



From refugee integration to the theory of change for integration. The evolution of the approach to social integration in the UK at the beginning of the 21st century

Od integracji uchodźców
do teorii zmiany na rzecz integracji.
Ewolucja podejścia do integracji społecznej
w Wielkiej Brytanii na początku XXI wieku

Natalya Antoniuk*

Abstract

The need and willingness to change motivates decision-makers and practitioners in the UK to take decisive integration-oriented measures. The country has never succeeded in developing its own original policy in this area. The first steps were taken in 2004 with the publication of the Indicators of Integration, but it was only in recent years that work on integration management has been intensified. There is a clear departure from focusing on individual aspects of integration and implementing a problem management system in a broader context. This is reflected in

Abstrakt

Potrzeba i chęć zmiany motywuje decydentów i praktyków w Wielkiej Brytanii do podejmowania zdecydowanych działań integracyjnych. Kraj ten nigdy nie wypracował własnej oryginalnej polityki w tej dziedzinie. W 2004 roku podjęto pierwsze kroki wraz z publikacją Wskaźników Integracji, ale dopiero w ostatnich latach zintensyfikowano prace nad zarządzaniem integracją. Istnieje wyraźne odejście od skupiania się na poszczególnych aspektach integracji na rzecz wdrażania systemu zarządzania integracją w szerszym kontekście. Znajduje to odzwierciedlenie w publi-

* University of Opole (nantonyuk@uni.opole.pl);  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0902-2428>.

the publication of the Home Office Indicators for Integration framework (2019). The document is based on the 2004 version, but presents it in terms of the Theory of Change, which was adopted as the basis for designing and verifying the integration process in the UK. The aim of the paper is to compare the Integration Indicators of 2004 with the new version in order to identify the progress of work on the integration system and the change in the approach to the problem.

Key words: social integration, social integration in Great Britain, Theory of Change, Theory of Change for Integration, Theory of Change for Integration in Great Britain

kacji Ramowych wskaźników Ministerstwa Spraw Wewnętrznych dla integracji (2019).

Dokument ten bazuje na wersji z 2004 roku, ale przedstawia ją w ujęciu Teorii Zmiany, która została przyjęta jako podstawa do projektowania i weryfikacji procesu integracji w Wielkiej Brytanii. Celem artykułu jest porównanie Wskaźników Integracji z 2004 roku z nową wersją by określić zakres postępu prac nad systemem integracji oraz zmiany w podejściu do tego zagadnienia.

Słowa kluczowe: integracja społeczna, integracja społeczna w Wielkiej Brytanii, Teoria Zmiany, Teoria Zmiany dla integracji, Teoria Zmiany dla integracji w Wielkiej Brytanii

Introduction

As globalization has made the inequalities in the political, social and economic situations of entire societies all too clear and intensified migration is observed all over the world, there is a growing need to act in this matter. Individuals and groups migrate, join the already existing communities with all their diversified specificity, thus creating a completely new social situation.

One of the countries facing a significant influx of immigrants is the United Kingdom. It is an extremely popular destination because the country is perceived as a very good place to live (Integrated Communities Strategy, 2018), a democratic country with rich traditions, the essence of multiculturalism and tolerance towards otherness. However, this picture of a generally well-integrated society in which people live without conflicts and participate in civic life without obstacles has been verified by research. It shows that communities tend to live parallel lives and conflicts are commonplace, as are segregation, isolation, discrimination, and violence. Significantly, the issue of immigration was also the main theme of the referendum campaign on the UK's exit from the European Union in 2016.

Meanwhile, the UK has no single coherent integration policy. From the very beginning, the activities of the authorities were focused on migration, asylum or anti-discrimination policies, mainly through legislation. Due to the constant balancing between the need to reduce immigration and the integration of immigrants, no significant success has been achieved in any of these areas. Para-

doxically, attempts to put a stop to immigration are matched by an increase in numbers of immigrants and immigration intensity.

Measures to manage integration were taken at the beginning of this century, but it was only in recent years that the activities have been intensified. Nowadays a change in the approach to integration can be observed. This is reflected in the publication of the framework document, the Home Office Indicators for Integration (Framework) (2019). The document is based on the 2004 Indicators for Integration, but presents them in terms of the Theory of Change, which was adopted as the basis for designing and verifying the integration process in the UK.

The aim of the paper is to compare the Integration Indicators of 2004 with the new version in order to identify the progress of work on the integration system and the change in the approach to the problem.

Change is the key element here. Its necessity implies the process of integration, motivates and directs actions. Integration is a whole process of changes on different levels, with consequences varying in scope and time. Observation of changes makes it possible to draw conclusions about positive or negative results of actions taken and to modify them, if necessary (also in the context of change). The need and willingness to change motivate decision-makers and practitioners in the UK to take decisive integration-oriented measures. The new document is based on the Theory of Change with its specific retroactive approach to the problem. The new solutions, appropriately promoted, can be applied on a broader scale than migration or refuge-seeking. This is a good step towards an integration policy that is coherently integrated despite its extensive contextuality.

Definition of social integration

The concept of social integration turns out to be ambiguous and multidimensional, therefore it is difficult to expect a single generally accepted definition (Rytter, 2018). C. Ferguson (2008: 1) proposes to define it as “a process of building values, relations and institutions that enable all people to participate in the social, economic and political life on the basis of equal rights and opportunities, justice and dignity.” It is also “a state or process occurring in society, consisting in the fact that its individual elements tend to merge into a harmonious, coordinated, and functional whole [...]” (Olechnicki, Załęcki 1997: 85—86).

From the British perspective, according to the Social Integration Commission (2015: 7), social integration is “a degree of interaction among people in the UK of different ages, social classes, and ethnic backgrounds.” In 2018, the definition was extended and in the Integrated Communities Strategy (2018: 10)

it is described as “communities where people, whatever their background, live, work, learn and socialise together, based on shared rights, responsibilities and opportunities [...]. Communities where many religions, cultures and opinions are celebrated, underpinned by a shared set of British values that champion tolerance, freedom and equality of opportunity [...].”

According to another definition, “social integration refers to interacting processes, personal and social changes between individuals and institutions in interrelated areas of life” (Charsley, Spencer, 2019), and the 2019 Report on Integration Indicators treats integration as “a multi-directional process involving multiple changes from both incoming and diverse host communities” (Home Office Indicators, 2019: 11). This is how integration, with emphasis on the word “change,” will be understood in this paper, of course, with all the awareness of the fact that this definition does not exhaust the characteristics of the phenomenon.

Selected aspects of the theoretical perspective on social integration

The lack of a clear definition of integration means the lack of clear attributes of integration and its purpose(s), and without them the observation, measurement and execution of the processes and the verification of the achieved results will encounter considerable difficulties. For this reason, it is necessary to present the problem in a manner facilitating its comprehension. According to scholars, the approach can vary depending on the perspective, interests, assumptions and values (Phillimore, 2012). Furthermore, the term is strongly rooted in social contexts and “no matter how many parameters are introduced in the diagnosis of integration, enough is never enough” (Rytter, 2018). This extremely vague concept also involves a specific perspective of the nation, immigration, and the relationship between minority and majority (Framework), which clearly dominates in the understanding of social integration.

A number of approaches to the problem analyzing social integration from different perspectives are highlighted in the academic discussion. Of the numerous academic proposals, the distinction of integration dimensions made by A. Ager and S. Strang (2004) is more useful, or actually fundamental, for these deliberations because, slightly modified, it is one of the elements of the Theory of Change for the integration process in the UK. The authors identified ten key areas of integration: the first four of them: labor market participation, housing, education, and health were singled out as “means and markers.” The next three — intra-group links, relations with members of the dominant group and

contacts with the host community institutions — belong to social connections. Language and cultural knowledge, stability and safety were identified as facilitators in the process. Finally, rights and citizenship were seen as the foundation of integration (Home Office, 2004).

Processes in these areas can occur on their own or interact with each other, at different speeds, or even take the opposite direction, e.g., from employment to unemployment (Charsley, Spencer, 2019). If integration is considered in terms of mutual relations, from the perspective of the immigrant, the host community, and the state, the question of all these actors' co-responsibility for their contribution to integration becomes significant. Moreover, integration is context-dependent and must be understood and planned in relation to the specificity of a particular place, time, individuals and their groups (Home Office Indicators of Integration framework, 2019:7).

Change and the theory of change in the design and evaluation of integration policy

The concept of integration in a social context, with all its complexity, makes one clearly aware of the problems that practitioners have to face measuring and implementing it.

Integration — the process between exclusion and inclusion, and social cohesion (Ganowicz, 2018) — should be seen as part of changes taking place in society, individual communities, individuals, and groups. The lack of integration is manifested in isolation, alienation, segregation. They are social problems, i.e., according to J. Sztumski (1977), “they result from a particular situation, they cannot be reconciled with norms, standards or values commonly recognized in a given society, which are believed to be possible to be solved or overcome by social activity.” This activity is aimed at making changes. According to J. Sobczak (2008:24), “social change” must be understood as “the emergence of a new state of affairs within a functioning social system, or its transformation may result from conscious actions taken by humans, but it may also be an effect of the endogenous development of the system or its adaptation to changes in the environment. The need for change is associated with the desire or necessity to “fix” something that does not function properly. Hence some corrective actions (Framework, 2008:25) aimed at solving the existing problem.

In the integration process, change is an inherent element, aimed at the transformation of a dysfunctional situation in which not all actors are involved in the system. It is not just about their inclusion, which will mean a change in their position, but about multidimensional and multidirectional modifications cover-

ing all elements of the structure. As a result, the whole society, the community undergoes a change to some extent.

Today, to a greater extent than ever before, change is permanent, fast and usually takes place on a larger scale. As many processes change can and should be subject to planning, organization, control. Change needs management (Mastyk, 1978; Zarębska, 2002). It is about both promoting positive and preventing negative transformations. Change can be a measure of progression or regression and as such must be an element of organizational processes in terms of the purpose of the latter, its existence and development. It is management for change and by change.

In the analysis and planning of organizational changes, it is interventions that are of particular importance because, as E. Mastyk (1978) states, they refer “to the use of correct ways of structuring people’s activities in organizations, i.e., the structuring of activities that leads to the improvement of organization’s performance.”

Because it is permanently embedded in social processes, change is an ideal tool for managing them. This is no different in the case of integration management, where the design of change and its evaluation are not inconsiderable. There is even a Theory of Change (ToC), which puts change at the heart of any strategic action.

The conducted literature review shows that there is no consensus with regard to defining the Theory of Change (ToC). It is commonly understood as an articulation of how and why a given intervention will lead to a specific change (Stein, Walters 2012) or “(...) how and why an intervention in a particular situation or context can work” (Collins, Clark, 2013). According to Anderson (2020), at its most basic sense, the theory of change explains how a group of early and intermediate accomplishments sets the stage for producing long-range results.

I. Vogel (2012) observes that the Theory of Change is “(...) a dialogue-based process intended to generate a description of a sequence of events that is expected to lead to a particular desired outcome.” It consists in formulating a number of basic assumptions concerning the change that will take place in the program (Framework), and how all required early and intermediate results related to achieving the desired long-term change will be triggered and documented when they occur (Anderson, 2020).

According to more developed definitions, such as the one presented by the Center for the Theory of Change (2020), the Theory of Change is a comprehensive description and illustration of how and why a desired change is expected to happen in a particular context. D.H. Taplin, H. Clark, E. Collins, D.C. Colby, (2013) explain that the Theory of Change “defines long-term goals and then maps backward to identify changes that need to happen earlier (preconditions). The identified changes are mapped graphically in causal pathways of outcomes, showing each outcome in logical relationship to all the others. Interventions,

which are activities and outputs of any sort, are mapped to the outcomes pathway to show what stakeholders think it will take to effect the changes, and when.”

The Theory of Change provides a working model against which testing hypotheses and assumptions about what actions will best bring about the intended outcomes (Brest, 2010). Certain stages are distinguished in the theory: a problem, barriers, interventions and strategies, outputs, assumptions, outcomes, impacts (Indicators of Integration framework, 2019a). They are illustrated in the table below.

Table 1

Stages of integration process in context of Theory of Change

Stage	Content
Problem	It is necessary to identify the fact that the lack of integration of certain groups in society is real and limits their ability to access resources, services and being part of the society.
Barriers	present the key obstacles to effective integration practices
Interventions and strategies	divided into two categories: those that are taken into account at all levels and that are aimed at promoting specific aspects of integration or at eliminating specific shortcomings in integration
Outputs	Each block of domain-related outputs is affected by each of the interventions leading to them.
Assumptions	The theory of change is based on research-based assumptions about how results can be achieved and how contextual and environmental factors can affect the achievement of results. The assumptions of each intervention explain why an organization believes that an intervention can work. ToC as a whole explains why the intervention can be effective.
The outcomes	Each outcome represents the integration domain proposed in the Integration Indicators structure. The complex interrelationships between the outcomes are further defined by systematic data collection with the use of Integration Indicators.
Impact	All outcomes in ToC, supported and interacting, lead to impact - proper integration of all members of the society, regardless of their background, who live, work, learn and socialize together, based on shared rights, responsibilities and opportunities.

Source: Home Office (2019a:8)

Through specific actions within the above-mentioned stages, starting from the end (the Impact), objectives of a different scope and assumptions of the intervention are defined, and interventions that are to lead to subsequent changes are adjusted. The theory allows their design and monitoring, which will be presented in the subsequent part of the paper.

The conditions for an integration policy in the UK

The British integration model has never been clearly defined (Saggar, Somerville, 2012). Despite extensive experience related to problems resulting from large-scale immigration and refuge-seeking, no formal integration program has been developed yet. The presentation of potential solutions should be preceded by a few remarks on the factors determining the specificity of the adopted model.

Quite early, in comparison with other countries (as early as in the 19th century), the country had to face problems related to the influx of immigrants on a larger scale than ever before (Castles, Miller 2003). However, the number of immigrants increased significantly after World War II. Changes occurred in all countries, but the United Kingdom experienced them in a special way, which was not without influence on its integration policy.

Almost immediately after the Second World War and with a new migration, tensions and even open hostility between the local population and ethnically different immigrants appeared (Problems of integration of immigrants, 2008). Discriminatory practices and violence were widespread, and attempts were made to deal with them by focusing on combating discrimination and incitement to racial hatred, and on the mechanisms of managing relations with the community (Policy Primer, Integration, 2020). The impulse for more decisive action was provided by the racial riots in 1958 and 1959 (Commonwealth immigrants in the Modern Era, 2020). Until the end of the 1990s, actions were limited to the development of legal regulations rather than integration-oriented activities, and the legal and political moves of that time determined the shape of the British integration model. It seems to constantly balance between the need to limit the inflow of immigrants on the one hand, and to implement certain integration measures on the other, which is reflected in the well-known statement by R. Hattersley (Hattersley, 1965) in a parliamentary debate on 23 March 1965: *Without integration, limitation is inexcusable; Without limitation, integration is impossible*. These two pillars have been shaping the British policy in this area until today. At that time, integration was also perceived as a process that meant “equal opportunities accompanied by cultural diversity in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance” (Marwick, 2003). The rejection of the assimilation approach, and concentration on actions to ensure equality between different social groups while preserving social cohesion (Spencer and Rudiger, 2003), which determines the specificity of integration policy in the UK, is clear.

At the beginning of the integration policy formation process, the practice of integration oriented towards preventing discrimination did not bring the desired results (Fiałkowska, Wiśniewski, 2009). The British became aware of the necessity to develop strategic solutions at the end of 20th century and beginning of 21st century. A meaningful statement concerning integration was made by

T. Blair (2006): “Integration isn’t about what defines us as people, but as citizens, the rights and duties that go with being a member of our society.” This view marks the British perspective of the ultimate goal of integration.

To date, there is no national framework for integration policy across the UK. The Home Office is responsible for refugee integration and settlement, and citizenship policies, while the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG¹) deals with community cohesion in England. Other departments have been running initiatives in their policy areas since 2011 (Migrant Integration, 2017); in the Localism Act of 2011 the United Kingdom abandoned the top-down approach and encouraged local authorities and decentralized administrations to set their own priorities in this area. However, the responsibility for migration policy lies with the Home Office (Migration Observatory, 2020).

The uniqueness of the British model compared to other European countries lies in the fact that it separates the issues of immigration, refugee-seeking and integration (Problems of integration of immigrants, 2008). There is no integration policy in the UK, no separate law on integration (Governance of Migrant Integration in the UK, former Member State, 2017). This approach presents the British attitude towards society as it considers diversity to be a natural phenomenon, an inherent feature of society, not necessarily a consequence of immigration alone, and the principle of equal opportunities as something obvious, and the participation of all groups in the social life as an unquestionable right (Problems of integration of immigrants, 2008). However, the lack of an integration policy in the changing conditions and the growing number of immigrants — despite efforts to limit immigration — is a certain weakness of the British model (Framework).

The need for change became urgent in 2004, when, after the enlargement of the European Union, immigrants from the new Member States arrived in the United Kingdom, settling down not only in large cities, but also in areas with little or no experience of diversity in communities (Fiałkowska K., Wiśniewski, J., 2009). It became clear then, and was reflected in the report of the Commission on Integration and Cohesion (“Our shared future”) in 2007 (CIC 2007), that local communities and their authorities must also be involved in integration policy measures.

In 2012, the strategic document “Creating the Conditions for Integration” was published (CCI, 2012), which argued that integration could be achieved through cooperation at the neighborhood level. Meanwhile, tension in communities was increasing. Despite the general image of integrated communities, more in-depth research proved that groups within communities lived parallel lives and there was segregation (Cantle, 2020; Cantle, Kaufmann, 2016). A review by Dame L. Casey of 2016 highlighted segregation and “cultural and religious prac-

¹ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government

tices in communities that (...) are contrary to British values and sometimes to [...] the regulations” (Casey 2016:5). Casey suggested that the integration policy program had not been consistently implemented (Casey 2016: item 70). The following problems were identified in the report: the level and pace of migration, school segregation, housing segregation, an unfavorable situation on the labor market, a lack of command of English, personal, religious and cultural standards, values and attitudes, a lack of meaningful social mixing.

In response, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) published the Integrated Communities Strategy Green Book in 2018 (Integrated Communities, 2018). The document defines integration as “communities in which people, regardless of their background, live, work, learn and socialise together, based on shared rights, responsibilities and opportunities.” It identifies areas for the development of integration policy, such as boosting English language skills, enhancing economic opportunities and promoting meaningful social contacts. It provides a change of focus from the previous programs for equality and community cohesion to support for newcomers and residents. In addition to the Green Paper, a number of national policy changes supporting integration have been developed, such as a set of integration indicators published by the Home Office (2019) referred to in this paper.

It should also be added that immigration was a key issue in the referendum of June 2016 on EU membership and largely contributed to the outcome that determined the UK’s exit from EU structures (Bulman, 2017). It is currently unknown what shape the integration and immigration policy will take (The Migration Observatory, 2016). The existing documents date back to 2016 Immigration & integration after brexit a policy exchange agenda (Goodhard, 2016). The author believes that “the vote on Brexit is an opportunity to re-launch political thinking in many areas, especially immigration and integration, one of the main factors that inspired the vote in the first place.”

The approach to integration in the UK

The approach to integration in the UK is best illustrated by comparing two documents with the same name: Integration Indicators, issued in 2004 and 2019 by and on behalf of the Home Office, i.e., the Ministry responsible for all matters related to integration.

In 2004, the document entitled *Indicators of Integration. The final report* by Alastair Ager and Alison Strang of Queen Margaret University College Edinburgh was published. It was commissioned by the Home Office to pursue the policy direction set out in the Home Office report “Full and Equal Citizens”

(2001). The Indicators of Integration study first of all aimed at helping people understand what the integration of refugees means in the specific UK context and then to direct the future work of the Home Office in this area (Home Office, 2004). It should be noted that the report deals with the integration of refugees and was intended as a starting point for action in this context.

Among the general objectives pursued by the authors of the study, in addition to exploring integration as a concept that was not commonly understood, there was a need to create a framework that would allow those working in the field of refugee integration in the UK to use the concept of “integration” in the same way, and a framework to help those involved in local projects as well as policy makers to plan and verify services for refugees (Home Office, 2004).

On 24 pages, the document explains what the Integration Indicators are and what they are used for. The document comprises three sections: from the structure, through the methods of using this “guide,” to an explanation of the context of the work and indication of the research that made up the final result. This general framework of the Indicators of Integration is addressed to practitioners. It explains how and why, based on research results, changes can be made and better practices can be developed in the areas concerned.

The document is structured around 10 domains grouped in 4 dimensions: *Means and markers*, *Social connections*, *Facilitators* and *Foundation* (Fig. 1). For each of them, the document suggests a number of indicators (with the recommendation that there should be about 10) to assess integration in relation to this particular field. These are the key areas which, as proved by the evidence collected to prepare the report, are the most relevant for refugee integration.



Fig.1. Domains of key importance for integration (2004)

Source: Indicators of Integration final report (2004), Home Office UK

It is not difficult to notice that this is the concept of integration presented by the authors of the report, Ager and Strang. It was adapted as a central point of the Integration Indicators in 2004.

In the first dimension, Means and Markers, there are four domains: employment, housing, education and health. They were identified as the major areas of attainment that are widely recognized as critical to the integration process. This was inspired by the areas of public activity in which integration can be assessed, which were identified when the Council of Europe established the categories of integration indicators (Council of Europe, 1997). They illustrate the “outcome” of integration, but at the same time serve equally clearly as a “means” for this purpose. By analyzing them, progress towards integration can be demonstrated, but they can also be used as means to support achievements in other areas. Thus, success/failure in these domains indicates positive/negative results of integration, which makes them markers. They are means because success in these domains usually translates into success in other areas and thus helps to expand the integration process.

There are three domains in the social connections framework: “social bridges”, “social bonds” and “social links” (Home Office, 2004:3-4). They were included there because of the need to present the aspect of relations in order to understand the integration process as a whole, since the domains considered as markers and means, referred to as the “public face” of integration by the authors, do not fully illustrate what integration is about. It is necessary to present the process from the perspective of participants. It is the relations between people (and their groups and institutions) that are the key to both defining and achieving integration. Based on the concept of social capital, three forms of social relationships illustrate connections, with members of other communities, the closest connections within a particular type of community, and connections with institutions, including authorities at various levels, respectively.

Facilitators were identified as factors necessary for integration with the community, for establishing relationships and for gaining access to the main resources that determine the degree of integration. Two domains were identified here, namely “language and culture knowledge” and “safety and stability.” These are key factors facilitating the integration process, “key areas of cultural competence that are necessary for people to effectively integrate into the community” (Home Office, 2004). The knowledge of both language and culture was presented together as equally necessary for the processes and results of integration. The document stresses the need for some cultural reciprocity and respect for the knowledge of another language. Safety and stability were identified as crucial as well. Freedom from the experience of racial persecution, discrimination and crime in general allows people to develop a sense of belonging, sustainability, continuity, and to develop relationships in many directions and to integrate.

The final domain, “Rights and Citizenship,” is the content of the *Foundation* part of the framework for the Integration Indicators. It is an expression of the conviction, based on the research into the concept of integration and qualitative studies, that rights and responsibilities are extremely important in the integration process and there is a similarity of attitudes among all participants. This is the basis for determining the expectations and responsibilities related to the integration process. Ideas of citizenship and nationality, and the associated rights and obligations, fundamentally shape the degree of integration. The acquisition of citizenship or the right of permanent residence is an important measure of how integrated a person is, presupposes the use of language, knowledge and acceptance of norms, legal values, culture, a certain degree of multi-directional social connections and access to and use of resources according to individual needs and possibilities.

There are multiple links between the domains and, as a result, actions in any of them can potentially affect the others. It is assumed that, although graphically presented in a specific way, they are all equally important. Moreover, there is no model of the integration process in the form of consecutive stages in a specific order. The authors recommend looking at the domains from the perspective of numbers and ways in which they can be linked.

Around ten or so indicators were selected for each area to measure the phenomenon, with a view to using them as identifiers of the issues to be taken into account or as a means of verifying the outcomes, i.e., progress in the integration process, both individually and collectively, and in quantitative or qualitative terms (Home Office, 2004:5).

The indicators are located at the level of policy and practice. The former, relevant and available for the verification of regional or national integration trends, may be different from those to be used to assess the results of a specific project at the local level. The sets of indicators are different for practice and policy, but the structure of the domains remains common for both in order to ensure a coherent picture of integration as a whole and a possibility to use the Guide of Integration Indicators at all levels. According to the authors of the document (Home Office, 2004:5), this approach makes it possible to understand what integration is, how it can be achieved, how to measure progress (policy), and help in planning activities and providing services to integration stakeholders (practice).

In addition, at the policy level, there is a distinction between *core* indicators considered to be the key to measuring integration — two within each domain — and other, additional indicators. In order to facilitate potential comparative studies, it is recommended to reduce the set of indicators.

Four issues were taken into consideration when selecting indicators from each domain: comprehensiveness, flexibility, comparability, and feasibility. The list of indicators is not enumerative, and users are offered the possibility to identify additional indicators that better reflect the specific needs of their projects or

programs, with a recommendation to stick to the general approach outlined in the work on Integration Indicators, which will allow for potential comparability with other actors in the field of integration.

The structure of the integration process outlined above leads to the conclusion that an individual or a group is integrated into society when they participate in the areas of employment, housing, education, health in a manner comparable to that of the members of the receiving community, establish social relations with members of the community with which they identify, with other communities and with relevant state institutions, and have language competence, cultural knowledge, a sense of security and stability sufficient to become involved in the society “in a manner consistent with the common concepts of nationality and citizenship” (Home Office, 2004: 5). This is by no means a proposed definition, but an illustration of the main ideas of the concept of integration.

After reviewing dozens of interpretations of the term and the related concepts, together with the default definitions offered by refugees and other relevant stakeholders, it was concluded that, while no single definition would be adequate for the purposes of the Integration Indicators project, a number of distinct issues were clearly outlined. Finally, it was found that operational definition includes external signs of integration, social connections supporting integration activities understood as potentially involving all members of the community, and explains the final degree of civic involvement needed for full integration. Rights and citizenship are at the heart of the presented structure of the integration process. As the authors of the document observe, it is clear in the UK that there are many discussions going on about the idea of “common concepts of nationality and citizenship” (Home Office, 2004: 6). The acquisition of citizenship formally guarantees access to resources and implies the existence of bonds and competences necessary to function in society.

Among the principles that define the structure of the Integration Indicators and are intended to enable their effective use, it is possible to distinguish the following: ease of use, flexibility, availability of relevant data and availability of information (guidance) in this respect. The main areas of application of the Integration Indicators are: a review of the principles, assistance in local consultations, monitoring and evaluation of services and benchmarking.

The presentation of integration in the form of a structure with domains helps organize consultations concerning the dimensions of integration at the local level. It helps to frame the discussion at the verification and joint planning stage by identifying appropriate domains and relevant indicators.

This approach to integration enables decision-makers and practitioners to reflect on the objectives they want to achieve in the field of integration and helps to identify the indicators for monitoring results. Integration indicators can be useful in the comparison of the work of those involved in integration processes in different environments, at different levels, to identify areas for potential

improvement. They can also be used for measurements in a wider context. Although the focus of the structure of Integration Indicators is on refugee integration, the use of selected indicators can be extended to the communities in which refugees settle, or (with some modifications, of course) to the presentation of the experiences of asylum seekers, economic migrants and other groups. This structure can therefore have a potential impact on social cohesion issues and thus improve the quality of integration.

Integration indicators also prove to be an incentive for government actions to increase the cohesion of integration-related data collection by determining strategies for action in this area. The potential for initiatives in this area, the possibility of developing comprehensive data sets on issues concerning dispute settlement, integration and social cohesion was recognized.

The document also points to the need to consult all the participants of integration processes, both at the level of local practices and more extensive policies. It was also important to review the importance and usefulness of such an integration management framework for potential users (practitioners of local integration activities and decision-makers in integration policy processes in a wider context).

In the final part of the document, the indicators for each domain are also listed quite concisely, with a description of their relevance for the level of practice and for the level of policies (the main and other indicators). They were accompanied by potential data sources.

The document represented a breakthrough in the UK integration policy, paving the way for its significant transformation.

It took almost 15 years for the next specific actions to be implemented. The Home Office Indicators of Integration framework of 2019 (Home Office, 2019) presents the Theory of Change for Integration, its structure, basic principles, the manner of using the indicators, and the very integration indicators. It is based on the Integration Indicators of 2004.

It is an extensive 60-page document consisting of 8 sections. Additional documents were also published: The Home Office Indicators of Integration Framework 2019, The Theory of Change Guide notes Part A (2019a), The Home Office Indicators of Integration framework 2019. Applying Theory of Change Guide notes Part B (2019b), Indicators of Integration Toolkit (IoIT, 2019). An interesting addition is an interactive diagram of the Theory of Change for Integration (IC 2019), which simplifies this rather complex problem.

A clear change in the approach to integration is evident here. Activities in this regard are not concentrated on refugees only, but, as had already been implied in 2004, the scope of application of the *Indicators* was extended to other actors who may be in a position justifying the need for integration. The document states that “the Indicators of Integration framework helps to identify the practical processes and changes that contribute to the integration of individuals

and communities.” The aim of this report is to provide guidance and tools to identify and measure the key factors that contribute to integration processes, and thereby help organizations design more effective strategies.”

Unlike in 2004, the issue of the meaning of the concept of integration is actually mentioned at the very beginning of the document. It is referred to in the foreword: “Successful integration helps people to realise their full potential. It makes it easier for them to access services, reduces educational and health inequalities, helps them to find jobs and, fundamentally, underpins social cohesion and community empowerment. Although integration is difficult to define, its absence can be all too apparent.” The definition included in the Government’s Integrated Communities Strategy, which describes integration as “Communities in which people, regardless of their background, live, work, learn and socialise, based on shared rights, responsibilities and opportunities,” was adapted. It was stressed that the term has many meanings in different contexts. For the purposes of the Integration Indicators, it should be considered as “a multi-directional process involving many changes from both the incoming (communities) and diverse receiving communities.”

This approach to integration is based on its four characteristics, which at the same time constitute the principles for action in this field: multidimensionality, multidirectionality, co-responsibility and contextualization.

The framework of integration indicators aims at providing a comprehensive understanding of the integration experience. Integration cannot be measured by means of indicators from one domain, just as a successful integration strategy or plan cannot focus only on activity in one domain. Indicators from different domains need to be used to measure integration. Understanding the relationship between them and the complexity of the domains requires a structural approach using aspects of all domains, including systematic data collection by means of the proposed indicators.

Multidimensionality of integration is accompanied by multidirectionality. It implies adjustments by everyone in society since integration has to be seen in the context of diversity and recognition of existing differences. The British model is far from assimilation. It treats integration as a process of “mixing” through interaction between people who are diverse in many ways, not just because of their ethnicity or countries of origin. Integration requires adaptation and change of all those involved, without undermining their original identity. Diversity (especially in the context of multidimensionality) makes it difficult to determine what needs to be achieved to conclude that society is well integrated. For integration to succeed, migrants, members of the receiving communities, practitioners and decision-makers must facilitate the process of change by meeting each other. This entails the shared responsibility of all integration process participants for its success.

Finally, integration can only be measured in relation to specific populations in a specific context and time. Therefore, universal targets cannot be set as indicators of “successful” integration that can be relevant for all communities or at all times.

Change is a key factor here that must be constantly taken into account in all social integration-related activities. In 2019, the use of the Theory of Change (ToC) was proposed for integration.

As in the previous document, the structure of the ToC Integration Indicators is determined by the key domains, 14 instead of 10. They are presented in the following figure. The structure of Markers and Means, Social Connections, Facilitators, and Foundation was preserved, but changes were made within the mentioned areas. It is important to note that the first headline was redrafted, it is not Means and Markers but the other way round. This is essential, and points out that domains are first of all the markers of integration, and then the means potentially extending integration.



Fig. 2. Domains in ToC Integration Indicators document in 2019

Source: Home Office Indicators of Integration framework 2019 third edition, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/835573/home-office-indicators-of-integration-framework-2019-horr109.pdf

Another domain was added to the four “Markers and means”: work, housing, education, health and social care, plus leisure. It was stated that leisure activities can be helpful in learning more about the culture of a country or local area, as well as provide opportunities to make social contacts, practice language skills and improve the overall health and well-being of individuals. This includes, for example, using libraries, sports facilities, participating in groups with specific interests (hobbies).

The latest version of the Integration Indicators describes the domains in detail. Employment provides a mechanism for income generation and economic independence, and possibly advancement; as such, it is a key factor supporting integration (Home Office, 2019: 28). Access to, and progress within, the education system serves as a significant integration marker, and as a major means of achieving this goal. Education creates significant employment opportunities and wider social connections (Framework: 30). Housing has an impact on many individual integration experiences; affects the sense of security and stability, opportunities for social connection, and access to health care, education and employment (Framework: 32). Equal access to healthcare and social services and responsiveness of such services to the specific needs of the individual are also key issues here. Good health enables greater social participation and engagement in employment and education activities (Framework: 34).

Success in these areas illustrates the progress of integration and potentially its strengthening (expansion), which results in a certain social mix, since everyone has equal opportunities to participate in every area of social life. This involves a sense of belonging, mental and emotional well-being. They are still considered fundamental for all aspects of integration.

The Social Connections covering the three domains: social bonds, social bridges and social links remain unchanged. Still, a description of each domain was included, as in the case of Markers and Means.

Social bonds, supportive relationships with people who share many values and expectations about life (norms), are crucial for mental health and well-being and therefore underpin integration. Such relationships are generally — but not always — formed with family members and people from the same cultural background (Framework: 38). The absence of such relationships results in isolation.

Social bridges are somewhat looser connections between people (and their groups) of different origin. The level of trust, although not as high as in bonds, is sufficient for interaction and exchange of resources, despite differences. Establishing social connections with people perceived to be of other backgrounds, such as language, ethnicity, religion and sexuality, is essential to establish a “two-way” interaction at the heart of many definitions of integration. Interaction builds trust and reciprocity by preventing social segregation (Framework: 40).

Social links refer to engagement with the institutions of society, such as local governmental and non-governmental services, civic duties and political processes, and demonstrates a further set of social connections supporting integration. They exist when an individual is able to both receive benefits provided by the institutions of society and to contribute to decision-making and delivery. Linkage into such activities provides a further dimension of social connection. These are vertical relations between people and institutions of the society in which they live. A lack of such relations may cause the feeling of alienation.

Social relationships of all types do not necessarily increase access to resources. Within the ToC, they should be measured separately and in addition to access to other key resources (Home Office, 2019).

The Facilitators were changed significantly. The category now comprises five instead of two domains. The components of the existing domains — language and culture, as well as security and stability — were separated and digital skills were added. It is clear that social change in the context of technology has a significant impact on the functioning of elements of each community.

Language and culture were separated in the new document as areas that must be measured separately. Digital skills were added as a facilitator because familiarity with and confidence in using information communication technology can help facilitate social connections and is increasingly crucial in accessing rights and services (Framework:48). A sense of personal safety and social stability is also important. Like language and culture, they are included as individual domains, although they are inseparable (Framework: 50).

The domain of rights and responsibilities under the heading “Foundation” remained unchanged. It concerns the extent to which members of minority groups are provided with the basis for full and equal engagement in UK society (which may lead to a formal application for citizenship). It assesses the existence and awareness of rights and responsibilities, as well as the enablement of these rights and fulfillment of responsibilities. The current approach to integration clarifies the understanding of this area. Previously, a debate on this issue was recommended and questions were asked. The 2019 document underlines that the domain of “rights and responsibilities” illustrates the issue of mutual expectations and obligations supporting the integration process. This concerns the relationship between the system and the individual (group) or the receiving community (majority) and the newcomers (minority). Acquisition of citizenship and a possibility to take advantage of the related rights (e.g., participation in elections) is a significant foundation for a successful integration of each individual in the society. Obeying the law and fulfilling obligations is equally important. This shapes the attitudes of all participants towards each other and towards integration itself. This area clearly requires responsibilities and entitlements to be combined and measured from the perspective of all actors. It is worth noting that in the integration process communities are places of change with layers of migration from recently arrived migrant populations and longer settled minority populations resulting in diverse receiving communities (Framework: 18).

The 2019 Integration Indicators comprise a whole chapter on how to use the Guide, including: outcome indicators and good practices, choosing what to measure, measuring change(s), making comparisons and identifying barriers to integration. The most developed part is the chapter that presents the indicators. The number of indicators is quite significant, and, unlike in 2004, it is not the level of practice and policy, but good practice at the local and national level that

is distinguished. A section on the use of the Indicators of Integration Toolkit was published separately (Indicators of Integration Toolkit 2019) in an MS Excel spreadsheet. The toolkit contains more detailed information on the use of measurements to collect data concerning a specific population, comparable with data available in the public domain for larger representative samples. It consists of six major elements: Overview of sources in the UK, Questions and data information (UK), Comparison of international indicators, International data sources, Monetary value, Reporting own notes.

The *Integration Indicators. Theory of Change. Part A* explains the concept of the Theory of Change and its application in the context of integration in the United Kingdom, and encourages the development of a deeper understanding of the concept by referring to relevant information. Furthermore, it promotes continuous consultation, review and evaluation by civil society institutions. There are certain important stages of the ToC: problem, barriers, interventions and strategies, outputs, assumptions, outcomes, impacts (Indicators of Integration framework, 2019a), which need to be kept in mind constantly.

Part B provides guidance for practitioners to use the Theory of Change for Integration and to develop their own theories of change in various programs and strategies. The document also explains how to collect data and interpret the results so that they provide a reliable basis for the evaluation of actions.

This document presents the application of the ToC in the design and evaluation of social interventions. It is worth examining this specific process, which occurs in the opposite way than other processes. It opens with a reflection on the final step mentioned above, i.e., Impact. It defines the overall objective of a specific program and the specificity of the actors to whom it is to be addressed. The domains of integration are helpful in defining the area and therefore also the desired goal of the program. The specification of the desired impact should describe the expected difference in the long term. There are no obstacles to linking it to broader priorities.

The next stage is Outcomes. Thinking about the changes that need to be made to achieve a goal one cannot set a long-term goal. Outcomes are changes that take place as a result of some work. They describe the medium-term changes to be made, not the work to be done. These changes lead to the final result, or impact.

In this phase, it is important to define the Assumptions used to formulate a conviction concerning the manner of implementing a change. Assumptions are intended to help identify some critical success factors that should influence the way services are delivered in the integration process. It is recommended that the assumptions should be based on existing literature, practice and expertise. They are also extremely important for the evaluation of the project, especially in the changing conditions of interventions.

Once the outcomes and assumptions have been established, it should be considered what change, as an output, would be needed before an outcome is pos-

sible. This refers to the direct result of activities, services and products that are undertaken or delivered. These are short-term outcomes, leading to medium-term ones.

In order to achieve project outcomes, project initiatives should be formulated that are relevant to them and the defined project indicators. The question is what initiatives would have to be taken to help achieve the intended outcomes. Initiatives will lead to outputs and those to medium-term outcomes.

The final step is to decide on actions and relevant tasks necessary to implement the planned initiatives and the method of their implementation.

In other words, in the Theory of Change, long-term changes (impact) are supported by medium-term changes (outcomes), and these are supported by short-term changes (outputs), usually resulting from actions taken.

The role of assumptions is crucial in the whole process. They explain how initiatives, medium-term outcomes and the final impact of a project are combined. They need to be as clear as possible because the ToC explains why integration can work, while the assumptions of each intervention explain why the organization itself believes that the intervention has the potential to deliver the desired effects. It is important that the hypotheses are supported by high quality research. The Theory of Change hypotheses are hypotheses of change. The hypotheses of change are based on the Theory of Change hypotheses, and design and monitor them in a continuous process of change in communities.

This document is the result of more than a decade of intensive work to improve the integration process in the UK. It shows the enormous amount of efforts made to lay foundations for an integration system designed for a wide range of entities rather than a narrow group of them. The main principles were developed, the understanding of integration was clarified, the domain area was developed and adapted to contemporary requirements, and new factors influencing the integration process were identified and taken into account. What is also important is that the indicators were further specified and practical guidelines were developed to design and evaluate the integration process. It was based on a proven scientific method, the Theory of Change, which was found to be helpful in creating and improving integration policies. By promoting this model of the process, coherent documents were developed as a guide allowing all participants to work independently in this direction.

Conclusions

The intensification of work on the Integration Indicators in 2019 resulted in a mature outcome, laying foundations for a truly coherent integration manage-

ment system. It is clearly based on the Integration Indicators of 2004, but the difference between the documents can be seen at first glance. The former document was a pioneering work. Its task was to outline the issue and make the general public aware of the importance and complexity of social integration as a process of change in a changing environment, especially when it comes to planning and evaluation. The integration indicators of 2004 are narrow in scope and refer to refugees. However, the authors clearly underlined the possibility of extending the application of the document.

The approach here is more pragmatic, illustrating the logical process of its creation. Therefore, the explanation of the structure on which the analysis of the integration process was based, with the domains and their corresponding indicators, preceded the arrangements concerning the definition of integration itself. It is not a concise and exhaustive interpretation; it points to some important features in the context in question. The 2019 Integration Indicators start with a definition taken from the Green Paper on Integration and the Strategy for Coherent Communities, stressing that the concept is still blurred and the term must be interpreted in a context. It is in the explanation that the factor of change is again emphasized.

The structure of the domain is transformed by adding a few domains adequate to modern reality and separating others, which should be measured separately for better results. The document is significantly based on scientific research in this area, which should be considered important for the reliability of the whole process.

A huge effort put into constructing and explaining the indicators is also evident. Their presentation was also modified: from practical and political to local and national.

The differences are visible in the respective volumes of the documents. The newer one is not only more extensive, but is also accompanied by other documents, i.e., guides to strategy development. Most importantly, however, the Theory of Change was adapted in 2019 for the design and evaluation of integration processes. This is a specific way of acting, ideal for integration, which is supposed to bring about changes in an ever-changing environment. The intensive promotion of this approach, involving all participants — from the civil society to authorities at every level — already creates a community in action for integration. It makes it possible to consult problems and to benefit from experiences from many perspectives. It can be said that the United Kingdom is on a good way to create a system of integration, which could not be developed for decades.

References

- Alba, R; Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration. *International Migration Review*. 31, 4: 826—874.
- Anderson, A. A. (2020), The Community Builder's Approach to Theory of Change, a practical guide to theory development, The Aspen Institute, http://www.theory-ofchange.org/pdf/TOC_fac_guide.pdf
- Blair, T. "The Duty to Integrate: Shared British Values." Speech at 10 Downing Street, 8 December 2006 <http://englischlehrer.de/texts/blair.php>
- Brest P. (2010), The Power of Theories of Change, Stanford Social Innovation Review, 2010
- Center for Theory of Change (2020), What is Theory of Change?,
- Bulman M. (2017) Brexit: People voted to leave EU because they feared immigration, major survey finds, The independent 28 June, <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/brexit-latest-news-leave-eu-immigration-main-reason-european-union-survey-a7811651.html>
- Castles S., Miller M. J. (2003). The Age of Migration, Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke — New York.
- Cantle, T.; Kaufmann, E. (2016). Is Segregation Increasing in the UK? Open Democracy. <http://tedcantle.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Cantle-and-Kaufmann-2016-Is-Segregation-Increasing-in-the-UK-Open-Democracy-099.pdf>
- Cantle, T. (2020), 'Parallel Lives': the new evidence, <http://tedcantle.co.uk/parallel-lives-the-new-evidence/#>
- Charsley K., Spencer S. (2019), Understanding integration processes: informing policy and practice, Understanding integration processes, Informing policy and practice, Bristol, <https://www.bristol.ac.uk/media-library/sites/policybristol/PolicyBristol-PolicyReport-44-Jan19-integration.pdf>
- Collins E., Clark H., (2013), Supporting Young People to Make Change Happen. A Review of Theories of Change Synthesis Report. A joint working paper by ActKnowledge and Oxfam, February, <http://www.actknowledge.org/resources/documents/SupportingYoungPeopletoMakeChangeHappenActKnowledgeOxfamAustralia.pdf>
- Commission on Integration and Cohesion. "Our Shared Future." CIC, London, 2007, <http://image.guardian.co.uk/sys-files/Education/documents/2007/06/14/oursharedfuture.pdf>
- Commonwealth immigrants in the Modern Era 1948 — present (2020), <https://www.bbc.co.uk/bitesize/guides/zx93tyc/revision/1>
- Council of Europe (1997) Measurement and Indicators of Integration. COE: Strasbourg.
- CCI Creating the conditions for integration (2012) https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7504/2092103.pdf
- de Palo D., Faini R., Venturini A. (2006), The Social Assimilation of Immigrants, Discussion Paper No. 2439 <http://ftp.iza.org/dp2439.pdf>

- Davies R. (2012), Blog post on the criteria for assessing the evaluability of a theory of change <http://mandenews.blogspot.co.uk/2012/04/criteria-for-assessing-evaluability-of.html>
- Ferguson, C., 2008, 'Promoting Social Integration: Background Paper for Discussion', Report commissioned by the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) for the Expert Group Meeting on Promoting Social Integration, Helsinki, Finland, 8-10 July 2008
- Fiałkowska K., Wiśniewski, J., (2009), Polityka integracyjna Wielkiej Brytanii wobec uchodźców, Instytut Spraw Publicznych, Warszawa, <https://interwencja.prawna.pl/docs/polityka-integracyjna-wielkiej-brytanii-wobec-uchodzcow.pdf>
- Ganowicz E. (2018), Inkluzyjna funkcja bezpośrednich wyborów wójtów, burmistrzów i prezydentów miast, Uniwersytet Opolski, Studia i monografie no. 525, Opole
- Goodhard D. (2016), IMMIGRATION & INTEGRATION AFTER BREXIT A POLICY EXCHANGE AGENDA, <https://policyexchange.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/immigration-and-integration-after-brexit-aug-16.pdf>
- Governance of Migrant Integration in the UK, former Member State, 2017; <https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/governance/united-kingdom>
- Hattersley R., (1965), The Spectator Archive 20 August, <http://archive.spectator.co.uk/article/20th-august-1965/4/immigration>
- Home Office Indicators of Integration Framework (2019), https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/835573/home-office-indicators-of-integration-framework-2019-horr109.pdf
- Home Office Indicators of Integration framework Theory of Change Guide notes Part A (2019a) May https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/805872/home-office-indicators-of-integration-framework-2019-theory-of-change-guide-notes-parta.pdf
- Home Office Indicators of Integration framework 2019 Applying Theory of Change Guide notes Part B (2019b) May https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/805873/home-office-indicators-of-integration-framework-2019-theory-of-change-guide-notes-partb.pdf
- Immigration and Integration in the UK — an introduction (2007), Developing New Approaches to Migration Policies, <https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/index.cfm?action=media.download&uuid=29EA1DAE-A973-93D7-179EBA90266815CA>
- Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper. Building stronger, more united communities, (2018), <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/integrated-communities-strategy-green-paper>
- IOM (2008) MIGRANTS AND THE HOST SOCIETY: PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUCCESS, no. 11, https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/idm_11_en.pdf
- James C. (2011), THEORY OF CHANGE REVIEW A report commissioned by Comic Relief, http://www.actknowledge.org/resources/documents/James_ToC.pdf
- Magnus, N., (2017) Immigration and Integration in the UK, <https://www.civitas.org.uk/content/files/apragmaticapproachtointegration.pdf>

- Marwick A., (2003), British Society since 1945, accessed from researchgate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/47107271_British_Society_Since_1945/
- Mastyk, E. (1978), *Teoria i praktyka rozwoju organizacyjnego. Analiza koncepcji*, Ossolineum.
- Olechnicki K., Załęcki P. (1997). *Słownik socjologiczny*, Toruń: Wydawnictwo Graffiti BC
- Policy Primer, Integration, (2020) <https://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/resources/primers/policy-primer-integration/>
- Problemy integracji imigrantów Koncepcje, badania, polityki (2008), EFS Warszawa 2008
- Saggar S., Somerville W. (2012), *Building a British Model of Integration in an Era of Immigration: Policy Lessons for Government*, Transatlantic Council of Migration
- Rytter M. (2018), *Writing against integration: Danish imaginaries of culture, race and belonging*. Ethnos.
- Sobczak J. B. (2008), *Interwencja społeczna — teoria i praktyka na przykładzie Projektu IW EQUAL „Akademia Przedsiębiorczości. Rozwój alternatywnych form zatrudnienia*, Kraków
- Sztumski, J. (1977), *Problem społeczny jako przedmiot badań socjologii*, „Studia Socjologiczne”, no. 3
- Commission (2015). *How Integrated is Modern Britain?*, http://socialintegrationcommission.org.uk/SIC_Report_WEB.pdf
- Spencer, S. and Rudiger, A. (2003) ‘Social Integration of Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities, Policies to Combat Discrimination’, Paper presented to the conference ‘The Economic and Social Aspects of Migration’ organised by the European Commission and OECD, Brussels, 21—22 January, OECD/European Commission
- Sztompka P. *Socjologia zmian społecznych*. Kraków: Znak, 2005
- Rogers, P. (2014). *Theory of Change, Methodological Briefs: Impact Evaluation 2*, UNICEF Office of Research, Florence.
- Stein D., Valters C. (2012), *Understanding Theory Of Change In International Development*, JSRP Paper 1 (JSRP and TAF collaborative project) August, <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08a64ed915d622c0006ff/JSRP1-SteinValtersPN.pdf>
- Taplin D.H., Clark H., Collins E., Colby D.C., (2013) *Theory of Change. Technical Papers, A Series of Papers to Support Development of Theories of Change Based on Practice in the Field*. April, http://www.theoryofchange.org/wp-content/uploads/toco_library/pdf/ToC-Tech-Papers.pdf
- The Migration Observatory (2016), *What would UK immigration policy look like after Brexit? (Pre-referendum)*, <https://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/resources/commentaries/uk-immigration-policy-look-like-brexit/>
- Theory of change for achieving integration Interactive content https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/805874/theory-of-change-for-achieving-integration-2019.pdf

-
- Vogel, I. (2012). Review of the use of “Theory of Change” in international development. DFID, April, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08a5ded915d3cfd00071a/DFID_ToC_Review_VogelV7.pdf
- Zarębska A. (2002) *Zmiany organizacyjne w przedsiębiorstwie: teoria i praktyka*, Difin, Warszawa