandably apprehensive about getting out of their comfort zones. This was soon overcome with the emphasis on enjoyable and challenging activities, for example by using the performing arts and by bringing people together around a common cause and creating local pride.

Community and faith leaders also sometimes felt that their control was being undermined as attitudes and behaviours were now individualised rather than mediated through them. And this proved to be the case with less financial support being channelled through single identity groups.

The results were very encouraging - surveys demonstrated that attitudes were becoming more positive about diversity and research based evaluations showed that intercultural contact did in fact reduce prejudice and intolerance. In wider policy terms, an intercultural policy narrative began to emerge to support community cohesion and to challenge the previous multicultural approach.

However, the new ‘extremism’ agenda, developing from about 2007 and initially in parallel with community cohesion, gradually became a very dominant and singular policy objective. The Coalition Government stopped almost all community cohesion programmes, removing what was really quite

---

<sup>7</sup> See also Cantle, T., (2012) *Interculturalism: for the era of cohesion and diversity* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan) pages 91-105 for a discussion of the contribution of community cohesion and pages 105-111 for details of ‘a new narrative of place’

modest funding and downgraded the policy, for example by taking the 'duty to promote community cohesion' in schools out of the Ofsted inspection framework and the focus has shifted to tackling extremist views. These are largely seen to revolve around the Muslim communities but some initiatives are focused on the Far Right. The UK's *Prevent* programme has also become almost entirely concentrated on attempting to stop young people becoming radicalised.

### 3. The Need for Local Integration Plans

The evidence suggests that two trends are evident. First, there are some parts of the country where more mixed and diverse areas are being created, with little by way of community tensions. Younger people in these areas seem to regard diversity as a part of normal life, attach some positive benefit to it and increasingly identify with a global community.

On the other hand, there are now more segregated communities in many towns and cities.

The Demos Integration Hub<sup>8</sup> made the following points last year:

*'Though white areas have become less white, minority areas have not become less minority. In 2011, 4.1 million minorities (41% of the minority population) live in wards that are less than 50% white. This compares with about a million minorities (25% of the minority population) living in white minority wards in 2001*

*'In 2001, just 119 wards were majority nonwhite. In 2011, 429 were.*

*'In 2001, a fifth of minorities lived in the most diverse quintile, where 33 percent of the population was white. Today, a fifth of minorities live in the most diverse quintile, which is just 21 percent white.*

*'What is occurring is that, with a few exceptions, when whites and minorities leave inner city areas of minority concentration, their place is generally taken by other minorities*

*'Overall, minorities are entering white areas but whites are often avoiding minority areas, producing a growing number of zones in which minorities are relatively isolated from whites*

At the same time many White British people are leaving towns and cities and generally being replaced by minorities and by additional minority migrant populations. For example, in London the White population reduced by 600,000 between 2001 and 2011 and were replaced by 1,200,000 people from minorities. This is sometimes described as 'White Flight' but this term suggests that they have been leaving because they are White and has some racist connotation. It may well be simply a reflection of socio-economic position and the attraction of more suburban and rural areas. However, the motivation is less important than the fact that some of our towns and cities are becoming significantly more minority-concentrated, whilst mixing in other areas is increasing but to a much more limited extent.

---

<sup>8</sup> Demos Integration Hub On Line Resource <http://www.integrationhub.net/module/do-we-live-together-or-apart-residential-patterns/> Last accessed 13<sup>th</sup> October 2017

There is more recent evidence that segregation is increasing rather than reducing in respect of residential patterns, at least in terms of the White British population and minorities as a whole. Cantle and Kaufmann (2016) found that towns and cities that had had a disproportionately low White British population had become even lower and those that had had a disproportionately high number had become even less proportionate, often due to out and in movement of the White British group in each case.<sup>9</sup>

School segregation is equally problematic (and interconnected). The Integration Hub points out that whilst attainment has improved 'meanwhile British schools have become more segregated'. They go on to point to some significant divisions with and between schools:

*In 2013, over 50 per cent of ethnic minority students were in schools where ethnic minorities were in the majority (although not necessarily their own minority). This compares to over 90 per cent of White British pupils who are in majority White British schools. But there is some variation between cohorts. For instance 52 per cent of ethnic minority pupils in Year 11 are in schools where ethnic minority pupils are in the majority compared to 60.8 per cent of Year 1 ethnic minority pupils. As recently as 2008 only 49.1 of ethnic majority pupils in Year 13 were in ethnic minority majority schools, by 2013 the share had risen to 54 per cent.*

*In London alone, 90 per cent of ethnic minority Year 1s are in ethnic minority majority schools. This compares to 49 per cent of White British in majority White British schools*

School segregation patterns have also been assessed more recently in similar terms (Cantle et al, 2017)<sup>10</sup> with school populations becoming more polarised, again reducing the opportunities for children to learn about difference and for their families to mix and develop an understanding of the 'other'. The current trend towards differentiated school structure and type, including a wider range of faith schools, seems set to accelerate this trend.

It must be emphasised that 'segregation' usually refers to ethnic clustering and divisions, but any form of separation in which 'others' are physically distant is likely to result in the development of stereotypes and prejudice. In the UK the 'parallel lives' first described in relation to ethnicity<sup>11</sup> are even more evident in the sectarian divide in parts of Northern Ireland, but would also potentially include enclaves for older people, gated communities for the rich, housing schemes with 'poor doors', schools for children with special needs, and separate units for people with disabilities and mental health problems – as well as communities separated more generally by faith or class - means that the possibility of tolerance and understanding is greatly diminished.

---

<sup>9</sup> Cantle, T and Kaufmann, E. (2016) Is Segregation On The Increase In The UK? Open Democracy <https://www.opendemocracy.net/wfd/ted-cantle-and-eric-kaufmann/is-segregation-on-increase-in-uk>

<sup>10</sup> Cantle et al (2017) *Understanding School Segregation in the UK* London: The Challenge

<sup>11</sup> This term was first used by Cantle in the Report of the Community Cohesion Review Team 2001, following the riots in Northern towns in England

It is known, however, that contact with the ‘other’ in one dimension may assist in reducing prejudice in other respects (Hewstone, 2015)<sup>12</sup> through indirect contact with people from different backgrounds, simply by living and working in close proximity, rather than through more meaningful associations or friendships. Yet, again, little is done to capitalise on such arrangements and there is currently no systematic or policy framework to build bridges between communities. Rather, local government and other funding restrictions have led to a reduction in intercultural programmes.

#### **4. The Potential Programmes for LIPs**

##### 4.1. Learning to Live Together

LIPs will provide a framework for reinvesting in contact between all sections of the population, particularly across faiths and ethnicities, whilst not forgetting that contact can reduce prejudice and stereotyping in respect of all areas of difference. In other words, we all need to learn to live together. These are very low cost (and in many cases no-cost) schemes which simply mean working across communities and providing services on an integrated basis. The support of schools, communities and workplaces will of course need to be enlisted.

However, this is not just about contact. LIPs can also develop real discussion and debate – and even ‘dangerous conversations’ in which simplistic and extremist views are undermined by developing intercultural understanding and building religious literacy – skills that younger people will need in an increasingly globalised world. This means challenging the controlling influence of some of the so-called community leaders. It also means that there are limits to the difference that are afforded respect, ie not those differences that conflict with human rights – and the Government can claim some success here in taking action against FGM and forced marriage – which went unchallenged by former multicultural policy.

Unfortunately, the Government seems to want to restrict debate rather than use it to challenge extremists and those who peddle hatred of others – for example the recent controversial<sup>13</sup> restrictions imposed on universities.

We also need to change from the present emphasis which is almost all on countering fear and threats. This unfortunately serves to reinforce negative perspectives of diversity, immigration and radicalisation. Many of the present policies and programmes are designed to repair the problems of diversity, not support the benefits, nor enable people to become more comfortable with diversity.

People have to *want* to integrate, it cannot be forced upon them. But there is little by way of a positive story to tell – to either minority, or majority, communities. There is no narrative which champions a diverse and mixed society, nor the benefits of pluralism and the development of a cosmopolitan, or world view.

---

<sup>12</sup> Hewstone, M. (2015) ‘Consequences of Diversity for Social Cohesion and Prejudice: The Missing Dimension of Intergroup Contact’ *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 71, No. 2, 2015, pp. 417–438 doi: 10.1111/josi.12120

<sup>13</sup> See for example, the Cambridge University Reporter ‘Report of Discussion’ 10<sup>th</sup> Amy 2016 <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2015-16/weekly/6426/section10.shtml>

LIPs will also need to recognise that whilst faith leaders can be part of the solution they are also part of the problem. Little is done to challenge faith leaders to allow free choice, nor to dismantle the present community taboos and pressures – for example in respect of ‘marrying out’, apostasy and the singular education requirement of children with parents of different faiths. Many schools teach only a single doctrine and are allowed to perpetuate the idea that people are ‘born into’ a faith and that there are Christian, Jewish or Muslim children. Whilst it is not for the state to regulate home life (unless abuse is taking place) schools and all places of learning must be expected to comply with a plurality of views about faith and non-faith beliefs, allowing free choice at adulthood. The recent *Living With Difference* Butler-Sloss Report<sup>14</sup> takes a step in this direction but requires a clear and statutory underpinning.

And with this in mind, we need to develop new ways of engaging Muslim communities in particular, and consider both how they will feel included rather than ‘suspect’, which would encourage them to engage others and be matched by a greater willingness by others to engage with them. This is perhaps one of the most urgent tasks which we face. It needs to be carefully planned and developed, but is not as difficult as may be supposed – there are now many good examples of changing perceptions of the ‘other’ – and some are serendipitous, for example it is arguable that Nadiya Hussain’s appearance on ‘Bake Off’ has done more to promote unity than 10 years of Government policy.

It also goes without saying that contact depends upon a common language. English language schemes – not just classes need to be offered on a universal and accessible basis.

#### 4.2. Providing for population growth – resources

There has been little recognition that many people are struggling to come to terms with the pace of change in their communities. As a consequence, some suggest that inward migration has to be slowed down, but in any case, the foreign-born and migrant population is already significant and LIPs will need to respond with much more investment in integration measures.

But there is a second and much more controversial point here too. Since 2001, population has grown by 5 million or around 8% and far more significantly in the major growth areas. But school places and resources, affordable housing, transport capacity and the health service have not grown by anything like the same amount. Migration is clearly tied to economic growth and tax revenues, but whilst the benefits seem to accrue nationally, they do not appear to have been invested in increased capacity at the local level and there is very evident feeling of competition within communities. This has been dismissed too lightly and should now be addressed.

Governments have largely failed to acknowledge the impact of the growth in population – which is largely due to inward migration – and is faster and higher than any period since the 1950/60s post war period. Government spending is related to current or previous levels in cash or real terms, not to overall population, nor to per capita spending. In this way, most public spending, for example on health or education, can be shown as an increase but does not relate to real demand for services.

---

<sup>14</sup> ‘Living with Difference: Community, Diversity and the Common Good’. *Commission on Religion and Belief in British Public Life* (The Butler-Sloss Report). The Woolf Institute. 7 December 2015.

It is instructive to compare the present situation with the post-war period. At that time, government was building a up to 350,000 homes a year, embarking on a massive school building programme, building new hospitals, developing new transport and roads to cater for the increase. Indeed, elections were won or lost on promised public services, with every political party competing over housebuilding targets.

Housing – particularly that which is affordable – is now under most pressure and in contrast to the post-war period, housebuilding is lagging seriously behind the present growth in population, especially in respect of social housing.

In the early post-war period, housebuilding easily matched the growth in population, with around half provided as social housing. In the last 15 years however, the 5 million extra population has not been matched by provision – only 2.2 million new homes, of which only 300,000 were accessible social housing<sup>15</sup>.

It is no wonder that there are now around 1.2 million households on the waiting list for social housing; that house purchase has become beyond the reach of many young people and; that rents have risen to unprecedented levels.

For the NHS, the picture is not much better. For hospital beds, the reduction is particularly noticeable. Despite the large increase in population, the number of hospital beds has continued to decline by 51% since 1988 in England<sup>16</sup>. This is justified in part as a result both of medical advances (leading to shorter lengths of stay) and a shift in policy towards treatment and care outside hospital. On the other hand, the number of elderly and very elderly in the population has grown and they will inevitable need more medical interventions and care than the population as a whole. Consequently, there has been an increase in the intensity with which beds are being used (measured by occupancy rates). Occupancy rates for acute beds have increased from 87.7 per cent in 2010/11 to 89.5 per cent in 2014/15. Given the pressure on hospitals now being experienced, the bed reduction has clearly gone too far and too quickly.

For GPs in the UK the picture is also one of rising pressure. There has been a 24% increase in GP consultations since 1998 and it is estimated that 340 million consultations are undertaken every year, this is up 40 million since 2008 from 2014<sup>17</sup>. Overall, for England, between 2009 and 2015 the number of professionally qualified clinical staff within the NHS has risen by 3.9 per cent. This rise includes an increase in doctors of 8.9 per cent; a rise in the number of nurses of 0.7 per cent; and 6.8 per cent more qualified ambulance staff<sup>18</sup>.

Clearly the NHS is under huge pressure. It has had some extra staff and has improved efficiency, but this has not kept pace with the increase in population, the ageing of that population, medical advances and cost pressures.

For school education we see the same picture, with the education budget rising, but spend per pupil down by as much as 8% under present spending proposals, according to the Institute of Fiscal

---

<sup>15</sup> Office for National Statistics; General Register Office for Scotland; Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (ONS, 2009a; 2010a; 2010b). Data to 1961 are enumerated Census figures, 1971 to 2009 are mid-year estimates, 2011 onward are national projections based on mid-2008 population estimates.

<sup>16</sup> Sources: NHS England (2015); The King's Fund estimate for 2011/12 to 2013/14

<sup>17</sup> BMA file:///C:/Users/ted/Downloads/PressBriefingGeneralPracticeInTheUK\_July2014\_v2%20(2).pdf

<sup>18</sup> NHS Confederation <http://www.nhsconfed.org/resources/key-statistics-on-the-nhs>



Studies<sup>19</sup>. Class sizes are rising as a consequence, teaching and other support staff - perhaps especially teaching assistants - have been reduced.

Local Government has been particularly badly hit by expenditure reductions and police numbers have also been reduced following budget changes.

The physical infrastructure – roads, rail, airports, water and utility supply networks – are also under much greater pressure, with the National Infrastructure Commission warning that ‘The UK faces gridlock on the roads, railways and in the skies, slower mobile and broadband connections and ever-worsening air quality’<sup>20</sup>

Few if any areas of public services have kept pace with rising population

The failure to provide for a rising population is hard to explain, given that the benefit of inward migration has been seen in terms of higher levels of GDP and tax revenues, particularly in respect of migrants from the EU<sup>21</sup>, and many studies have suggested that this ‘growth’ has improved our overall economic position. But, if this is the case, this benefit has accrued nationally and seemingly not applied to basic public services at the local level to meet the needs of the growing population. Further, the local impact is highly variable:

*‘there needs to be greater recognition of, and support for, the local impact of immigration. The non-UK born population of England and Wales grew by 2.9 million between 2001-11. Three quarters of this rise happened in just a quarter of local authorities. Although we show that, nationally, the economic impact of immigration on GDP per head, productivity and prices is very modest, the economic and social impact on particular local authorities is much stronger. This includes pressure on education and health services and on the housing market and potential problems around cohesion, integration and wellbeing’<sup>22</sup>.*

Clearly, this assessment has not been acted upon and those who claim that inward migration – or more correctly, the increase in population – has resulted in more competition for limited resources and public services cannot be so easily dismissed.

Local Integration Plans therefore need to assess the demand for new resources in their own areas and put resource planning at the heart of their proposals.

#### 4.3. Tackling Segregation – Promoting Integration

There are four principal domains where it is possible to make progress.

These are schools, housing, employment and community

##### Schools

---

<sup>19</sup> IFS (2017) A Comparison of Election Manifestos on School Spending 2017  
<https://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/9252>

<sup>20</sup> National Infrastructure Commission Statement 13<sup>th</sup> October 2017 <https://www.nic.org.uk/news/adonis-tackle-the-three-cs-and-deliver-world-class-infrastructure/>

<sup>21</sup> House of Commons Briefing Paper (2016) Number 7659, 25 July 2016 ‘Impacts of immigration on population and the economy’

<sup>22</sup> Migration Advisory Committee, Migrants in low-skilled work: the growth of EU and non-EU labour in lowskilled jobs and its impact on the UK - full report, July 2014, p10.

Firstly, schools should provide young people with the skills and experience to further integration and to live successfully in an ever increasingly diverse and globalised world. Indeed, they will need such skills to compete in the future job market.

This does not mean specific learning programmes (though they would benefit from being part of the school curriculum), but by ensuring it is part of the ethos of the institution and that every opportunity is taken to build critical thinking skills and resilience by introducing key contemporary issues into all areas of the school society. This should include ‘dangerous conversations’ which are often avoided in schools, partly because teachers lack the confidence and training and partly, because of the fear of upsetting some part of the school’s community.

Secondly, we need to take seriously the former Prime Minister’s recent commitment<sup>23</sup> to

*“building a shared community where children of many faiths and backgrounds learn not just with each other, but from each other too”.*

This can only be realised if schools develop a mixed intake in which students interact with each other and moreover, develop friendships across boundaries which bring family networks and communities together. The Prime Minister also said<sup>24</sup>

*“it is right to look again more broadly at how we can move away from segregated schooling in our most divided communities. We have already said that all new faith academies and free schools must allocate half their places without reference to faith.*

*“But now we’ll go further to incentivise schools in our most divided areas to provide a shared future for our children.*

As any parent will know, school friendships create contact between families and within wider communities and are therefore very important for bringing a wide range of people together.

However, schools in many parts of the Country have become more segregated than the areas which they serve<sup>25</sup>.

The Government should grasp the logic of its own position and request, or require, all schools to broaden their intake to encompass 50% of children from other backgrounds, or at least reflect the diversity of their local areas. There will be arguments about what constitute their ‘local area’ particularly with regard to faith schools, but schools need to implement this requirement in the spirit it is intended – as a small number of them are already doing. This does not just apply to faith schools, (although it is very disappointing to see many faith schools manipulating their admissions code to deny access to other backgrounds) all schools need to broaden their intakes, taking account of faith, ethnicity, class and special needs. In the absence of a national commitment, however, each local authority should be working with all schools to develop this approach – a positive appeal may have to be reinforced by the potential exposure of current poor practice – though LAs still directly controlled a substantial minority of all schools and can develop exemplar projects.

---

<sup>23</sup> Prime Minister’s Speech 20<sup>th</sup> July 2015, Birmingham

<sup>24</sup> *ibid*

<sup>25</sup> Cattle et al (2017) *Understanding School Segregation in the UK* London: The Challenge

Thirdly, the school curriculum has to be broadened. The teaching of 'British Values' is to be welcomed but in its present form is unlikely to have much impact. Most of the concepts are relatively abstract and do not relate to everyday experiences.

SMSC needs to be taken more seriously, provide a clearer framework, but seen as part of the whole curriculum, not as a separate programme. As suggested by the recent Woolf institute report<sup>26</sup> religious education also needs to be reconsidered. All students need a religious literacy which includes an understanding of all belief (and non-faith) systems.

Religious instruction (in one faith) should be clearly separated from the above and children from that faith should be withdrawn, preferably outside normal school time, so that they can distinguish their faith from an understanding of a world view. This instruction should of course, be subject to inspection to ensure that it does not develop into a superior or hateful view of 'others'.

Again, in the absence of such a commitment from national government each local area should be seeking to promote such practice.

### The workplace

The segregation of workplaces has been under the radar for far too long.

It is of course the case that some workforces are richly diverse and the NHS particularly stands out in this regard (though not of course in every area or level of seniority).

However, there are many businesses that are very monocultural and make little attempt to broaden their recruitment. This is especially true of employers that target new migrants and even more so where labour providers are used to recruit the workforce. Many parts of the food picking, packing and processing industry are deeply segregated, often built around separate language and/or ethnic groups.

However, segregation is also found in some of the businesses that have been established for decades and the labour force has been continually replenished by a particular community or communities.

Apart from the problem of segregation, these firms often experience other problems – the lack of job mobility, supervision by managers who are only qualified by their language ability, the failure to use the available skills and lack of protection against discrimination and abuse.

Many businesses are, however, often a beacon of good practice and business leaders have become champions of diversity and fully recognise the commercial advantages, in terms of creativity, entrepreneurialism and internationalisation.

A business-led task force needs to address this problem with some urgency and ensure more integration in the workforce and in the communities which they inhabit.

---

<sup>26</sup> Woolf Institute 2015. *Living With Difference*, Report of the Commission on Religion and Belief in British Public Life

In addition, employers need to do far more to promote equal opportunities and positive action to ensure that their workforces represent the communities and customers they serve. This will also ensure that employees have the opportunity to relate to each other on a day to day basis.

Local authorities therefore need to work with local employers, FE and HE and the training providers to promote more open recruitment and selection.

### Housing

Housing is a crucial - but the most difficult - part of the integration story. People have to live in the same vicinity in order to encounter each other in shops, parks, sports centres and on the streets. Even this level of proximity has been found to reduce prejudice. However, this becomes even more beneficial when this 'observational' form of meeting becomes more meaningful as friendships form as a result of regular contact over time, especially where facilities are shared, schools are integrated, or people meet as neighbours. Too many areas are segregated, however, and have become more so in recent years.

Social housing has generally been provided on the basis of need, irrespective of differences and is therefore generally more integrated than other forms. However, there are many barriers to entry, both real and imagined – and is both in decline and often not available to new arrivals. Social housing providers also have a good record in tackling hate crimes and discrimination, but there is more that they could do to examine intercultural relations in the areas that they manage and develop a more proactive and positive approach in response to any perceived problems.

Owner occupied housing should contribute more to the integration effort. There are often local voluntary organisations, such as a Neighbourhood Watch or a Residents' Association, that could help to review and promote positive relations, but currently have been given no incentive or remit. This would therefore need the support of local or national government, in a modest way. Barriers to entry also need to be considered and house builders need to consider whether their designs make them attractive to all – very limited attempts in this direction have been made in the past<sup>27</sup>. More particularly, rented and owner occupied housing should be integrated from the outset and both national and local government need to be more proactive in this area.

The private rented sector has become part of the inner city revolving door for new arrivals, maintaining a separation of migrants over many decades. Dispersal policies need review both between different parts of the Country and within towns and cities. The private rented sector also has the poorest housing conditions and needs to be better regulated.

It is recognised that housing is a difficult area in that people will resist any sense of compulsion. The focus therefore needs to be on incentives and particularly by ensuring that diverse areas are seen as attractive and creative places to live, with exciting and interesting social and cultural events. This can only succeed if supported by the 'narrative which champions a diverse and mixed society' referred to earlier.

---

<sup>27</sup> Cantle T., (2008) *Community Cohesion: A New Framework for Race and Diversity*. (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan) pages 216-218

This also has to be related to wider community design issues and ‘place making’, which encompasses the whole of the public realm, as suggested by Nasser’s<sup>28</sup> recent *Bridging Cultures* and supported by social and cultural signals.

It is suggested that a series of related discussion groups, involving both professional and community organisations be established to develop ideas and guidance across these areas.

### Communities

As suggested in the ‘Living Together’ strand, it is necessary to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to engage with others across divides and develop an intercultural competence. This clearly cannot be left to chance and has to be carefully planned and organised, at least until new networks are established. And the results are very clear – contact between different groups helps to promote tolerance and reduce prejudice.

Much of this work can be done by voluntary agencies in communities and they will need support, again at a relatively modest level. Some sports bodies have been particularly successful in the past but now receive little encouragement and support for this valuable work. Statutory agencies, such as health and housing trusts can also facilitate such interaction, and in some cases need to avoid developing services along ethnic and faith lines. The business sector, as suggested above, also needs to review its practices in terms of recruitment and workplace organisation to ensure that cross cultural teams become the norm.

There are now many examples of intercultural activities<sup>29</sup>, including the twinning of schools with different faith and ethnic intakes<sup>30</sup>; theatre productions that use drama to explore controversial and extreme views<sup>31</sup>; local projects that confront anti-migrant and xenophobic views of young people who have no previous experience of ‘difference’<sup>32</sup>; and inter-faith encounters and dialogue<sup>33</sup>.

LIPs will also have to recognise that deeply segregated areas – both minority and majority – are likely to express the biggest resistance to integration. This is partly to do with fear of the loss of identity and perhaps also to economic pressures. But it is also a reflection of the lack of opportunity to experience diversity. In terms of priorities, the most deeply segregated areas will need the most investment in building opportunities to engage with others.

Particular attention also has to be paid to new arrivals. Many will need support to settle and to integrate. And in some cases they will be coming from very different cultures with limited understanding of norms, accepted and acceptable behaviours – and the law of the land which may

---

<sup>28</sup> Nasser, N. (2015) *Bridging Cultures – The Guide to Social Innovation in Cosmopolitan Cities*. (Markham, Canada: 10-10-10 Publishing)

<sup>29</sup> For a wide range of examples in many different countries see The Intercultural Cities Network sponsored by the Council of Europe <https://www.coe.int/en/web/interculturalcities/home> and; for a fuller discussion of policy and practice see Cantle, T., (2012) *Interculturalism: for the era of cohesion and diversity* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan) pages 177-212

<sup>30</sup> See the Linking Network for more details <http://thelinkingnetwork.org.uk/>

<sup>31</sup> The GW Theatre Company runs this project and details can be found at <http://www.gwtheatre.co.uk/shows/one-extreme-to-the-other/>

<sup>32</sup> The details of the EYST ‘Think Project’ can be found at <http://eyst.org.uk/think-project/>

<sup>33</sup> The Inter-Faith Network promotes many different schemes at local and national level. For more details go to <https://www.interfaith.org.uk/>

be very different to their home countries. A nationally co-ordinated settlement programme is clearly necessary, with resources directed to local agencies to evaluate needs and determine local responses. This could be connected to schemes for learning the English language and a series of planned learning experiences, conducted on both an informal or formal level.

## **5. Concluding remarks**

The introduction of local integration plans will help to build a new language of integration that is positive and are likely to succeed in this because they are based around the lived experience of people in local communities. They must also provide opportunities for people to grow and develop. This must relate to ideas about identity and recognise that it is never fixed and that the absorbing of new and different layers of identity does not mean that people have to forsake their roots or give up their heritage, merely that they acquire new dimensions of it. What matters is that people have both the confidence and competence to discuss and explore their personal and collective boundaries without fear.

However, LIPs also need to tackle the real and perceived sense of grievance which arises from the resource competition which associated with the needs of a growing population and declining public services. They must also recognise that the pace of change in some communities does give rise to concerns and that people need time to come to terms with that change and that this therefore needs investment in dialogue and debate, some of which will be difficult and controversial.

Integration should never be taken for granted, it may take place without any form of intervention, but for many people some form of assistance will be necessary, if only to encourage and incentivise – and speed up - the process. It therefore needs to be supported and planned. This can only be done effectively at the local level, sensitive to the local context and by working with the community. Local plans also need to offer a range of interconnected and mutually supporting strategies across the domains indicated above - providing an intercultural experience in one domain may simply be undone by inward-looking and restrictive experiences in other domains. And, as with any effective process, it will also mean developing clear lines of responsibility and accountability, with regular performance reporting.