

**COOPERATION BETWEEN
PUBLIC AUTHORITIES AND CIVIL SOCIETY**

Forms, Drivers, Principles, Policies, Means and Tools

*A Pilot Study in the UK at Local Level: Cooperation Between Public
Authorities and Civil Society for the Integration of Refugees*

by

Duygu YARDIMCI

**Submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements of the award of
LLM by Research**

Oxford, England, the UK, January 2021

ABSTRACT

COOPERATION BETWEEN PUBLIC AUTHORITIES AND CIVIL SOCIETY

Forms, Drivers, Principles, Policies, Means and Tools

A Pilot Study in the UK at Local Level: Cooperation Between Public Authorities and Civil Society for the Integration of Refugees

In the last few decades, cooperation with civil society has been receiving increasing attention from governments at all levels, from national to regional to local, as well as from international organisations due to various drivers. These drivers have led to a more cooperative approach in almost all policy fields. Even though cooperation has been receiving increasing attention, experience informs that it is not an easy task to put it into practice. Nevertheless, the literature mostly concentrated on the “Why” question and sought to answer the question: “Why do public authorities and civil society cooperate?” Relatively little attention has been given to the practical aspects of cooperation that answer the “How” question: “How do public authorities and civil society cooperate?” In other words, the practical aspects of cooperation are far less well explored. Drawing on desk research, documentary evidence and qualitative research, this study addresses the relatively neglected side of public-civil society cooperation.

This study moves from theory to practice -from “why it is” to “how to do it”. The key policy field of focus for research is identified as the integration of refugees for two reasons: first, the global refugee crisis establishes the integration of refugees as one of the most urgent issues in the agenda of public authorities; and secondly, this is one of the areas where public-civil society cooperation has the potential to make a real difference; however, research in this field is far less well explored. The geographical focus of the research is the local level because local authorities are not only at the front line of receiving refugees but also their integration into society, as it is primarily in the cities where refugees seek their basic needs.

Key words: Civil society, public-civil society cooperation, partnership, collaboration, NGOs, CSOs, integration, refugees, local authority, the UK, government-CSO relations

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis has been written during the challenging times of the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite these hard times, I have been very fortunate to have many people supporting me uninterruptedly during this study.

First and foremost, I would like to express my deep and sincere gratitude to my supervisor Prof Dr Sonia Morano-Foadi for encouraging me to apply to the LLM at Oxford Brookes University and providing invaluable guidance throughout this research. I was deeply impressed by her sincerity, motivation, dynamism, and knowledge in the field, all of which have made this study an inspiring experience for me. It was a great honour for me to study under her supervision. I will never forget her friendship and empathy which helped me to feel less stressed and calm throughout my research during the tough days of the pandemic.

Sincere thanks to my co-supervisor Professor Peter Edge, for providing wise guidance and feedback to this study. I would like to thank Terri Morris (Research Administrator), and Jill Organ (Head of the Research Degrees Team) and all members of the Oxford Brookes University Research Degree Team for their continued support despite the difficult times of the pandemic.

I am extremely grateful to John Linnard for his support, guidance and friendship, and his generous time devoted to my study. John was always willing to assist in any way he could throughout my study.

I am very thankful to all the interviewees who took part in the study and shared their valuable experiences, thoughts, and knowledge with me and enabled this research to be possible. They were so generous with their time despite being in the difficult period of the pandemic.

I would like to thank my employer (Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate for EU Affairs) for supporting me in conducting an academic study.

I am honoured to be a Jean Monnet Scholar. I would like to thank the Jean Monnet Scholarship Programme funded by the EU, for providing financial support and to the Jean Monnet Technical Assistance Team for providing uninterrupted technical support throughout my study.

I am thankful to my friends who motivated and uplifted me throughout my study.

I am grateful to my parents, parents-in-law and siblings in my home county, Turkey, who enabled me to feel their support from miles away. Last but not least, my deepest thanks are to my spouse Okan Yardımcı, my daughter Mavi Yardımcı and son Kemal Yardımcı who were there for me from the beginning till the end of this study with their never-ending love, support, and understanding. Nothing on the earth would be meaningful without them.

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my grandma, who sadly passed away three months before my submission of the thesis and could not see my graduation.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CIVICUS	World Alliance for Citizen Participation
CMF	Controlling Migration Fund
CoE	Council of Europe
COMPAS	Centre on Migration, Policy and Society
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
ECNL	European Centre for Not-for-Profit Law
ECRE	European Council on Refugees and Exiles
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
EU	European Union
ICNL	International Centre for Not-for-Profit Law
IGAM	Research Centre on Asylum and Migration in Turkey
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
IPA	Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance
JHU - CCSS	Johns Hopkins University Centre for Civil Society Studies
MIPEX	Migrant Integration Policy Index
NCVO	National Council for Voluntary Organisations
NGOs	Non-governmental Organisations
NHS	National Health Service
NPM	New Public Management
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SVPRS	Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme
TUSEV	Third Sector Foundation of Turkey
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UN DESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VPRS	Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme
VCRS	Vulnerable Children's Resettlement Scheme
EUROSTAT	Statistical Office of the EU

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Complexity of Terminology	25
--	----

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF PUBLIC-CIVIL SOCIETY COOPERATION AND METHODOLOGY	10
1.1. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	10
1.1.1. Definition of the Civil Society	10
1.1.2. Typology of Public-Civil Society Relations.....	12
1.1.2.1 Levels of Cooperation	14
1.1.3. Definition of Policy-Making Process	17
1.2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	18
1.3. METHODOLOGY	23
CHAPTER TWO: PRACTICAL FRAMEWORK OF PUBLIC-CIVIL SOCIETY COOPERATION	30
2.1. PRE-CONDITIONS AND PRINCIPLES FOR COOPERATION	30
2.2. MEANS AND TOOLS FOR COOPERATION.....	31
2.2.1. Regulatory Means and Tools.....	31
2.2.2. Institutional Means and Tools	32
2.2.3. Financial Means and Tools.....	32
2.2.4. The Means and Tools of Capacity Building.....	33
2.2.5. On-line Means and Tools	33
2.2.6. Informative Means and Tools.....	34
2.2.7. Other Means and Tools	34
2.3. BARRIERS AND CHALLENGES FOR COOPERATION.....	35
CHAPTER THREE: PUBLIC-CIVIL SOCIETY COOPERATION FOR INTEGRATION OF REFUGEES	38
3.1. DEFINITION OF INTEGRATION	38
3.2. MEANS AND TOOLS FOR INTEGRATION.....	42
3.2.1. The Legal Framework Towards Integration of Refugees.....	42
3.2.2. Cooperation Between Stakeholders.....	44
3.2.3. Resettlement Programmes	46
3.2.4. Community-based Sponsorship of Refugees.....	46
3.2.5. Other Means and Tools for Integration	47

CHAPTER FOUR: PILOT STUDY IN OXFORD CITY: COOPERATION BETWEEN PUBLIC AUTHORITIES AND CIVIL SOCIETY FOR THE INTEGRATION OF REFUGEES

..... **49**

4.1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION 49

 4.1.1. Profile of the Civil Society Sector in the UK 49

 4.1.2. Public-Civil Society Cooperation in the UK 50

 4.1.3. Integration of Refugees in the UK..... 56

4.2. FINDINGS OF THE EMPIRICAL STUDY 63

 4.2.1. Terminology 63

 4.2.2. Statistical Challenges..... 63

 4.2.3. Stakeholders for Cooperation 64

 4.2.4. Drivers for Cooperation..... 66

 4.2.5. Means and Tools for Cooperation 68

 4.2.5.1. Institutional Means and Tools 68

 4.2.5.2. Regulatory Means and Tools..... 70

 4.2.5.3. Financial Means and Tools..... 71

 4.2.5.4. The Means and Tools of Capacity Building..... 71

 4.2.5.5. Online Means and Tools..... 72

 4.2.5.6. Tailor-Made Means and Tools for Cooperation on the Integration of Refugees..... 72

 4.2.5.7. Community Hubs as a Means for Cooperation on Refugees’ Integration 75

 4.2.5.8. Other Means and Tools for Cooperation 76

 4.2.6. Domains of Cooperation..... 77

 4.2.7. Steps of the Policy-Making Cycle Where Cooperation Takes Place 77

 4.2.8. Level of Cooperation..... 78

 4.2.9. Monitoring of Cooperation..... 79

 4.2.10. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Future Cooperation 79

4.3. OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 83

CONCLUSION..... 88

APPENDIX 1 - Interview Templates - Questions..... 93

APPENDIX 2 - Ethical Documentation..... 95

 A) E-mail Template..... 95

 B) Participant Information Sheet..... 97

 C) Consent Form 101

 D) Privacy Notice 103

BIBLIOGRAPHY 106

INTRODUCTION

Though it is not a new concept, especially over the last three decades, public-civil society cooperation at various levels (supranational, international, national, regional, and local) has increasingly gained importance worldwide due to multiple drivers. At this point, it is worth noting that this study's key concepts are heavily contested. For this reason, a working definition is developed for each concept. This study defines civil society as “informal-non-institutionalized or formal-institutionalized groups of people who come together voluntarily and not primarily by commercial concerns but by common interests, goals, and values to create social impact.”¹ Public authorities refer to the formal institutions of state at the local, regional and national level.

The literature review suggests that drivers for public-civil society cooperation can mainly be categorized under two perspectives; in Bode and Brandsen's words these are both democratic and functionalist perspectives.² From a democratic perspective, civil society is accepted to be an essential element of democracy.³ Civil society is believed to play a crucial role in the policy-making process by enabling stakeholders to convey their voice, concerns, opinion, and experiences, promoting rights-based approaches, and claiming their rights, and providing a voice for those people whose voices are not heard through other channels, who are excluded and disadvantaged in society. From the functionalist perspective, civil society participation is valued for its functional concerns and benefits.⁴ From the functionalist perspective, cooperation

¹ This definition is developed in Section 1.1.1.

² Ingo Bode and Taco Brandsen, 'State-third Sector Partnerships: A short overview of key issues in the debate' (2014) 16 *Public Management Review: Government-third Sector Partnerships: Evidence and Cross-national Comparisons* 1055.

³ See, e.g., European Commission, 'European Governance - A White Paper' (Communication) [COM(2001) 428 final - Official Journal C 287 of 12102001]; Jan Aart Scholte, 'Civil society and democracy in global governance' (2002) 8 *Global Governance* 281; Council of Europe Co-operation Group to Combat Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking in Drug, 'Government interaction with Civil Society: Policy paper on government interaction with civil society on drug policy issues: Principles, ways and means, opportunities and challenges' (2015) Adopted at the 79th meeting of the Permanent Correspondents of the Pompidou Group, P-PG (2015) 4 Final; Council of Europe Council of Ministers, 'Guidelines for civil participation in political decision making' (2017) (Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 27 September 2017 at the 1295th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies).

⁴ See, e.g., TUSEV, 'Standards and Good Practices for Public Funding of Civil Society Organisations' (2020) <https://siviltoplum-kamu.org/en/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/SITKIKamuFonlariRapor_EN.Final_.pdf> accessed 25 July 2020, 12-13; Kirsten A. Gronbjerg, 'Patterns of Institutional Relations in the Welfare State: Public Mandates and the Nonprofit Sector' (1987) 16 *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 64; Hillel Schmid, 'The Role of Nonprofit Human Service Organizations in Providing Social Services: A Prefatory Essay' (2004) 28 *Administration in Social Work* 1; Michael J. Austin, 'The Changing Relationship Between Nonprofit Organizations and Public Social Service Agencies in the Era of Welfare Reform' (2003) 32 *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 97; Ramesh Mishra, *The welfare state in capitalist society : policies of retrenchment and maintenance in Europe, North America and Australia* (Studies in international social policy and welfare,

with civil society has gained importance mainly due to growing understanding that complex challenges, such as; poverty, climate change, mass migration, racism, lack of social services, and many others facing society in the globalized world which cannot be solved by government own its own anymore but bringing together the power and resources (financial, human capital, expertise, etc.) available in all sectors (public, private, civil society).

Public-civil society cooperation is a complex, multi-dimensional, multi-layered concept that has been a subject of study by many disciplines, such as, politics, public policy, sociology, economics with different theoretical perspectives. The literature review showed that explanations on the relations between individuals, groups, society, and institutions were mostly based on power relations.⁵ Especially after '70s, explanations on the public authorities-civil society relations based on economic theories were dominant in literature primarily due to the declining role of governments and the increasing role of civil society in the provision of social services to the decline of welfare states. After the 1990's, a new dominant perspective was added to the realm of explanations regarding public authorities-civil society relations, namely the good governance perspective. Although the literature review showed that explanations of the relations between individuals, groups, society, and institutions were mostly based on the notion of “power,” this study has focussed on economic theories and governance perspective to explain public-civil society cooperation.⁶

The COVID-19 pandemic that broke out in almost all countries around the world in 2020 showed that civil society is growing as an indispensable actor for cooperation to manage the

Harvester Wheatsheaf 1990); Lester M. Salamon, *The state of nonprofit America* (Ebook central, Brookings Institution Press 2002); Lester M. Salamon, 'Of Market Failure, Voluntary Failure, and Third-Party Government: Toward a Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State' (1987) 16 *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 29; Lucy Mayblin and Poppy James, 'Asylum and refugee support in the UK: civil society filling the gaps?' (2019) 45 *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 375; Adil Najam, 'The four-C's of third sector-government relations: Cooperation, confrontation, complementarity, and co-optation' (2000) 10 *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 375; Sarah Spencer and Nicola Delvino, 'Cooperation between government and civil society in the management of migration: Trends, opportunities and challenges in Europe and North America' (2018) The University of Oxford's Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS); Yoshiho Matsunaga, Naoto Yamauchi and Naoko Okuyama, 'What Determines the Size of the Nonprofit Sector?: A Cross-Country Analysis of the Government Failure Theory' (2010) 21 *Official journal of the International Society for Third-Sector Research* 180.

⁵ See, e.g., Michel Foucault and Colin Gordon, *Power/knowledge : selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977* (Power-knowledge, Harvester Wheatsheaf 1980); Max Weber, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology* (University of California Press. 1978); Talcott Parsons, 'On the Concept of Political Power' (1963) 107 *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 232; Stewart Clegg and Mark Haugaard, *The SAGE handbook of power* (Handbook of power, SAGE 2009); Steven Lukes, *Power : a radical view* (Studies in sociology, Second expanded edn, Palgrave Macmillan 2005).

⁶ For theoretical discussions see Section 1.2.

crisis, as well. Countries with a cooperation culture and quickly organising civil society networks benefited highly from it during the pandemic.⁷ The ongoing debate regarding the role of government-civil society cooperation is expected to gain momentum as the COVID-19 pandemics revealed once more the importance of civil society contribution in crises.⁸

Similarly, civil society has proved to play a crucial role and showed it has more potential to play in future to cope with the refugee crisis. The world has been witnessing the highest reported rate of forcible displacement ever.⁹ The United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR) recorded '79.5 million forcibly displaced people worldwide at the end of 2019.'¹⁰ Among them, 26 million were refugees.¹¹ Although migration is not a new phenomenon,¹² European countries were caught unprepared as a large number of arrivals occurred in a short period of time. A mass movement of refugee arrivals in Europe in 2015 and 2016 shifted the European countries' attention towards their integration into their host communities.¹³ UNHCR records that 'on average, a refugee spends 17 years of his or her life in exile.'¹⁴ 'Even after armed conflicts have ended, it takes another 17 years for the first refugees to return to their country.'¹⁵ That means

⁷ See, e.g., Solnit Rebecca, *Pandemic Solidarity Mutual Aid during the Covid-19 Crisis* (Pluto Press 2020); United Nations Department of Global Communications Civil Society Unit, 'Stories from the Civil Society COVID-19 Response' (2020) <<https://mailchi.mp/un/civilsocietycovid-19>> accessed 9 December 2020; European Economic and Social Committee, 'Civil Society Against COVID-19' (2020) <<https://www.eesc.europa.eu/en/initiatives/civil-society-against-covid-19>> accessed 9 December 2020.

⁸ It is argued that despite the increasing prominence of civil society during crisis, COVID-19 pandemic has restricted civic and democratic freedoms which is a pre-condition for strong civil society. This study accepts the importance of such arguments but these debates are beyond the scope of this study. For further details see, e.g., CIVICUS, 'State of Civil Society Report 2020' (2020) <https://www.civicus.org/documents/reports-and-publications/SOCS/2020/SOCS2020_Executive_Summary_en.pdf> accessed 29 May 2020; CIVICUS, 'Civic Freedoms and the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Snapshot of Restrictions and Attacks' (2020) <<https://monitor.civicus.org/COVID19/>> accessed 22 June 2020.

⁹ Fifty million people were displaced during World War II. For the first time in 2013, the world's displaced exceeded 50 million people since World War II. See UNHCR, 'Worldwide displacement hits all-time high as war and persecution increase' (2015) <<https://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2015/6/558193896/worldwide-displacement-hits-all-time-high-war-persecution-increase.html#:~:text=It%20said%20the%20number%20of,seen%20in%20a%20single%20year>> accessed 25 July 2020.

¹⁰ UNHCR, 'Figures at a Glance' (2020) <<https://www.unhcr.org/figures-at-a-glance.html>> accessed 25 July 2020.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² See, e.g., IOM, 'World Migration Report 2018' (2017) <https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/country/docs/china/r5_world_migration_report_2018_en.pdf> accessed 28 July 2020.

¹³ See, e.g., Council of Europe, 'Human Rights Handbook for Local and Regional Authorities Vol.1' (2019) <<https://rm.coe.int/the-congress-human-rights-handbook-vol-1-en/168098b094>> accessed 25 July 2020.

¹⁴ UNHCR, 'Resolve conflicts or face surge in life-long refugees worldwide, warns UNHCR Special Envoy' (2014) <<https://www.unhcr.org/news/press/2014/6/53a42f6d9/resolve-conflicts-face-surge-life-long-refugees-worldwide-warns-unhcr-special.html>> accessed 26 July 2020.

¹⁵ Doğu Şimşek and Metin Çorabatır, 'Challenges and Opportunities of Refugee Integration in Turkey' (2016) Research Centre on Asylum and Migration (IGAM) <https://trboellorg/sites/default/files/hb_rapor_duezlt_1904173pdf> accessed 21 October 2020.

that “emergency relief,” “humanitarian assistance,” “refugee camps,” “refugee centres,” etc. are necessary but temporary measures in response to the refugee crisis. Refugees’ long years of presence in receiving countries will have long-term repercussions for themselves and their receiving countries. That is why refugees’ integration to their host communities is crucial for refugees and host communities. Although there is no universally accepted definition of integration, it is generally accepted to be a “two-way process” based on mutual rights and corresponding obligations of refugees and the host countries.¹⁶ In response to the refugee crisis, many governments have introduced measures and policies designed to facilitate the integration of refugees into society. Increasing cooperation among public authorities and civil society is one of these policies. Not only states but also supranational (EU) and international organisations (such as UN agencies and related organisations, CoE, OECD, World Bank) have urged cooperation with civil society in the last decades, in many policy fields.¹⁷

At the *supra-national level*, the EU’s cooperation with civil society was believed to contribute to overcoming the EU’s legitimacy crisis and to meet a concern about citizens’ alienation from the political processes as is the case in the EU policy-making process.¹⁸ In other words, civil society participation in the EU decision-making process since the beginning of the 2000s was considered as to be a remedy to the EU’s legitimacy crisis and was reflected in EU documents such as the White Paper on European Governance (2001)¹⁹ and Treaty of Lisbon (2007).²⁰ The EU promotes cooperation with civil society within its institutions, among the Member States, and furthermore in the candidate and partner countries.²¹

At the *international level*, for instance, the CoE accepts “NGOs” as intermediaries between the CoE and the citizens of member states. Civil society organisations were granted observer status

¹⁶ For further information on the “definition of integration” see Section 3.1

¹⁷ See, e.g., Stephen Osborne, *Public-Private Partnerships : Theory and Practice in International Perspective* (Taylor & Francis Group 2000); Ngaire Woods, 'Good Governance in International Organizations' (1999) 5 *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations* 39.

¹⁸ See, e.g., Osborne, *Public-Private Partnerships : Theory and Practice in International Perspective*; Barbara Finke, *Civil society participation in EU governance* (SUB Hamburg Carl von Ossietzky 2011).

¹⁹ European Commission, 'European Governance - A White Paper'

²⁰ European Union, 'Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community' (2007) OJ C306/01.

²¹ See, e.g., European Commission DG NEAR, 'Guidelines for EU Support to Civil Society in Enlargement Countries 2014-2020' <https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/civil_society/doc_guidelines_cs_supportpdf> accessed 28 April 2020; European Commission, 'Empowering Local Authorities in Partner Countries for Enhanced Governance and More Effective Development Outcomes' (Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions) COM(2013) 280 final

in the Steering Committees and Ad Hoc Committees of the Council.²² The CoE recognizes civil society's contribution as essential for democracy and human rights and as a remedy to the alienation of citizens from the political processes, as it is a way for citizens to make their voice heard. The CoE recognizes civil society's role from a functionalist perspective as well. Civil society actors are believed to bring knowledge and expertise to policy development and implementation. For that reason, the CoE encourages member states to cooperate with civil society in all policy fields and all steps of the policy-making process.²³ To facilitate civil society organisations' participation in the political decision-making process at all levels (local, regional and national levels), a "Code of Good Practice for Civil Participation in the Decision-Making Process" was adopted by the CoE in 2009 laying down the rationale for cooperation and identifying the principles, the means and tools for cooperation. The Code was revised in 2019 to adapt it to social and technological changes.²⁴ The UN is another example of international organisations promoting public-civil society cooperation. Cooperation is believed to contribute to the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).²⁵

At the *national level* in many countries, including the UK, long-term strategies and policies to guide public-civil society cooperation were adopted, motivated either by concerns for democracy or functional concerns or both.²⁶ Public-civil society cooperation is also an important phenomenon at the *local level* because of functional concerns such as resource constraints, lack of knowledge and expertise in a specific policy field, and/or concerns for democracy to comply with the principles of good governance.²⁷

Despite increasing awareness and greater enthusiasm for cooperation at all levels, it is also acknowledged that ensuring efficient and continuing public-civil society cooperation is not an easy task due to a variety of reasons such as lack of an enabling environment for civil society,

²² Council of Europe Co-operation Group to Combat Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking in Drug, 'Government interaction with Civil Society: Policy paper on government interaction with civil society on drug policy issues: Principles, ways and means, opportunities and challenges'.

²³ Council of Europe Committee of Ministers, 'Guidelines for civil participation in political decision making' (2017) Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 27 September 2017 at the 1295th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies, CM(2017)83-final.

²⁴ Council of Europe Conference of INGOs, 'Code of Good Practice for Civil Participation in the Decision-making Process,' (2009) Adopted by the Conference of INGOs at its meeting on 1st October 2009, CONF/PLE(2009)CODE1; Council of Europe Conference of INGOs, 'Code of Good Practice for Civil Participation in the Decision-making Process Revised' (2019) Adopted by the Conference of INGOs on 30 October 2019.

²⁵ UN DESA Sustainable Development, 'The 17 Goals' <<https://sdgs.un.org/goals>> accessed 18 September 2020.

²⁶ For further information about the UK example see Chapter 4.

²⁷ See, e.g., OECD, *Working Together for Local Integration of Migrants and Refugees* (2018).

lack of a regulatory and institutional framework for cooperation, lack of capacity, lack of mechanisms to cooperate or unawareness of existing ones, etc.²⁸ This study is motivated by and responds to this finding of the broader literature on the subject.

Against this background, to fill in the above-mentioned gap, this study aims to explore the answers to these two specific research questions with particular regard to the integration of refugees:

- How do local public authorities and civil society cooperate?
- What are the forms, pre-conditions, basic principles, means and tools for public-civil society cooperation?

Compared to previous studies that concentrate mostly on the evolution and “driving forces of cooperation”²⁹, this study offers an analysis of cooperation structures. Cooperation is a highly “contested” concept, with different meanings under different typologies attributed to it. This study defines cooperation as a form of relationship between public authorities and civil society where a public authority and a civil society actor interact with each other either within the policy-making process of a specific public policy field or by engaging sporadically towards a shared goal or individual goals. Considering the diversities of civil society in terms of roles, functions, fields of interest, this study opts for a more multi-layered understanding of cooperation between public authorities and civil society. In this regard, this study is inspired by the CoE’s categorization of civil society participation in the decision-making process as information sharing, consultation, dialogue, and partnership, from the “lowest to the highest level of participation.” However, this study argues that civil society’s role is considered relatively passive in the CoE typology as it proposes that the levels of cooperation are initiated by public authorities. Despite employing the CoE’s typology, this study attributes a more active role to civil society organisations in cooperating with public authorities and accepts that either party can initiate cooperation in any of these levels. This study also employs the CoE’s methodology that discusses public-civil society cooperation at each step of policy-making cycles. However, this study argues that in addition to public-civil society cooperation within the policy-making cycle of a policy/strategy/law/regulation, there is ad hoc-sporadic

²⁸ See Section 2.3 “Barriers and Challenges for Cooperation.”

²⁹ See footnote 3 and 4.

cooperation. These ad hoc-sporadic relations may arise for various reasons such as emergency situations, efforts of civil society to create an agenda that is not in the programme of governments, etc.³⁰

This study investigates actors, bodies, motivations, perceptions, views, perspectives, experiences, texts, actions, contexts, interactions, rules, structures, and underlying mechanisms to answer the research questions. In this regard, a socio-legal approach was adopted, encompassing two overlapping phases: a theoretical phase and an empirical phase based on qualitative method. These two phases enable the analysis of cooperation at ‘macro’ and ‘micro’ levels. Macro pictures of public-civil society cooperation were taken through documentary analysis based on the literature's desktop research. The second phase, the empirical phase, offered to explore cooperation at the “micro” level. In this regard, a pilot study was undertaken in a local setting within a geographical ambit (Oxford City) that focuses on a specific policy field (integration of refugees). Micro pictures of public-civil society cooperation at the local level were taken through qualitative research based on in-depth, semi-structured interviews with key informants from public authorities and civil society actors. The distinctive (but also compelling) feature of this study is that it tries to explore the intersection of two policy fields, namely cooperation policy (cooperation between public authorities and civil society) and integration policy (integration of refugees). The empirical study aimed to explore how the theories reflected in practice, on public-civil society cooperation to integrate refugees. The specific aim was to find out the mechanism which makes the cooperation functional. Evidence of what really happens between law, policy, and actual practices also helps to explore the strengths, weaknesses, and challenges of cooperation.

Before proceeding with the outline of each chapters, it is worth mentioning what is excluded from this study's scope. *Firstly*, this is not a theoretical study of "civil society," "cooperation," and "integration." *Secondly*, these are highly contested terms. This study does not aim to resolve the disputes. Still, it offers a perspective to explore the intersection of cooperation policy and integration policy. *Thirdly*, in many countries public-civil society cooperation is mostly seen in the provision of services. The provision of services may result in increasing commercial activities by civil society. This increasing trend toward commercialism is criticized with the

³⁰For instance, Turkish national and local governments' cooperation with civil society organisations in the aftermath of the Elazığ and İzmir earthquakes in 2020 is a very good example of ad hoc cooperation in emergency situations.

argument that it creates a risk to their identity by diverting them to operate as profit-making firms.³¹ It is also argued that public-civil society cooperation erodes civil society's independence and autonomy. The more civil society is financially dependent on the government as a result of public-civil society cooperation, the less it engages in advocacy activities and protests against government policies.³² This study accepts the importance of such arguments, but they are beyond the scope of the study. *Fourthly*, it is argued that civil society involvement in the policy-making process creates a kind of blurring of responsibilities, which creates ambiguity about who is responsible for failures.³³ This study accepts the importance of discussions on accountability, but they are beyond the scope of the study.

This study is organized into four chapters. *Chapter 1* sets out the conceptual and theoretical foundations upon which the empirical research is based on. Moreover, it informs the methodological aspects of the study. To ensure clarity and coherence throughout the study, Chapter 1 starts with working definitions of the main concepts. The chapter then presents the typologies developed by various scholars and institutions to understand and explain public-civil society relationships in general, and public-civil society cooperation in particular. The literature review suggests that drivers for public-civil society cooperation can mainly be categorized under two perspectives: democratic and functionalist perspectives. In parallel, this study argues that public-civil society cooperation is more complex and diverse than can be explained by one theory alone. Despite not offering an exhaustive theoretical discussion, this study argues that government failure theory, interdependence theory, and good governance approach are appropriate approaches to consider when considering cooperation between public authorities and civil society.

While *Chapter 1* presents the theoretical aspects of cooperation, *Chapter 2* presents the practical aspects. It explores the preconditions, basic principles, regulatory and institutional arrangements, and other means and tools paving the way for cooperation. Barriers and challenges for cooperation are also evaluated in this chapter.

³¹ Schmid, 'The Role of Nonprofit Human Service Organizations in Providing Social Services: A Prefatory Essay'.

³² For debates on these concerns see Osborne, *Public-Private Partnerships : Theory and Practice in International Perspective*, 335-338.

³³ Gerry Stoker, 'Governance as theory: five propositions' (2018) 68 *International Social Science Journal* 15.; Schmid, 'The Role of Nonprofit Human Service Organizations in Providing Social Services: A Prefatory Essay'.

Chapter 3 deals with the phenomenon of integration. This chapter highlights the increasing importance of integration policies. It identifies the means and tools that are required for successful integration. It reflects the role of cooperation for the implementation of integration policies.

Chapter 4 presents the outcome of the pilot study based on empirical data gathered through interviews. This study's empirical analysis explores public-civil society cooperation within a particular policy field (integration of refugees) at local level (Oxford City). The pilot study targeted the local level because local authorities are not only at the front line of receiving refugees but are also responsible for their integration into society.

The purpose of this study is to compile existing knowledge on cooperation between public authorities and civil society and to explore its implication on the integration of refugees to provide an understanding of how public-civil society cooperation is developed. *In conclusion*, the study offers a set of recommendations for developing public-civil society cooperation by highlighting the main aspects that should be considered when developing such a framework. This chapter concludes that any generalisation of public-civil society cooperation in all policy fields would be misleading, given the significant variation in many aspects.

CHAPTER ONE: CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF PUBLIC-CIVIL SOCIETY COOPERATION AND METHODOLOGY

1.1. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

1.1.1. Definition of the Civil Society

The origin of the term “civil society” is traced back to ancient times, to the Greek and Roman philosophers.³⁴ The theoretical foundation of civil society in modern political discourse emerged with the rise of capitalism and liberal political thought (17th-18th centuries).³⁵ However, ancient civil society was one thing, while contemporary civil society is quite another. Scholte points out this evolution as below:

‘In sixteenth century English political thought, the term referred to the state, whereas present-day usage tends to contrast civil society and the state. Hegel's nineteenth-century notion of civil society included the market, whereas current concepts tend to treat civil society as a non-profit sector. Writing in the 1930s, Gramsci regarded civil society as an arena where class hegemony forges consent, whereas much contemporary discussion identifies civil society as a site of disruption and dissent.’³⁶

Contemporary civil society is commonly described as ‘the area outside the family, market and state.’³⁷ This common understanding of civil society has changed over time as boundaries between civil society, state, and the market became more blurred due to the evolving ecosystems. For instance, it is not now possible to claim that civil society does not engage in commercial activities. Although being primarily motivated by creating social value, it engages in commercial activities and seeks profit to create social value.³⁸

Today, the main feature of the civil society sector is its diversity. For instance, civil society can be grouped based on targeted geographic locales, such as: grassroots, regional, national,

³⁴See, e.g., Jean L. Cohen and Andrew Arato, *Civil society and political theory* (Studies in contemporary German social thought, MIT Press 1992); Boris DeWiel, 'A Conceptual History of Civil Society: From Greek Beginnings to the End of Marx' (1997) Vol. 6 Past Imperfect 3.

³⁵ See, e.g., Cohen and Arato, *Civil society and political theory*; Vivek Kumar Mishra, 'The Role of Global Civil Society in Global Governance' (2012) Vol.03No.04 Beijing Law Review 4; Michael Edwards and John Ehrenberg, *The History of Civil Society Ideas* (Oxford University Press 2012); DeWiel, 'A Conceptual History of Civil Society: From Greek Beginnings to the End of Marx'; Mihai Bădescu and Anca Bădescu, 'The Origin and Evolution of Civil Society' (2018) IV Journal of Law and Public Administration 27.

³⁶Scholte, 'Civil society and democracy in global governance'.

³⁷World Economic Forum, 'World Scenario Series: The Future Role of Civil Society' (2013) <http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_FutureRoleCivilSociety_Report_2013.pdf> accessed 22 July 2020; See also. Najam, 'The four-C's of third sector-government relations: Cooperation, confrontation, complementarity, and co-optation'.

³⁸See, e.g., James T. Bennett, *To profit or not to profit: The commercial transformation of the nonprofit sector*, edited by Weisbrod, B.A. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998, XII+340 pp., \$69.95 (cloth (1999)).

international civil society organisations. Civil society can be grouped based on their roles, interests, and functions. But this does not mean that they are entitled to have only one role, interest, and function. They may perform more than a single role and function, such as service provision (such as childcare, elderly care, social counselling, housing, food distributing, employment support), advocacy, watchdog, networking, expertise, capacity building, campaigning, lobbying, monitoring and evaluation, etc. Civil society can be grouped based on the thematic areas they are interested in, such as children, women, migration, environment, animal protection, sport, youth, elders, etc. Scholte grouped civil society based on their purposes as Conformist, Reformist, or Transformist.³⁹ Civil society can be categorized by its size: large (with too many paid staff and financial means), or small (with few or no paid staff and regular income). Civil society can be categorized as formal/informal, institutionalized/non-institutionalized. Today, some use the term "civil society" as a synonym for the terms "community and voluntary sector", "nonprofit sector", "non-government sector", "third sector", "charitable sector", "philanthropic sector", "social economy", etc. Others use these terms to refer to specific actors of civil society while excluding others.

Based on the above-mentioned diversity and ambiguity of the 'civil society' term, it may be argued that an endeavour to make a universally accepted definition of civil society is spinning one's wheel. Nevertheless, it is essential to clarify what should be understood by "civil society" within the context of that specific study. In this study, as mentioned in the Introduction, civil society is accepted as informal-non-institutionalized AND formal- institutionalized groups of people who come together voluntarily and not primarily for commercial concerns but with common interests, goals, and values whether political, cultural, social or economic to create social impact. In this context, the civil society ecosystem includes informal-non-institutionalized voluntary groups, community groups, advocacy groups, platforms, AND formal-institutionalized organisations (NGOs and CSOs), such as charities, foundations, associations, social entrepreneurs, social cooperatives, labour unions, etc. Civil society includes organized (either formal or informal) groups but excludes active individuals. This definition also excludes universities, faith groups, political parties, think tanks.⁴⁰ This definition is designed to be flexible and expansive. It does not distinguish between organisations by type of legal entity, size, geographic locale, the field of interest, roles, or purposes.

³⁹ Scholte, 'Civil society and democracy in global governance'. 284

⁴⁰ There are discussions regarding the role of universities, faith groups, political parties, think tanks in civil society but these discussions are beyond the scope of this study.

1.1.2. Typology of Public-Civil Society Relations

There is a long-lasting debate regarding the role of governments on the one hand and civil society on the other hand. Some portrayed these roles as a zero-sum game which substitute each other: “As one gets bigger, the other gets smaller.”⁴¹ Some people claim their roles as complementary.⁴² Some people claim public-civil society relations are more complex and diverse. In this regard, they developed a typology of public-civil society relationships to explain these relationships in a particular context and to identify the characteristics of alternative relationship types.⁴³

Gronbjerg suggests four patterns to define relations between the public and nonprofit sector: **cooperation, accommodation, competition, and symbiosis.**⁴⁴ These patterns are based on two driving forces: 1- public sector dependency on the nonprofit sector for the provision of public services, and 2- the presence or not of a strong private sector economy. He argues that the pattern of cooperation between the public and nonprofit sectors appears in the lack of incentives from the private sector to enter service provision in a policy field.

Coston suggests eight relationship types, ranging from **repression to rivalry to competition to contracting to the third-party government to cooperation to complementarity to collaboration,** based on government's resistance to or acceptance of institutional pluralism, favourability of government policy vis-a-vis civil society Organisation, the relative power in the relationship, degree of formality, government-civil society Organisation linkage.⁴⁵ In **contracting, third-party government, cooperation, complementarity, and collaboration,** government accepted institutional pluralism. There is a linkage between government and civil society organisations.

⁴¹ See, e.g., Frederick W. Powell, *The politics of civil society : big society and small government* (University Press Scholarship Online, Second edn, The Policy Press 2013).

⁴² See, e.g., Anthony Giddens, *The third way : the renewal of social democracy* (Polity Press 1998).

⁴³ Among others see. e.g. Gronbjerg, 'Patterns of Institutional Relations in the Welfare State: Public Mandates and the Nonprofit Sector'; Denise R. Young, 'Complementary, supplementary or adversarial: A theoretical and historical examination of government-nonprofit relations in the U.S.' in T. Boris and C. E. Steurele (ed), *Government and nonprofit organizations: The challenges of civil society* (The Urban Institute. 1999); Jennifer M. Coston, 'A Model and Typology of Government-NGO Relationships' (1998) 27 *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 358; Najam, 'The four-C's of third sector-government relations: Cooperation, confrontation, complementarity, and co-optation'.

⁴⁴ Gronbjerg, 'Patterns of Institutional Relations in the Welfare State: Public Mandates and the Nonprofit Sector'.

⁴⁵ Coston, 'A Model and Typology of Government-NGO Relationships'.

Young's typology offers three model for public-civil society relations, namely **supplementary, complementary, and adversarial**.⁴⁶ The **supplementary model** suggests that civil society provides public goods where the government failed to deliver. In the **complementary model**, public services delivered by civil society and financed by government in policy fields. The **adversarial model** points out the adversarial relationship between public and civil society in policymaking and service delivery.

Najam proposed the four-C framework for public-civil society relations based on different combinations of institutional policy goals and preferred means of government and civil society in pursuing these goals. These are **Cooperation, Confrontation, Complementarity, and Co-optation**.⁴⁷ Najam identifies the relationship as "cooperation" where government and civil society organisations have a similar vision on desired goals and prefer identical means to achieve them. Najam also points out "non-engagement" as a fifth possibility in which government and civil society do not engage with each other for various reasons.

Although the discussion on typologies has proved useful in highlighting different types of relationships between public authorities and civil society, they may require time adaptation to the evolving nature of civil society or the context that civil society operates in. For instance, World Economic Forum depicted four scenarios for the context that civil society might in the future operate in.⁴⁸

Whilst recognising other types of relations between civil society and public authorities, this study proceeds with one specific type: "cooperation." Literature review reveals that terminology for the term "cooperation" is quite complicated as in the case of the term "civil society". Several different phrases and words are used in different studies or within the same study, sometimes interchangeably and sometimes in an unclear way to define and understand the cooperation between government and civil society, such as interaction, cooperation, collaboration, co-production, or partnership. In this research, the term 'cooperation' is used as a catch-all for the various terms used in the literature.

⁴⁶ Young, 'Complementary, supplementary or adversarial: A theoretical and historical examination of government-nonprofit relations in the U.S.'

⁴⁷ Najam, 'The four-C's of third sector-government relations: Cooperation, confrontation, complementarity, and co-optation'.

⁴⁸ World Economic Forum, 'World Scenario Series: The Future Role of Civil Society'.

Above are the examples of typologies developed to explain public-civil society relations in general. There are also models focusing on specific relationship types, such as cooperation. For instance, The ECNL models for cooperation are based on the level of independence and the aspect of institutionalization. Institutionalization refers to the institutional capacity (human resources, budget, etc.) to manage projects and provide public services, ensuring CSO as a reliable and accountable partner to the government. Independence refers to the CSOS's ability to act independently from the government in its policies and practices. Based on these two characteristics, ECNL identified four main models of cooperation.⁴⁹Stoker points out various forms of partnerships, as well.⁵⁰

As already argued in the introduction, this study claims that the nature of public-civil society cooperation is multi-layered, multi-dimensional, depends on a wide range of factors on both public and civil society sides. There is no 'one-size-fits-all' cooperation in all policy fields. The scope of public-civil society cooperation varies depending on the policy field in question. It may differ across the different steps of the policy-making cycle in a specific policy field. It depends on the public authority (national, regional, local) and civil society actors in question. For instance, the same public authority may have different levels of cooperation with different civil society actors in different policy fields at different policy-making cycles. For these reasons, this study argues that public-civil society cooperation is not straightforward as described in the above typologies. In this study, the CoE's level-based typology of "cooperation," which fits well with this understanding, is employed to describe the types of cooperation between public authorities and civil society.

1.1.2.1 Levels of Cooperation

This study defines cooperation as “a form of public authorities-civil society relationship where a public authority and a civil society actor interact with each other either within the policy-making process of a specific public policy field or sporadically towards a shared goal or individual goals.” This definition stresses five essential criteria: (1) the interaction can be initiated either by the public authority or the civil society actor. (2) the focus of the interaction is a specific public policy field (health, environment, housing, education, social services,

⁴⁹ These four models are: Corporatist (Continental) Model, Socio-Democratic (Scandi) Model, Liberal (United Kingdom and Ireland) Model, Emerging (Mediterranean and Eastern European) Model. For further details see. TUSEV, 'Standards and Good Practices for Public Funding of Civil Society Organisations'.

⁵⁰ Stoker, 'Governance as theory: five propositions'.

integration, etc.) (3) the interaction is realized in any step of the policy-making cycle (4) the interaction can start at any stage of the policy-making process not necessarily start from the first step towards the last step. (5) incentives for public authorities and civil society actors to cooperate can be different.

Accordingly, this study argues the importance of studying public-civil society cooperation at the micro-level, namely policy level rather than the macro-level, namely the sectors and institutions as a whole. Considering the different dynamics of each policy field, such as competence of the public authority, level of expertise of civil society, citizens' preferences, etc., civil society's role may differ. As a result, public authorities and civil society relations may vary accordingly. Coston exemplified that:

‘In areas such as the arts where citizen preferences vary widely, private nonprofit provision can be expected to be substantial. In areas such as policing and defense where preferences may be relatively homogeneous, we can expect the nonprofit role to be less substantial. In areas such as social services, where citizens' preferences can be volatile, we can expect non-profit provision to respond to ebbs and flows of public sentiment and consensus.’⁵¹

In parallel, the level of public-civil society cooperation varies among policy fields. Furthermore, the level of cooperation varies at different steps of policy-making cycle within the same policy field in question. For that reason, this study argues that public-civil society cooperation should be addressed in a multilevel approach as it provides a better understanding of cooperation given the different nature of policy fields, different steps of policy-making process, and different types of civil society organisations. The CoE’s typology is thought to fit this understanding well. According to this typology, there are four levels of participation of civil society- from least to most participative- in the policy-making process. This study is inspired by the CoE’s typology. However, as mentioned in the Introduction, this study argues that civil society’s role is considered relatively passive in the CoE typology, especially in the first two steps. Despite employing the CoE’s typology, this study attributes a more active role to civil society organisations in cooperating with public authorities. The levels of participation (this study prefers to call these levels as “levels of cooperation”) defined by the CoE typology are as follows⁵²:

⁵¹ Coston, 'A Model and Typology of Government-NGO Relationships'.

⁵² Council of Europe Conference of INGOs, 'Code of Good Practice for Civil Participation in the Decision-making Process Revised'; Council of Europe Council of Ministers, 'Guidelines for civil participation in political decision making'.

- *Information sharing* on a specific policy. Although the CoE's typology proposes that information sharing is the provision of information from the public authorities, this study accepts "information sharing" as a one-way provision of information from any of the parties- as it is argued that civil society does not have a passive role in the cooperation process. It is argued that civil society may share information with public authorities to affect a policy.
- *Consultation* for opinion/comments/feedbacks/views on a specific policy. The CoE considers consultation as a one-way initiative of public authorities. However, this study argues that consultation should be regarded as a one-way initiative of either party where they ask each others' opinion/comments/feedback/views on a specific policy.
- *Dialogue* is a two-way communication between public authorities and civil society launched by either party to ensure an exchange of views on mutual interests and shared objectives, or for a specific policy development.
- *Partnership*, which is the highest form of cooperation, implies shared responsibilities in each step of the policy-making cycle. The partnership is accepted as more than a contractual relationship. It implies shared power through consensus.⁵³ It is more than the mere implementation of public authorities' will. This level implies that civil society will also have power and responsibility for a policy outcome.

The CoE typology is employed in the empirical part of this study as it enables greater flexibility to understand significant variation in the extent of cooperation. Some other typologies are much more restrictive. Any description of the public-civil society cooperation with the CoE's level-based typology of "cooperation" would not be complete without references to the policy-making cycle. Another term that demands definitional disclosure is the policy-making process.

⁵³ The CoE's partnership definition is expanded in this study by adding from Franziska Rosenbach Jo Blundell, Tanyah Hameed, Clare FitzGerald, 'Are we rallying together? Collaboration and public sector reform' (2019) Government Outcomes Lab, University of Oxford, Blavatnik School of Government.

1.1.3. Definition of Policy-Making Process

‘There are also many different approaches to analyzing policy processes in democratic systems (e.g., public choice, the institutional-ideological framework, policy cycles)’⁵⁴ This study uses the policy cycle approach because it fits well with the above-mentioned “cooperation” definition and provides an appropriate framework for analysing and understanding the multidimensional cooperative relationship between public authorities and civil society. Besides, as this model presents the complex policy-making process in a relatively simple manner, this model offers opportunities during the empirical phase of the study such that it provides a clear framework for participants of the empirical phase about the policy-making process within the scope of this study.

Even though the policy cycle approach is commonly used in analysing the policy process, policy cycles are identified in different stages by different institutions and scholars.⁵⁵For instance, the CoE political decision-making process is composed of seven different steps: input/incentive ideas, agenda setting, drafting of policy, decision-making, implementation of policy, monitoring, and reformulation of policy.⁵⁶ Each step is argued to offer opportunities for public-civil society cooperation. Howlett and Ramesh's model identifies five stages of policy-making process: agenda setting, policy formulation, adoption (or decision making), implementation, and evaluation.⁵⁷

This study makes use of a six-stage policy cycle approach by adding one more stage (monitoring) to Howlett and Ramesh’s model. Within the context of this study, these six stages are defined as follows:

- *The agenda-setting* stage is where problems are identified, and the agenda is set.
- *The policy formulation* stage is where possible solutions, policy options discussed and developed.

⁵⁴ Marie Claire Brisbois, 'Natural resource industries and the state in collaborative approaches to water governance: a power-based analysis' (2015).

⁵⁵See, e.g., François Benoit, *Public Policy Models and Their Usefulness in Public Health: The Stages Model* (2013); Council of Europe Council of Ministers, 'Guidelines for civil participation in political decision making'.

⁵⁶ Policy-making process has been variously called. For instance, the CoE uses the term ‘decision-making process’.

⁵⁷ D.P.S.M. Howlett and others, *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems* (Oxford University Press 1995).

- *The policy adoption (decision-making)* stage where the strategic approach is shaped, decisions are made, and an alternative policy option is selected and adopted. At this stage, final decision power may lie with the public authorities.
- *The implementation stage* is where the selected policy is implemented.
- *The monitoring stage* is where the implemented policy outcomes are monitored via indicators that must be identified during the policy adoption phase.
- *The evaluation stage* is where outcomes of the implemented policy and their alignment with the policy's objectives are discussed, and policy is reformulated, if necessary.

This study argues that in addition to the public-civil society cooperation within the policy-making cycle of a policy, a strategy, a law or a regulation, there is sporadic cooperation. These sporadic relations may arise for various reasons, such as emergency situations, with respect to the efforts of the civil society to create an agenda that is not in the programme of the governments, etc.⁵⁸

1.2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Public-civil society's cooperation is more complex than any relations due to diversities in civil society. It is difficult to explain it by one single theory as there are limitations of theories stemming from addressing civil society's diversity and complexity.⁵⁹ Civil society is not merely a service provider, but also civil society has a role in the other steps of the policy-making cycle. However, the advocacy role of the civil society as listed under the section 1.1.1 is not well reflected in the economic theories. This gap is filled in by a governance perspective. Similarly, the governance perspective remains limited in its ability to address the service provider role of civil society.

By considering civil society's complex nature, public-civil society cooperation in the policy-making process is valued mainly from two key streams of reasoning; in Bode and Brandsen'

⁵⁸ See footnote 30.

⁵⁹ See, e.g., Section 1.1.1. See also Laura Pedraza-Farina, 'Conceptions of civil society in international lawmaking and implementation: a theoretical framework' (2013) 34 Michigan Journal of International Law 605. Pedraza proposes a typology that distinguishes civil society organisations into their possible functions and purposes. Then she suggests five groups of civil society theories focusing on specific functions of civil society. For her, each theory provides different answers to the question of how civil society cooperate with international organisations and national governments.

words, "democratic perspective" and "functionalist perspective."⁶⁰ These reasonings set the ground for public-civil society cooperation based on governance perspective and different strands of economic theories.

From the functionalist perspective, civil society participation is valued for functional concerns and benefits.⁶¹ Civil society is believed to identify and solve significant problems in society in innovative ways at a better value for money, and civil society is an important actor in the delivery of public services. It is argued that especially after the 70's as the welfare states declined and state's role as service provider is diminished due to neo-liberal reforms or decreases in the public expenditure, civil society arises as the main provider and as public service contractors.⁶²

Under the functionalist perspective, civil society is an important actor in providing special services to underserved populations. For instance, in localities where public authorities could not provide certain special services, such as specialist health services, elderly care, disability care, social care services, etc., specialist civil society organisations may deliver them.⁶³ Civil society provides services where the state does not have the expertise, knowledge, desire, or capacity to do so.⁶⁴ Civil society is good at addressing individuals' special needs and knows their local priorities and needs best. Civil society can act faster through a less formal and bureaucratic approach. Civil society can deliver services more cost-effectively thanks to volunteers.⁶⁵ As an alternative to civil society organisations' cooperation, public authorities may cooperate with the private sector in the provision of public services. However, it is argued that 'NGOs ...are better able to bridge the gap between the private intimacy that individuals would prefer and the anonymity of public service provision'.⁶⁶ Civil society may overcome sectoral barriers easier than public authorities in some instances, thanks to their communication and networking capabilities. 'From the perspective of government, non-public partners are very

⁶⁰ Bode and Brandsen, 'State-third Sector Partnerships: A short overview of key issues in the debate'.

⁶¹ See, e.g., TUSEV, 'Standards and Good Practices for Public Funding of Civil Society Organisations', 12-13; Gronbjerg, 'Patterns of Institutional Relations in the Welfare State: Public Mandates and the Nonprofit Sector'; Schmid, 'The Role of Nonprofit Human Service Organizations in Providing Social Services: A Prefatory Essay'.

⁶² See, e.g., Austin, 'The Changing Relationship Between Nonprofit Organizations and Public Social Service Agencies in the Era of Welfare Reform'; Mishra, *The welfare state in capitalist society : policies of retrenchment and maintenance in Europe, North America and Australia*.

⁶³ Salamon, *The state of nonprofit America*; Salamon, 'Of Market Failure, Voluntary Failure, and Third-Party Government: Toward a Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State'; Mayblin and James, 'Asylum and refugee support in the UK: civil society filling the gaps?'

⁶⁴ Najam, 'The four-C's of third sector-government relations: Cooperation, confrontation, complementarity, and co-optation', 380.

⁶⁵ TUSEV, 'Standards and Good Practices for Public Funding of Civil Society Organisations', 13.

⁶⁶ Spencer and Delvino, 'Cooperation between government and civil society in the management of migration: Trends, opportunities and challenges in Europe and North America'.

much welcome as they are expected to enrich the repertoire of public management and to provide relief to an ever more disarmed welfare state.’⁶⁷

From the civil society point of view, it may be argued that an effective partnership with public authority's civil society organisations can deliver greater scale projects than they could do alone. Besides, they expand their professional networks, improve their advocacy and lobbying capacity, and better understand the policy-making process and improve their capacity and capabilities in this regard.

The functionalist perspective can be linked to the strands of economic theories of “government failure theory”⁶⁸ introduced by Weisbrod and, “interdependence theory”⁶⁹ introduced by Salamon. Government failure theory argues that government provides homogeneous goods and services for the majority of voters (politically dominant groups) and fail to satisfy people with special needs and heterogeneous groups due to a variety of constraints, such as the lack of knowledge, lack of equity providing services to specific groups or purposefully neglects these needs for political reasons.⁷⁰ Civil society satisfy the unsatisfied demand where both the market and the state fail to address.

The interdependence theory introduced by Salamon argues that civil society, satisfying a wide variety of unmet demands, also fails to meet all needs due to a variety of shortcomings, such as lack of adequate secured financial resources. As civil society fails to meet all demands that the government cannot fulfil, the government is involved in the process. That means that civil society failure results in a mutual dependence between government and civil society to address diverse needs and demands.⁷¹ This mutual dependence creates the environment for public-civil society cooperation. Saidel, who points out “resource interdependence” between government

⁶⁷ Bode and Brandsen, 'State-third Sector Partnerships: A short overview of key issues in the debate'. For motives from the government's point of view see also Schmid, 'The Role of Nonprofit Human Service Organizations in Providing Social Services: A Prefatory Essay'; Matsunaga, Yamauchi and Okuyama, 'What Determines the Size of the Nonprofit Sector?: A Cross-Country Analysis of the Government Failure Theory'.

⁶⁸ Weisbrod, B. (1975). Toward a theory of the voluntary non-profit sector in a three-sector economy in E. S. Phelps (Ed.), *Altruism, morality, and economic theory* (pp. 171-195). New York, NY: Russell Sage in Khaldoun AbouAssi and others, 'Use and Perceptions of the Availability of Local Government and Nonprofit Services in Diverse Urban Settings' (2019) 48 *Nonprofit And Voluntary Sector Quarterly* pp975; Francis M. Bator, 'The Anatomy of Market Failure' (1958) 72 *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 351.

⁶⁹ Salamon, 'Of Market Failure, Voluntary Failure, and Third-Party Government: Toward a Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State'.

⁷⁰ Weisbrod, B. (1975). Toward a theory of the voluntary non-profit sector in a three-sector economy in E. S. Phelps (Ed.), *Altruism, morality, and economic theory* (pp. 171-195). New York, NY: Russell Sage in AbouAssi and others, 'Use and Perceptions of the Availability of Local Government and Nonprofit Services in Diverse Urban Settings'.

⁷¹ Salamon, 'Of Market Failure, Voluntary Failure, and Third-Party Government: Toward a Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State'.

and nonprofits, defines “resource” as ‘anything of value, tangible or intangible, that can be exchanged between organisations.’⁷² For AbouAssi and others ‘governments provide revenue, information, and access to policy processes, in exchange for resources controlled by nonprofit, such as service–delivery capacity, political support, and legitimacy.’⁷³

The interdependence theory and government failure theory are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Instead, they are complementary and together help us understand government and civil society's motives and drivers to cooperate, especially in the implementation step of policy-making process.

From the democratic perspective, civil society participation, either directly or indirectly, in the policy-making process is believed to be an integral part of the democracy.⁷⁴ As stated in the Introduction civil society is believed to play a crucial role in the policy-making process by enabling stakeholders to convey their voice, concerns, opinion, and experiences, promoting rights-based approaches, and claiming their rights, and providing a voice for those people whose voices are not heard through other channels, and who are excluded and disadvantaged in society. For instance, this is reflected in the Special Eurobarometer Survey on Democracy and Elections (2018): 76% of respondents considered that civil society has a vital role in promoting and protecting democracy.⁷⁵

It is argued that civil society enhances the effectiveness and legitimacy of the state and institutions.⁷⁶ Limitations of the representative democracy models have paved the way for participatory democracy models, as in the EU case, in which civil society plays a crucial role.⁷⁷ Cooperating with civil society is believed to contribute to overcoming the legitimacy crisis and meeting to address a concern about citizens' alienation from the political processes as is the case in the EU policy-making process.

⁷² Judith Saidel, 'Resource Interdependence: The Relationship Between State Agencies and Nonprofit Organizations' (1991) 51 *Public Administration Review* 543.

⁷³ AbouAssi and others, 'Use and Perceptions of the Availability of Local Government and Nonprofit Services in Diverse Urban Settings'.

⁷⁴ European Commission, 'European Governance - A White Paper'; Scholte, 'Civil society and democracy in global governance'; Council of Europe Co-operation Group to Combat Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking in Drug, 'Government interaction with Civil Society: Policy paper on government interaction with civil society on drug policy issues: Principles, ways and means, opportunities and challenges'; Council of Europe Council of Ministers, 'Guidelines for civil participation in political decision making'.

⁷⁵ European Commission, 'Special Eurobarometer 477 – Wave EB90.1 – Kantar Public, Democracy and Elections, November 2018' <file:///C:/Users/Duygu/Downloads/ebs_477_sum_en.pdf> accessed 28 March 2020.

⁷⁶ Pedraza-Farina, 'Conceptions of civil society in international lawmaking and implementation: a theoretical framework'.

⁷⁷ Justin Greenwood, 'Organized Civil Society and Democratic Legitimacy in the European Union' (2007) 37 *British Journal of Political Science* 333.

Besides, civil society is believed to contribute, through some education and awareness-raising activities, people's understanding of how decisions that affect their lives are taken, building bridges between people and public authorities and leads to authorities making better decisions as it canalizes more voice, different perspectives, and more expertise into the decision-making process. Civil society is believed to increase people's confidence in institutions.⁷⁸ It is also argued that civil society as a pressure group increases the public authorities' transparency and accountability through monitoring the policy-making process and presses for the necessary measures if needed.⁷⁹

The democracy perspective can be linked to the governance approach. The literature review shows that the concept of governance started to be commonly used in the discussion of public administration around the 1990's. However, governance is another contested term of this study. Governance is interpreted differently in different disciplines and contexts.⁸⁰ For instance, Rhodes points out six separate uses of governance: 'as the minimal state; as corporate governance; as the new public management; as 'good governance'; as a socio-cybernetic system; as self-organizing networks.'⁸¹ Besides different interpretations of governance, there are certain aspects where scholars are not in agreement with each other.⁸² Within the context of this study, the democracy perspective is linked to the good governance approach. The essence of good governance is participatory action. It promotes multi-stakeholder participation (including civil society) in the policy-making process. Collaborative policy-making with the participation of civil society is thought to address above mentioned democracy concerns.

International Organisations (World Bank, UN, WTO, etc.) and the EU have played a vital role in developing a good governance approach since 1990.⁸³ Furthermore, these organisations not

⁷⁸ Scholte, 'Civil society and democracy in global governance'.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ See, e.g., R. A. W. Rhodes, *Network Governance and the Differentiated Polity* (Oxford University Press 2017); Stoker, 'Governance as theory: five propositions'; Chris Ansell and Alison Gash, 'Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice' (2008) 18 *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 543; B. Guy Peters and John Pierre, 'Governance without Government? Rethinking Public Administration' (1998) 8 *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART* 223; Mark Bevir, *Key concepts in governance* (SAGE Publications Ltd 2008); Henk Addink and H. Addink, *Good Governance: Concept and Context* (Oxford University Press 2019).

⁸¹ Rhodes, *Network Governance and the Differentiated Polity*.

⁸² See, e.g., Peters and Pierre, 'Governance without Government? Rethinking Public Administration'; Stoker, 'Governance as theory: five propositions'.

⁸³ Woods, 'Good Governance in International Organizations'; Pedraza-Farina, 'Conceptions of civil society in international lawmaking and implementation: a theoretical framework'; European Commission, 'European Governance - A White Paper'; Council of Europe, '12 Principles of Good Governance' (2008) <<https://www.coe.int/en/web/good-governance/12-principles>> accessed 29 March 2020.

only incorporated a good governance approach in their institutional set-up but also promoted good governance approach at the national level to increase the quality, accountability, and legitimacy of public administrations.⁸⁴

This study argues that government failure theory, interdependence theory, and a good governance approach enable an understanding of cooperation between public authorities and civil society as a complex form of relationship that exists uniquely depends on the competence, capacity, resources, and motivation of the public authorities, and motivations and characteristics of civil society actors in terms of roles, functions, fields of interest, etc. This study is an addition to public-civil society cooperation research, which is generally based on a single theory disregarding the motivations and diversification of civil society and needs, motivations, and competencies of the public authorities simultaneously. Moreover, this is an addition to public-civil society cooperation research, which is generally based on public authorities-oriented focus with a premise that public authorities have the final say on cooperation. This study hopes to contribute to the understanding of cooperation as a two-way process, based on the mutual consent of both sides.

1.3. METHODOLOGY

The literature shows that the theoretical discussion questioning the public-civil society cooperation has been explored to a large extent. Thus, an ample debate on ‘WHY’ question, on ‘why public authorities and civil society cooperate’ is present in literature. What is missing is the ‘HOW’ question. This study fills in this gap as it attempts to answer the question of ‘How do public authorities and civil society develop cooperation?’ That means that the gap in knowledge relates to the practical aspects of the cooperation. This study addresses this neglected side of public-civil society cooperation. To this end, this study aims to explore:

- How do local public authorities and civil society cooperate?
- What are the pre-conditions, basic principles, forms, and means and tools for cooperation?

⁸⁴ See. e.g. European Commission, 'Promoting Good Governance - European Social Fund Thematic Paper' (2014) <file:///C:/Users/Duygu/Downloads/esf_technicalpaper_good_governance_en%20(2).pdf> accessed 28 July 2020; Council of Europe European Committee on Local and Regional Democracy, 'Strategy for Innovation and Good Governance at Local Level' (2011) Strasbourg, 6 September 2011, CDLR(2011)37.

This study investigates actors, bodies, motivations, perceptions, views, perspectives, experiences, texts, actions, contexts, interactions, rules, structures, and underlying mechanisms to answer these research questions. In these regards, a socio-legal approach was adopted, encompassing two overlapping phases: the theoretical phase and the empirical phase based on qualitative methods. In other words, the methodology used in this study is both theoretical and empirical. These two phases enable the analysis of the cooperation at ‘macro’ and ‘micro’ dimensions. The first phase -theoretical phase- offered to explore cooperation ‘macro’ level. Macro pictures of public-civil society cooperation were taken through documentary analysis based on the literature's desktop research. The second phase, the empirical phase, offered to explore cooperation at the “micro” level. In this regard, a pilot study was undertaken in a local setting within a geographical ambit (Oxford City) that focuses on a specific policy field (integration of refugees). Public-civil society cooperation, including forms, means and tools, was researched to understand how cooperation is structured to contribute to the integration of refugees. A micro picture of public-civil society cooperation was taken through qualitative research based on in-depth, semi-structured interviews with key informants from public authorities and civil society actors at the local level. To find out something about interviewees’ experiences, comparing, contrasting, and interpreting them, uncovering new issues and prospects for the future would be unlikely to be achieved without qualitative methods.

Theoretical Analysis

The theoretical analysis employed documentary research covering preliminary review and in-deep review of the academic and policy literature. Preliminary desk research showed that there is not an agreed terminology. A variety of terms is used to deal with the same field. For instance, the question of “How do public authorities and civil society develop effective cooperation?” is formalized in various ways with the terms summarized in the below table.

Table 1: Complexity of Terminology

Public Authorities	Civil Society	Develop	Effective	Cooperation
State	Civil Society Sector	Achieve	Constructive	Interaction
State Agencies	Voluntary Sector	Ensure	Cooperative	Relation
State Bodies	Community and	Foster	Continuing	Relationship
Government	voluntary sector	Improve	Healthy	Partnership
Government	Third Sector	Strengthen	Inclusive	Collaboration
department	Nonprofits		Sustainable	Co-
Government	Nonprofit Sector		Stable	production
agencies			Productive	
Public Sector			Positive	
Public Agencies			Working	
Public				
Organisations				
Public Institutions				
Statutory Sector				
Statutory Agencies				

The deep review of the literature searched by these keywords explored through preliminary research. Databases searched through a variety of keyword, synonyms, and related terms. Bibliography and reference sections of previous studies were also reviewed to catch the relevant sources, key authors, and theorists. The literature review focused on published literature in the English language.

Desk research focused on a review of five main groups:

- 1) A review of the key documents of supranational and international organisations, such as the EU, the CoE, the IOM, the UNHCR, and the OECD.
- 2) A review of the documents of the UK government and local authorities, such as Home Office, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, Oxford County Council, Oxford City Council.

- 3) A review of the documents of research institutes and civil society organisations, such as ICNL, ECNL, JHU – CCSS, CIVICUS, NACVA, Compact Voice, the University of Oxford-COMPAS, ECRE, TUSEV.
- 4) Academic writings obtained through books, journal articles, and online resources.
- 5) Reports of the public-civil society cooperation projects funded by various donors, such as the EU, including those projects implemented in Turkey.

The main difficulty of this study, as in most of the cases in the study of social sciences, is that of conceptual ambiguity. The terms "civil society," "cooperation," "governance," "integration" are highly disputed terms in as much as there are many different versions of their interpretations by authors, governments, and even within the same state by various institutions. There has been no single universally agreed definition of these terms - neither in the past nor currently. What makes the case more complicated is that many other terms are used as a synonym for the mentioned words as seen above. Moreover, even when these terms are used as synonyms by many, what they mean may be interpreted differently by them. This conceptual ambiguity is the primary source of difficulty in the theoretical analysis of this study. However, this study does not aim to address in detailed this conceptual ambiguity. Instead, this study adopted working definitions of key concepts.

Empirical Analysis

For empirical analysis, a qualitative research design was used. Oxford City is the geographical ambit where empirical research took place with the participation of key informants from the City Council (Councillors and officers) and civil society (members, staff, volunteers) by way of semi-structured interviews being conducted between June 2020 to August 2020. Potential interviewees were identified mainly through an online search and accessed through publicly available mailing lists of organisations. The use of the snowball sampling technique was also employed to reach potential interviewees.

There were seven participants, three participants from public authorities, and four participants from civil society holding different roles- who participated in the interviews. Three of them were male, four of them were female. Interviews were conducted in the English language. Given the new rules on social distancing due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a face-to-face interview was impossible. This situation created barriers to get the benefits of face-to-face

contact. To overcome that barrier, online tools that enable online face-to-face talk were utilized during the interviews—semi-structured interviews conducted via online means (Zoom and Microsoft Teams). Online tools were selected based on interviewees' preferences. Although each interview was scheduled to take 40 min, they lasted longer, up to 60 to 75 min. Each interview was audio-recorded to guarantee the availability of complete data.

An invitation e-mail was sent to the potential participants or gatekeepers (Appendix 2-A). As soon as a positive response was received to the invitation e-mail, a participant's information sheet (Appendix 2-B) was sent via e-mail. The interviews were conducted according to the semi-structured interview template (Appendix 1). Although there was a semi-structured framework for conducting interviews, each interviewee could choose the focus according to his/her experiences and competencies.

Why UK and Oxford City?

The UK was selected based on the following factor: it is a country with a long tradition of public-civil society cooperation. The UK introduced innovative examples of public-civil society cooperation mechanisms and served as a model for other countries. Oxford is thought to provide suitable settings to study integration phenomena within the UK because Oxford, with its ethnic and cultural diversity, has the third-highest ethnic minority in the southeast.⁸⁵

Ethical Consideration

'The University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) has specific responsibility for reviewing research involving human participants.'⁸⁶ In this respect, an application for research ethics approval was submitted to the Oxford Brookes University Research Ethics Committee at the beginning of March 2020 and ethics approval was received at the end of March 2020. The documents under Appendix 2 are the attachments of the Research Ethics Application Form.

⁸⁵ Oxford City Council, 'Council Strategy 2020-2024'

<<https://consultation.oxford.gov.uk/consult.ti/Corpstrat/consultationHome#:~:text=The%20Council%20Strategy%202020%2D2024,by%20the%20end%20of%202024>> accessed 24 November 2020.

⁸⁶ Oxford Brookes University, 'Research Ethic Statement' <<https://www.brookes.ac.uk/research/research-ethics-statement/>> accessed 6 January 2020.

Safety, Confidentiality, Anonymity, and Informed Consent

Interviewees participated in a confidential and anonymous, semi-structured interview session. A privacy notice explaining how their data was to be collected and used was provided to the prospective interviewee (Appendix 2-D). A written consent via the consent form received from each interviewee (Appendix 2-C). They were also informed that they were free to refrain from answering any questions.

Data Analysis

In the qualitative data analysis, thematic analysis and narrative analysis were used to understand, interpret, and come to a conclusion with data. In the thematic analysis, data was examined to identify common themes, ideas, and patterns. Thematic analysis was preferred as it enables flexibility in interpreting the data and allows sorting extensive data efficiently. A deductive approach was applied to the data with some preconceived themes based on theory or literature review. The thematic analysis started with a transcription of the recordings. The transcribed information was then categorized based on interview questions. Then it was followed by coding the data, generating, and defining themes, and writing up steps. In the narrative analysis, stories that were told within the context of research interpreted.

Constraints during Data Collection

The research's main constraint was that it coincided with the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, which caused a lack of interest and response on the part of potential participants to join in the research. Minimum five participants from public authorities and minimum five participants from civil society were targeted for interviews. However, many of the potential respondents gave a negative response to an invitation for an interview due to their over exhausting schedule with the management of COVID-19. That is why the number of key informants interviewed is lower (seven in total) than expected.

Second constraint was that -initially, the selection of interview candidates focused on a wider sample, including respondents from the NHS, police, or among refugees. However, data collection from these groups required a special approval process that was impossible to be

completed within the duration of this study. That is why respondents were selected among narrower institutions and groups.

Limitations of the study

The study's main limitation is that this study does not capture the entire cooperation landscape in Oxford City but captures cooperation approaches on a specific policy field, namely refugees' integration. Secondly, the public authority within the context of this study is limited to the Oxford City Council. Another limitation of the study is that interviews were limited to the key informants that were reached. As a result, the output of the interviews was limited to the knowledge and understanding of those interviewees. For that reason, it may not be possible for all information gathered to be generalizable, but it is still valuable to identify variations in understanding. Additionally, they are still worthwhile as they are based on real-life experiences. This study is largely based on literature in English.

This study accepts the importance of including service recipients in a survey on public-civil society cooperation to understand how best the cooperation addresses their needs. However, data collection from service recipients (refugees) has required a special approval process that was impossible to be completed within the duration of this study. That is why service recipients are not included in the empirical process as a target group. Against this theoretical background, the Chapter Two will address the practical aspects of cooperation.

CHAPTER TWO: PRACTICAL FRAMEWORK OF PUBLIC-CIVIL SOCIETY COOPERATION

2.1. PRE-CONDITIONS AND PRINCIPLES FOR COOPERATION

Certain pre-conditions should be met, and principles should be recognised to establish effective public-civil society cooperation in the real sense of the term. These *pre-conditions* can be listed as -but not limited to- respect for the principle of the rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms; freedom of expression, information, assembly and association; existence of an enabling legal environment for civil society for the establishment, functioning, and sustainability; recognition of civil society as distinct, independent, autonomous actors with respect to their roles, missions, activities, and objectives; a willingness and commitment from both public authorities and civil society to cooperate with each other; existence of mutual trust and respect between civil society and public authorities by considering each other's roles and responsibilities; existence of fair judicial review.⁸⁷ These pre-conditions mean that political and legal structures should be enabled for civil society's existence, on the one hand, for the public-civil society cooperation on the other hand. Otherwise, regulatory and institutional frameworks, and means and tools for cooperation would be null.

For public-civil society cooperation to be effective, certain principles must be adhered to by the parties.⁸⁸ These *principles* can be listed as -but not limited to- *clarity, openness and transparency* of management of cooperation and institutional structure (such as clarity, openness and transparency in the call for cooperation, the selection criteria for identifying the potential partners for cooperation and for distribution of government funding, decision-making

⁸⁷ See, e.g., Council of Europe Committee of Ministers, 'Guidelines for civil participation in political decision making'; Council of Europe Conference of INGOs, 'Code of Good Practice for Civil Participation in the Decision-making Process Revised'; Council of Europe Co-operation Group to Combat Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking in Drug, 'Government interaction with Civil Society: Policy paper on government interaction with civil society on drug policy issues: Principles, ways and means, opportunities and challenges'; TUSEV, 'Standards and Good Practices for Public Funding of Civil Society Organisations'; Osborne, *Public-Private Partnerships : Theory and Practice in International Perspective*.

⁸⁸ See, e.g., Council of Europe Committee of Ministers, 'Guidelines for civil participation in political decision making'; Council of Europe Conference of INGOs, 'Code of Good Practice for Civil Participation in the Decision-making Process Revised'; Council of Europe Co-operation Group to Combat Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking in Drug, 'Government interaction with Civil Society: Policy paper on government interaction with civil society on drug policy issues: Principles, ways and means, opportunities and challenges'; TUSEV, 'Standards and Good Practices for Public Funding of Civil Society Organisations'; Osborne, *Public-Private Partnerships : Theory and Practice in International Perspective*; European Commission, 'European Governance - A White Paper'

process, governance structure, conflict resolution mechanisms, etc.); *accountability* ensured by both parties; *non-discrimination, equal treatment and inclusiveness* in identifying the potential partners for cooperation (for instance, not only bigger organisations but also smaller civil society organisations should be given a chance to cooperate if they have the capacity to cooperate based on objective criteria). In addition, enough time and information should be given to enable civil society to engage; their contributions should be taken into account and feedback about how contributions reflected in the policy-making process should be given. Roles and responsibilities between public authorities and civil society should be clarified at the very beginning of the cooperation. The objectives and priorities of public authorities and civil society should be clear, and their shared objectives and aims should be clarified at the very beginning.

2.2. MEANS AND TOOLS FOR COOPERATION

2.2.1. Regulatory Means and Tools

An effective public-civil society cooperation requires the existence of a strong civil society and a government willing to work with the civil society. In this regard, regulatory means and tools are those means and tools which create an enabling environment for the establishment, functioning, and sustainability of civil society on the one hand, and public-civil society cooperation on the other hand.

Regulatory means and tools may comprise any binding or unbinding documents, such as law, regulation, policy, strategy, code of conduct, procedures, framework agreements, etc. that promote, mainstream, shape, and regulate public-civil society cooperation. These binding and unbinding documents set the basis for cooperation, ensure above-mentioned preconditions, and identify the principles, roles, responsibilities, and procedures for cooperation. The regulatory framework provides a clear frame for public authorities and civil society actors on cooperation in general and on certain policy fields in particular. Volunteerism and philanthropy are critical to the success of civil society initiatives. The regulatory framework should also create an enabling environment for the development of volunteerism and philanthropy.

2.2.2. Institutional Means and Tools

Institutional means and tools enable continuous communication between public authorities and civil society and manage public-civil society cooperation in the policy-making cycle. The openness and inclusiveness of these structures is essential. These structures may include contact persons for civil society organisations at public authorities, contact persons for public authorities at civil society organisations, and a separate unit or department responsible for coordinating cooperation. Various permanent or ad hoc structures such as advisory committees, councils, expert committees, joint committees, stakeholder committees, steering committees, strategic partnership groups, working groups, citizen's assemblies, etc. create a shared space for dialogue, provide continuing communication between public authorities and civil society. International organisations, the EU, and many countries have established institutional means and tools to facilitate interaction with civil society and cooperation in the policy-making process permanently or on ad hoc basis.⁸⁹

2.2.3. Financial Means and Tools

Financial means and tools are those financial resources supporting public-civil society cooperation directly or indirectly. These means and tools fund: the delivery of public services provided by civil society, projects developed by the civil society which fall within the public authorities' priorities, capacity building of public officials or civil society members to increase their skills and knowledge to cooperate, institutional sustainability of the civil society, establishment of above-mentioned institutional means and tools of cooperation, etc.

Financial means and tools may comprise short-term or multi-year grants, subsidies, seed funding, service level agreements/service procurement/contracts, community sponsorship schemes, tax benefits (exemptions or deductions), etc.⁹⁰ This financial support may be either channelled from a central budget or from the budgets of local governments, or from other

⁸⁹ See, e.g., ICNL, 'Models to Promote Cooperation between Civil Society and Public Authorities' (2013) <<https://www.icnl.org/post/assessment-and-monitoring/models-to-promote-cooperation-between-civil-society-and-public-authorities>> accessed 30 March 2020.

⁹⁰ See, e.g., TUSEV, 'Standards and Good Practices for Public Funding of Civil Society Organisations'; UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States, *A Handbook on Non-State Social Service Delivery Models A guide for policy makers and practitioners in the CIS region* (2012) <http://www.bcnl.org/uploadfiles/documents/analyses/undpecnl_handbook_on_social_contracting_2012.pdf> accessed 2 April 2020

sources, such as lotteries, etc. While some of these means and tools establish a donor-donee relationship, others establish a contractual relationship between the public authorities and civil society.

2.2.4. The Means and Tools of Capacity Building

It is essential to improve both public authorities' and civil society actors' capacity for effective cooperation because cooperation is about a different way of working that requires a different mindset and an understanding of the values and principles of each other. Capacity building means and tools improve the capacity to learn about the working practices and roles and responsibilities of each other, increase awareness regarding steps in the policy-making process, and levels of cooperation. Furthermore, Osborne points out that a shift towards partnership is not an easy task and requires a cultural change that is quite difficult.⁹¹ Capacity building means and tools provide an opportunity for cultural change as well. Capacity building means and tools may include training, seminars, workshops etc. The content may include anything that will contribute to developing capacity and skills such as campaigning, lobbying, policy-making cycles, policy formulation, the regulatory framework on cooperation, project development, training on the policy field in question, etc. Capacity building involves increasing civil society actors' understanding of the policy-making cycle and their potential and ability to influence all policy-making processes. Supporting the use of digital technology by public employees and civil society actors through training is also a way of building capacity.

2.2.5. On-line Means and Tools

Online tools and modern communication technologies offer excellent opportunities to reach a broader target group in a shorter period at a lower cost. The importance of online means and tools increased as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic, and the importance of digital literacy has become more evident. Online means and tools may include online meetings and video conference platforms, e-consultation tools, e-mails, e-mail groups, online databases, e-participation, e-forum, social media platforms, websites, etc. While some of these means and tools enable only the sharing of information in a specific policy field, others enable two-way discussion and debate on a particular issue with a broader group of people. 'They can largely

⁹¹ Osborne, *Public-Private Partnerships : Theory and Practice in International Perspective*.

contribute to the efficiency, transparency, accountability and responsiveness of institutions, as well as to the promotion of citizens' engagement and to increasing empowerment.⁹² However, to encourage civil society to cooperate via online platforms, online tools should be accessible, digital literacy should be strengthened, and guidance should be offered.

2.2.6. Informative Means and Tools

Informative means and tools may include a *roadmap*⁹³ analysing the current situation on cooperation, setting priorities for the future and actions towards them with indicators to monitor progress; a *toolkit*⁹⁴ explaining how to develop cooperation step by step; *entry point mapping*⁹⁵ identifying the routes, platforms, mechanisms by which civil society can involve in the policy-making cycle; a *stakeholder mapping study* providing an overview of public authorities prepared to cooperate or civil society organisations prepared to cooperate, their capabilities, resources and needs, and the mutual benefits of cooperation. Informative means and tools may also include an annual report, guidelines, brochures, leaflets, internal reports, media releases, public hearings/forums/panels, question and answer platforms, petitions, research, questionnaires etc. that give information to cooperation partners about the policy field in question.

2.2.7. Other Means and Tools

Logistical means and tools include common spaces, community hubs that allows public authorities and civil society to come together, connect and work together. The means and tools supporting the running of civil society such as in-kind support in the form of goods or services (e.g., office equipment, computers, software) can be regarded as logistic support. Provision of

⁹² Council of Europe Co-operation Group to Combat Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking in Drug, 'Government interaction with Civil Society: Policy paper on government interaction with civil society on drug policy issues: Principles, ways and means, opportunities and challenges'.

⁹³ See, e.g., European Union Capacity4Dev Public Group on Civil Society, 'Roadmaps' <<https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/public-governance-civilsociety/wiki/roadmaps>> accessed 3 April 2020.

⁹⁴ See, e.g., UNDP, 'UNDP and Civil Society Organisations A Toolkit for Strengthening Partnerships ' (2006) <<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/2141UNDP%20and%20Civil%20Society%20Organizations%20a%20Toolkit%20for%20Strengthening%20Partnerships.pdf>> accessed 3 April 2020.

⁹⁵ See, e.g., USAID Health Finance and Governance Project, 'Entry Point Mapping: A Tool to Promote Civil Society Engagement On Health Finance and Governance' (2014) <https://www.hfgproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/EPM-Tool-6_2015.pdf> accessed 4 April 2020.

awards (e.g., for the development of volunteering programs) is considered as in-kind support as well.⁹⁶ These logistic means and tools support the resilience of the civil society sector.

There are other means and tools designed to respond to specific needs. For instance, to ensure the participation of all potential civil society actors in the policy-making cycle, information should be accessible to, and understandable by, all potential actors. Provision of language support for those who are not fluent in the language in use contributes to the accessibility of all potential civil society actors to the cooperation mechanisms.

2.3. BARRIERS AND CHALLENGES FOR COOPERATION

While the principles for effective cooperation mentioned above point out the *equality* among parties, this may not be achieved due to certain asymmetries between public authorities and civil society. Power imbalances between public authorities and civil society is a commonly mentioned problem in cooperative approaches. The power imbalances that are mainly resulting from resource dependency of civil society on public sources may impede civil society's independent, conflictual and critical contribution on the policy-making process as civil society can fear losing future funding.⁹⁷ This means that power imbalances between parties can lead to inequality at all levels of cooperation and civil society may not make full use of its potential contribution to the policy-making process.⁹⁸ Moreover, in the existence of power imbalances, the norms, rules and procedures of the powerful actor are dominant in the relationship.⁹⁹

Power imbalance does not only imply imbalances among public authorities and civil society but among civil society actors as well. For instance, civil society actors may not have the same capacity and resource to cooperate, which means stronger actors will have more opportunities and be more dominant in cooperation.¹⁰⁰ Smaller civil society organisations, on the other hand, may find it challenging to make their voices heard by the public authorities. They may not have the capacity to understand the policy-making process to engage effectively, an adequate number

⁹⁶ See, e.g., UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States, *A Handbook on Non-State Social Service Delivery Models A guide for policy makers and practitioners in the CIS region*.

⁹⁷ See, e.g., Coston, 'A Model and Typology of Government-NGO Relationships'; Osborne, *Public-Private Partnerships : Theory and Practice in International Perspective*.

⁹⁸ Spencer and Delvino, 'Cooperation between government and civil society in the management of migration: Trends, opportunities and challenges in Europe and North America', 7.

⁹⁹ Gary Craig, Marilyn Taylor and Tessa Parkes, 'Protest or Partnership? The Voluntary and Community Sectors in the Policy Process' (2004) 38 *Social Policy & Administration* 221.

¹⁰⁰ Ansell and Gash, 'Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice'.

of human resources to do so. This means that not all civil society actors may have equal opportunities to cooperate.

It is argued that:

‘civil society is not an intrinsically virtuous space. It includes destructive elements such as racists, ultranationalists, and religious fundamentalists who seek to deny the democratic rights of others. In addition, some professionals in civil society are so impressed with their "expertise" that they refuse to take lay views seriously.’¹⁰¹

This all means that a group of civil society actors may not be interested in cooperation with public authorities. Similarly, public authorities may not be interested in cooperating with a group of civil society actors. Civil society actors that fail to meet standards of openness and public transparency may be excluded from the list of potential actors of cooperation.¹⁰² It is also worth remembering that a public authority can cooperate in those policy fields that are in its competence. If it is not authorised in a policy field, a public authority cannot cooperate in that field.¹⁰³

Compatibility challenge is another challenge pointed out in the literature on public-civil society cooperation.¹⁰⁴ It refers to the different roles, responsibilities, professional interests, aims, objectives and differences in the management, administration and resource mobilisation of public authorities and civil society organisations. All these differences may require time, experience and training to learn about the working practices, roles, responsibilities, aims and objectives of each other.

Lack of commitment to cooperation (that may also arise from competitiveness between public authorities and civil society actors) and distrust among stakeholders are other barriers to

¹⁰¹ Scholte, 'Civil society and democracy in global governance', 298.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ For instance, in some countries, one of the barriers to public-civil society cooperation on migration policy at the local level is that local authorities (municipalities) are not authorised by law to involve in the management of migration. For instance, although these two actors need to cooperate to manage the migrants' flow in Turkey, there are legal challenges to effective cooperation. See

Kaan Akman, 'Local Governments and NGO Cooperation in Migration Management' (2018) 1 *Uluslararası Yönetim Akademisi Dergisi* 452.

¹⁰⁴ Council of Europe Co-operation Group to Combat Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking in Drug, 'Government interaction with Civil Society: Policy paper on government interaction with civil society on drug policy issues: Principles, ways and means, opportunities and challenges'.

effective cooperation.¹⁰⁵ The prehistory of antagonism or cooperation between stakeholders is a barrier or facilitator of cooperation.¹⁰⁶ Similarly, certain prejudices and misconception of parties against each other creates a barrier to cooperation. Some policy fields are more security-sensitive than others, such as drug policy. Security concerns are believed to have the potential to create barriers to cooperation.¹⁰⁷ Lack of above-mentioned necessary means and tools for cooperation are other barriers to cooperation. All these barriers and challenges imply that establishing public-civil society cooperation is not an easy task and requires a long time, cultural change, change of attitude and perception between parties, the establishment of principles and the development of the means and tools for cooperation.

In addition to general framework of cooperation, it must be highlighted that “cooperation” approach is embedded in policy fields specifically and sector-specific cooperation mechanisms have been developed accordingly. The next chapter will exemplify how cooperation approach embedded in the integration policies and what kind of sector-specific mechanisms utilized to facilitate cooperation.

¹⁰⁵ See, e.g., Ansell and Gash, 'Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice'; Council of Europe Co-operation Group to Combat Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking in Drug, 'Government interaction with Civil Society: Policy paper on government interaction with civil society on drug policy issues: Principles, ways and means, opportunities and challenges'.

¹⁰⁶ See Ansell and Gash, 'Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice', 553-554.

¹⁰⁷ See, e.g., Council of Europe Co-operation Group to Combat Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking in Drug, 'Government interaction with Civil Society: Policy paper on government interaction with civil society on drug policy issues: Principles, ways and means, opportunities and challenges'.

CHAPTER THREE: PUBLIC-CIVIL SOCIETY COOPERATION FOR INTEGRATION OF REFUGEES

3.1. DEFINITION OF INTEGRATION

As stated in the Introduction, UNHCR recorded 26 million “refugees”¹⁰⁸ by the end of 2019. Among them, 107,8000 refugees resettled to 26 countries.¹⁰⁹ At this point it is worth noting that there are two groups of refugees: “recognized refugees” and “resettled refugees.” The differentiation between them depends on their entry channel into the host society.¹¹⁰ UNHCR records that the average length of stay of refugees in host countries is 17 years.¹¹¹ This means that “emergency relief,” “humanitarian assistance,” “refugee camps,” “refugee centres” are temporary measures in response to the refugee crisis.¹¹² Due to refugees’ long years of presence in host countries their integration to their receiving societies is crucial for both refugees and host societies. For instance, it is argued that integration measures reduce the risks of the marginalization and radicalization of refugees on the one hand and counter discrimination, racism, and xenophobia on the other hand. When refugees are integrated into host countries

¹⁰⁸ The legal definition of the term “refugee” is set out in Article 1 of the 1951 Convention, which defines a refugee as a person who:

‘owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it.’ UN General Assembly, Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, 28 July 1951, United Nations, Treaty Series, 189: 137.

¹⁰⁹ UNHCR, 'Figures at a Glance'

¹¹⁰ An asylum seeker is someone seeking international protection, but whose request has not been decided yet. See UNHCR, 'Master Glossary of Terms, June 2006, Rev.1' (2006) <<https://www.refworld.org/docid/42ce7d444.html>> accessed 20 September 2020

An asylum seeker is granted international protection only after he/she is recognized as a refugee. An asylum seeker is entitled to refugee status when relevant asylum authorities in a signatory country agree that he/she meets the definition in the Refugee Convention (see. Section 3.2.1) and recognizes the person seeking asylum as a refugee. This group of refugees who are granted refugee status under the asylum process on Refugee Convention grounds are called “recognized refugees.”

On the other hand, resettled refugees are recognized refugees transferred from an asylum country to another third country under vulnerability criteria through resettlement programmes operated by UNHCR in partnership with governments worldwide. For “vulnerability criteria” see Natalie Welfens and Asya Pisarevskaya, 'The ‘Others’ amongst ‘Them’ – Selection Categories in European Resettlement and Humanitarian Admission Programmes' in Moritz Jesse (ed), *European Societies, Migration, and the Law: The ‘Others’ amongst ‘Us’* (Cambridge University Press 2020). For resettlement programs see UNHCR, 'Resettlement Handbook, 2011' <<https://www.refworld.org/docid/4ecb973c2.html>> accessed 11 September 2020.

The UNHCR Resettlement Handbook is a key reference tool on global resettlement policy and practices as it offers resettlement management and policy guidance to all relevant stakeholders (UNHCR staff, resettlement states, NGOs, etc.)

¹¹¹ UNHCR, 'Resolve conflicts or face surge in life-long refugees worldwide, warns UNHCR Special Envoy'

¹¹² For the meanings of these concepts see UNHCR, 'Master Glossary of Terms Rev.1' <<https://www.refworld.org/docid/42ce7d444.html>> accessed 14 September 2020.

successfully and gain access to labour markets, health and education services, etc. they can become “self-reliant.”¹¹³ It is also argued that they can contribute to economic growth, labour force demands, and the development of host countries.¹¹⁴

Integration, being especially popular after the mid-1990s, is an integral part of the migration phenomenon for refugees and all “migrant”¹¹⁵ groups. However, there are other inclusion models (assimilation, multiculturalism, etc.) as well.¹¹⁶ Although there is no universally accepted definition of integration, in contrast to assimilation, it is generally accepted to be a “two-way process” in academic literature¹¹⁷ and by various organisations¹¹⁸ where refugees keep their own cultural identity, and refugees and the host society have developed a mutual understanding in the exercise of their rights and obligations towards each other.

¹¹³ UNHCR, 'Handbook for Self-Reliance' 2005) <<http://www.unhcr.org/44bf7b012.pdf>> accessed 14 September 2020.

¹¹⁴ See, e.g., OECD, *Working Together for Local Integration of Migrants and Refugees*; UNHCR, 'Refugee Resettlement: An International Handbook to Guide Reception and Integration' (2002) <<https://www.refworld.org/docid/405189284.html>> accessed 6 October 2020; Jacqui Broadhead, 'Inclusive Cities Inclusive practices for newcomers at city level and examples of innovation from overseas' (*Compas*, 2017) <<https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Inclusive-Cities-Background-Paper-Oct-2017-FINAL.pdf>> accessed 6 October 2020.

¹¹⁵ A migrant is essentially a person who migrates. Various reasons (economic, educational, environmental, war, etc.) cause people to migrate. There is no universally agreed definition for “migrant” at the international level. Various organisations developed their definition for their own purposes, for example to analyse the effects of migration and migrants. Carling points out two approaches (inclusivist and residualist) to the definition. See Jørgen Carling, 'What is the meaning of migrant?' <<https://meaningofmigrants.org/>> accessed 17 July 2020. He exemplifies IOM and UN DESA's approaches as inclusivist and UNHCR's approach as residualist. The main difference between the two approaches is that the residualist approach does not include refugees in the migrant category, while inclusivists do. This study considers the term “migrant” from an inclusivist perspective; this means that “migrant integration” refers to the refugee integration as well.

¹¹⁶ See IOM, 'World Migration Report 2018'.

¹¹⁷ Sarah Spencer(ed), 'Refugees and Other New Migrants: A Review of the Evidence on Successful Approaches to Integration' (2006) The University of Oxford's Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS); Alison Strang and Alastair Ager, 'Refugee Integration: Emerging Trends and Remaining Agendas' (2010) 23 *Journal of Refugee Studies* 589.

¹¹⁸ See, e.g., European Council on Refugees and Exiles, 'Position on the Integration of Refugees in Europe' (1999) <<https://www.refworld.org/docid/3df4d3874.html>> accessed 7 October 2020; UNHCR, 'International Conference on the Reception and Integration of Resettled Refugees, 25-27 April 2001 - Norrköping, Sweden. ICRIRR: Principles, 27 April 2001' <<https://www.refworld.org/docid/404dd9ab4.html>> accessed 7 October 2020; Council of the European Union Justice and Home Affairs Council, 'The Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy' (2004) <https://www.eesc.europa.eu/resources/docs/common-basic-principles_en.pdf> accessed 20 July 2020; UNHCR Regional Representation for Central Europe, 'Refugee Integration and the Use of Indicators: Evidence From Central Europe' 2013) <<https://www.refworld.org/pdfid/532164584.pdf>> accessed 20 July 2020; IOM, 'World Migration Report 2020' (2019) <https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/wmr_2020.pdf> accessed 25 July 2020; European Commission, 'Immigration, Integration and Employment ' (Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions) COM (2003) 336 final .

‘From a refugee perspective, integration requires a preparedness to adapt to the lifestyle of the host society without having to lose one's own cultural identity. From the point of view of the host society, it requires a willingness to adapt public institutions to changes in the population profile, accept refugees as part of the national community, and take action to facilitate access to resources and decision-making processes.’¹¹⁹

The integration of migrants in general, and of refugees in particular, is a complex and challenging "process." It is a challenging process as these people may be a very diverse group of people (men/women, young/old, educated/uneducated, skilled/unskilled, qualified/unqualified, digitally literate/illiterate, etc.) from very different social, economic and cultural backgrounds. Demographic, social, economic, cultural dynamics and structures, legal framework, local context, and existing infrastructure in the host countries' cities shape the integration.¹²⁰ The integration process is challenging also because it has many dimensions involving economic and social rights, such as access to housing, health and social care, participation in education and the labour market, political rights, involvement in the policy-making process, social connections, learning the host country's language, culture, and institutions, etc.¹²¹ This means that integration is a long-term, complex, and multi-dimensional process that is subject to the dynamics and resources of the receiving countries and the diversification of the refugees. Integration of refugees from similar social, economic, and cultural backgrounds and with similar qualifications may differ in different countries depending on the dynamics and resources of the receiving countries.

Despite the challenges, integration remains significant as a policy goal. According to the UN DESA records (2019), 77% of Governments reported that they have policies promoting

¹¹⁹ UNHCR Department of International Protection Resettlement Section, 'Refugee Resettlement. An International Handbook to Guide Reception and Integration' (2002) <<https://www.refworld.org/docid/405189284.html>> accessed 7 October 2020.

¹²⁰ See, e.g. Khorshed Alam and Sophia Imran, 'The digital divide and social inclusion among refugee migrants' (2015) 28 *Information Technology & People* 344; European Commission, 'Using EU Indicators of Immigrant Integration' (2013) <https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/e-library/documents/policies/legal-migration/general/docs/final_report_on_using_eu_indicators_of_immigrant_integration_june_2013_en.pdf> accessed 11 September 2020; UNHCR, 'Resettlement Handbook, 2011'; European Commission, 'Action Plan on the Integration of Third Country Nationals ' (Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions) COM(2016) 377 final, ; Şimşek and Çorabatır, 'Challenges and Opportunities of Refugee Integration in Turkey'.

¹²¹ See, e.g., OECD, *Working Together for Local Integration of Migrants and Refugees*; Sarah Spencer and Katharine Charsley, 'Conceptualising integration: a framework for empirical research, taking marriage migration as a case study' (2016) 4 *Comparative Migration Studies* 18; Spencer(ed), 'Refugees and Other New Migrants: A Review of the Evidence on Successful Approaches to Integration'. See also footnote 132-134

migrants' integration.¹²² However, there may be considerable variations in refugee integration policies among countries, since the “key domains of integration”, such as health, education, employment, housing, etc. may be identified differently depending on the political, cultural, economic dynamics, the welfare system, and resources of the receiving countries; and secondly depending on the diversification of refugees. Some countries, international organisations and academicians have developed indicators and have used them as a tool to understand integration contexts, monitor and assess progress and outcomes, compare with other countries and contribute to the learning process. However, similar to the variations in the inclusion policies, there may be variations in the integration indicators and core policy fields identified. For instance, EUROSTAT measures migrants' integration in terms of employment, health, education, social inclusion, and active citizenship in the hosting country.¹²³ MIPEX, which is a tool measuring migrant integration policies, has developed 167 policy indicators under 8 policy fields (labour market mobility, education, political participation, access to nationality, family reunion, health, permanent residence, anti-discrimination).¹²⁴ Governments also develop indicators for integration. The UK Home Office identified a set of indicators under 14 key domains of integration: work, housing, education, health and social care, leisure, bonds, bridges, links, communications, culture, digital skill, safety, stability, rights, and responsibilities.¹²⁵

The successful integration of migrants is argued to be a key to the future well-being of not only migrants but also of host societies. However, successful integration is not an easy task. It requires some “key principles”¹²⁶ such as tolerance and non-discrimination, as well as certain means and tools, such as legal framework, cooperation at international, national, and local level, and the funding mechanisms mentioned below.

¹²² UN DESA Population Division, *International Migration 2019 Report, ST/ESA/SER.A/438*, 2019).

¹²³ European Commission EUROSTAT, 'Migrant Integration' <<https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/migrant-integration/data>> accessed 27 August 2020.

¹²⁴ Migrant Integration Policy Index 2020 <<https://www.mipex.eu/>> accessed 17 December 2020.

¹²⁵ UK Home Office, *Indicators of Integration (third edition)* (ISBN: 978-1-78655-833-6. 2019)

See also Alastair Ager and Alison Strang, 'Understanding Integration: A Conceptual Framework' (2008) 21 *Journal of Refugee Studies* 166.

¹²⁶ See, e.g., Sonia Morano-Foadi and Stelios Andreadakis, *Protection of Fundamental Rights in Europe : The Challenge of Integration* (Springer 2020); Sonia Morano-Foadi and Micaela Malena, *Integration for third-country nationals in the European Union [electronic resource] : the equality challenge* (Elgaronline, Edward Elgar 2012); European Council on Refugees and Exiles, 'Position on the Integration of Refugees in Europe'.

3.2. MEANS AND TOOLS FOR INTEGRATION

3.2.1. The Legal Framework Towards Integration of Refugees

Refugees are defined and protected under international law. Refugee protection has many aspects, including ‘safety from being returned to the dangers they have fled; access to asylum procedures that are fair and efficient; and measures to ensure that their basic human rights are respected to allow them to live in dignity and safety while helping them to find a longer-term solution.’¹²⁷ UNHCR promotes three longer-term solutions -in other words three “durable solutions” for refugees.¹²⁸ These are:

- voluntary repatriation
- local integration
- resettlement.

The 1951 Convention¹²⁹ and its 1967 Protocol¹³⁰ are key legal instruments at the international level for refugee protection (both hereafter entitled the Refugee Convention). The Refugee Convention sets minimum standards for the treatment of refugees, without impairment to more favourable rights and benefits granted by the Signatory States. States that are signatories to the Refugee Convention are obliged to grant protection and rights such as primary education, work, housing, etc. to those entitled as refugees under the Convention’s grounds.¹³¹ However, it is not only under the Refugee Convention that such rights are granted.¹³² International human rights law, regional refugee protection instruments, international humanitarian law, EU law and national law supplement and complement the Refugee Convention in terms of providing the legal framework to the recognition of refugees’ status, their protection and their integration to

¹²⁷ UNHCR, 'UNHCR viewpoint: ‘Refugee’ or ‘migrant’ – Which is right?' (2016) <<https://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2016/7/55df0e556/unhcr-viewpoint-refugee-migrant-right.html#:~:text=We%20say%20refugees%20when%20we,legal%20definition%20of%20a%20refugee>> accessed 25 September 2020.

¹²⁸ UNHCR, 'Executive Committee Conclusion on Durable Solutions and Refugee Protection, No. 56 (XL)' (1989) <<http://www.unhcr.org/41b041534.html>> accessed 14 September 2020.

¹²⁹ UN General Assembly, *Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, 28 July 1951, United Nations, Treaty Series, 189: 137.*

¹³⁰ UN General Assembly, *Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, 31 January 1967, United Nations, Treaty Series, 606: 267.*

¹³¹ See, e.g., UN General Assembly, *Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, 28 July 1951, United Nations, Treaty Series, 189: 137.* Gainful Employment (Articles 17-18-19); Housing (Article 21); Public Education (Article 22); Labour Legislation and Social Security (Article 24).

¹³² UNHCR, 'A guide to international refugee protection and building state asylum systems Handbook for Parliamentarians N° 27' (2017) <<https://www.unhcr.org/3d4aba564pdf>> accessed 20 July 2020.

the host communities.¹³³ Nevertheless, ‘it is the primary responsibility of States for safeguarding refugees’ human rights and their integration into the host country.’¹³⁴ In the context of the labour market integration Morano-Foadi, Croce and Lugosi point out that ‘whilst the Refugee Convention guarantees a right to engage in wage earning employment (Article 17), a job might not be available. Nevertheless, States must take steps to foster full and productive employment.’¹³⁵ Similarly, although the related legal framework guarantees certain rights for refugees, national and local governments must take further steps to provide adequate housing, access to education, language courses, psychological support, access to the health system, etc. for successful integration and ensure that refugees become self-reliant in the long run.

In 2018, two global compacts, one concerning international migration and one on refugees were endorsed by a large majority of the UN Member States.¹³⁶ The compacts reaffirm the sovereign right of States to govern migration in conformity with international law. Within EU law also, Member States retain sovereign rights in this field. Integration measures are not within the EU competence but within the competence of Member States, based on their needs, historical and cultural dynamics and legal framework.¹³⁷ EU action on integration ensures that Member States address integration issues in accordance with relevant EU policies, such as on equality and anti-discrimination, employment, education, health, etc.¹³⁸

¹³³ For international legal framework protecting refugees see *ibid* 15-32.

¹³⁴ Emiliya Bratanova van Harten, 'Integration Impossible? Ethnic Nationalism and Refugee Integration in Bulgaria' in Moritz Jesse (ed), *European Societies, Migration, and the Law: The 'Others' amongst 'Us'* (Cambridge University Press 2020).

¹³⁵ Sonia Morano-Foadi, Clara Della Croce and Peter Lugosi, 'Refugees' Integration into the Labour Market: Discharging Responsibility in the UK' in Moritz Jesse (ed), *European Societies, Migration, and the Law: The 'Others' amongst 'Us'* (Cambridge University Press 2020).

¹³⁶ UN General Assembly, *Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, UN Doc. A/RES/73/195 (Dec. 19, 2018)*; UN General Assembly, *Global Compact on Refugees, UN Doc. A/73/12 (2018)*.

¹³⁷ See. e.g. P. Scholten, R. Penninx and B. Garcés-Mascareñas, *The multilevel governance of migration and integration* (2016).

¹³⁸ In 2020, the European Commission has launched an EU-wide consultation to gather public opinion and views on future non-compulsory/non-legislative actions taken at EU level to promote the integration of migrants and support Member States in the field of integration. See European Commission, 'The EC Reveals Its New EU Action Plan on Integration and Inclusion (2021-2027) (24/11/2020)' <<https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/news/the-ec-presents-its-eu-action-plan-on-integration-and-inclusion-2021-2027>> accessed 6 December 2020.

3.2.2. Cooperation Between Stakeholders

There is a wide gap between the needs of refugees and available resources.¹³⁹ Furthermore, there is a big gap in terms of burden-and-responsibility-sharing between States providing protection to refugees. According to the IOM report, high-income countries host the lowest number of global refugee stock.¹⁴⁰ This situation widens the gap between the needs of refugees and the available resources. These gaps alert for a need for burden - and responsibility- sharing among countries and international organisations on the one hand, and among various stakeholders within a country on the other hand, for hosting, supporting, and integrating the refugee, as no one actor has enough financial and human resource, capacity, or expertise to manage the refugee crisis individually. Within individual countries, integration involves a range of actors from the public, private, and civil society sectors, such as national/regional/local authorities, financial institutions, employers, employers' associations, media, education and training institutions, civil society actors, local communities, refugees themselves based on their competence, capacities, and resources.

UN records note that '60 per cent of refugees worldwide are in urban settings and only a minority are in camps.'¹⁴¹ This rate increased to 90% in Turkey 'with an estimated 90% of Syrians in Turkey living outside camps in urban or rural areas.'¹⁴² These numbers show that 'migration is a local reality.'¹⁴³ Scholten and Penninx discovered that 'migrants identify much more with the city they live in than with the nation.'¹⁴⁴ These numbers and findings put the cities, as the receivers of refugees, and local authorities, as the public authority closest to the refugees, in a crucial place to integrate them. That is, although it is mainly the national authorities who determine refugees' right to integrate, local authorities have a great

¹³⁹ See, e.g., UN General Assembly, *New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants*, UN Doc. A/RES/71/1 (Sept. 19, 2016); UN General Assembly, *Global Compact on Refugees*, UN Doc. A/73/12 (2018); UN General Assembly, *Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration*, UN Doc. A/RES/73/195 (Dec. 19, 2018); Sonia Morano-Foadi, 'Solidarity and Responsibility: Advancing Humanitarian Responses to eu Migratory Pressures' (2017) 19 *European Journal of Migration and Law* 223; Mayblin and James, 'Asylum and refugee support in the UK: civil society filling the gaps?'

¹⁴⁰ IOM, 'World Migration Report 2018'.

¹⁴¹ UN General Assembly, *New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants*, UN Doc. A/RES/71/1 (Sept. 19, 2016) para 73.

¹⁴² UNHCR, 'Evaluation of UNHCR's Emergency Response to the influx of Syrian Refugees into Turkey - Full Report', 2016, ES/2016/03, <<https://www.refworld.org/docid/58bd6e674.html>> accessed 20 September 2020.

¹⁴³ European Commission, 'Action Plan: Partnership on Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees' <https://ec.europa.eu/futurium/en/system/files/ged/action_plan_inclusion_of_migrants_and_refugees.pdf> accessed 21 September 2020.

¹⁴⁴ Scholten, Penninx and Garcés-Mascareñas, *The multilevel governance of migration and integration*.

responsibility in taking further steps in respect of the integration of refugees, either directly in coordination with other levels of government or by promoting and managing multi-stakeholder solidarity and cooperation within their localities. Local authorities may perform more actively than national authorities to deal with the integration. Spencer and Delvino use the term “municipal activism” to highlight the provision of services by local authorities that grant more favourable services than required by national law.¹⁴⁵ To this end, as identified by the OECD report, local governments must 1- have competences and adequate means for action; 2- improve the capacity of their staff dealing with refugees; 3- provide coordination and a complementary approach operating within a broad spectrum of policy fields (such as labour, health, housing, and education); and 4- promote multi-stakeholder solidarity and cooperation.¹⁴⁶

Civil society actors are one of the stakeholders involved in the efforts towards the integration of refugees. Civil society actors could support all steps of the policy-making cycle towards integration. Moreover, civil society may have a significant role in the two-way integration process by facilitating the interaction between refugees and host communities. However, it is noteworthy that ‘non-State actors may act primarily out of compassionate responsibility, prompted by a sense of humanity or community solidarity but have no legal obligation to do so.’¹⁴⁷

Today, public authorities-civil society cooperation is a key feature of integration policies in the UK and many EU countries.¹⁴⁸ Governments rely heavily on civil society for the integration of refugees. However, considering the policy-making cycle mentioned in Chapter 1, literature review shows that public-civil society cooperation is more common in the implementation

¹⁴⁵ Spencer and Delvino explores municipal activism on irregular migrant. Spencer and Delvino notes that whilst governments do not expect from municipalities to contribute to the integration of irregular migrant, municipalities may provide more services than expected. See Sarah Spencer and Nicola Delvino, 'Municipal activism on irregular migrants: the framing of inclusive approaches at the local level' (2019) 17 *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies*.

¹⁴⁶ OECD, *Working Together for Local Integration of Migrants and Refugees*. See also Spencer and Delvino, 'Municipal activism on irregular migrants: the framing of inclusive approaches at the local level'. --in order to get an idea about varying competences of municipalities in various European Countries on providing services to the irregular migrants.

¹⁴⁷ Morano-Foadi, Croce and Lugosi, 'Refugees' Integration into the Labour Market: Discharging Responsibility in the UK'.

¹⁴⁸ See, e.g., Margit Feischmidt (ed), Ludger Pries (ed) and Celine Cantat (ed), *Refugee Protection and Civil Society in Europe* (2019); OECD, *Working Together for Local Integration of Migrants and Refugees*; Spencer and Delvino, 'Cooperation between government and civil society in the management of migration: Trends, opportunities and challenges in Europe and North America'.

phase, in other words, in the delivery of services rather than other phases such as agenda-setting, policy development, etc.¹⁴⁹

3.2.3. Resettlement Programmes

Resettlement is one of the durable solutions for those refugees for whom neither voluntary repatriation nor local integration is possible.¹⁵⁰ The idea of resettlement is to share the burden of those countries of asylum who are hosting massive numbers of refugees, since they can no longer offer local integration to more refugees due to the heavy burden on their societies and economies. Resettlement programmes transfer recognized refugees from an asylum country to another third country.¹⁵¹ States are not legally obliged to resettle refugees. They voluntarily offer refugees' settlement in their countries. For resettlement to be a durable solution, upon refugees' arrival, the resettlement programme must support and facilitate the integration of resettled refugees into his/her new community in partnership with stakeholders. The UNHCR lists stakeholders as resettlement states, municipalities, NGOs, IOM. Partners may also include donor institutions and the private sector.¹⁵²

3.2.4. Community-based Sponsorship of Refugees

Community-based sponsorships of refugees are a form of cooperation between public authorities and civil society to facilitate the integration of refugees. It enables community sponsors to financially support refugee(s) who are already being resettled in a third country during his/her/their integration. Direct engagement of local people in the resettlement efforts through community-based sponsorships programmes is believed to contribute to refugees' integration by facilitating relationships between refugees and sponsor-members of the community.¹⁵³

¹⁴⁹ See, e.g., Spencer and Delvino, 'Cooperation between government and civil society in the management of migration: Trends, opportunities and challenges in Europe and North America'.

¹⁵⁰ UNHCR, 'Resettlement Handbook, 2011'.

¹⁵¹ Identification of refugees in need of resettlement is done through "Resettlement Submission Categories" set by the UNHCR's Resettlement Handbook. However, in addition to these categories, resettlement countries may set their own priorities or selection criteria for their resettlement schemes, such as "giving priority to women." See also footnote 114.

¹⁵² UNHCR, 'Resettlement Handbook, 2011'.

¹⁵³ See Home Office, 'Community sponsorship scheme launched for refugees in the UK (19 July 2016)' <<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/community-sponsorship-scheme-launched-for-refugees-in-the-uk>> accessed 28 August 2020.

3.2.5. Other Means and Tools for Integration

Mainstreaming refugees' integration

Mainstreaming refugees' integration in all the relevant policy areas contributes to the successful integration of refugees. Mainstreaming can be achieved in many ways, such as through political leadership on tolerance, non-discrimination, and inclusive society, through laws, regulations, policies, and strategies, and linking refugee integration with national, regional, and multilateral development plans and allocating funds to programmes that target refugee integration.

Monitoring and Evaluation of Integration

Indicators of integration can be identified in various policy domains and used as a tool to monitor and assess the integration policies, programmes, their progress, and outcomes.

Capacity Improvement

Capacity improvement can be ensured through the training of professionals (teachers, health professionals, police, central and local authorities' staff, etc.) on the benefits of integration for refugees and host communities, refugees' backgrounds and their mental and physical vulnerabilities, refugee protection, relevant legal framework, policies, and services to be provided to refugees for their integration, etc. Incorporating educational and informative material such as on human rights, refugee issues, respect for differences, non-discrimination, benefits of cultural diversity for social and economic life, and benefits of integration for the well-being of the community into the curriculum contributes to capacity improvement as well.

Supporting Dialogue and Co-production of Integration Policies

Establishing common areas, shared spaces, expert groups, and committees bringing refugees, host communities, local authorities, civil society actors and other relevant actors together are efficient means and tools for integration, as they provide an opportunity for dialogue, cooperation and co-production of integration policies. The integration of refugees can also be enhanced by supporting financially or logistically social, cultural, educational, community,

sporting activities and events bringing people together from different backgrounds and encouraging people to work in partnership with each other.

Supporting Information-Sharing

Creating experience/know-how/good-practice-sharing platforms,¹⁵⁴ establishing a national contact point/coordination unit on integration to coordinate integration activities and prevent duplication of activities, mapping studies regarding the needs of refugees and tracking systems, utilisation of new information and communication technologies, online platforms, and digital tools can support information-sharing. The establishment of a website dedicated to integration,¹⁵⁵ and a help desk for refugees, and preparation of informative documents for refugees, such as directories,¹⁵⁶ are among the information sharing means and tools.

Any means and tools mentioned under Chapter 2 that contribute to better cooperation among public authorities and civil society also contribute to more successful integration of refugees.

¹⁵⁴ See, e.g., European Integration Network at European Commission, 'European Web Site On Integration' (2020) <<https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/network/european-integration-network-2>> accessed 4 September 2020; Migrant Integration Information and Good Practices at European Commission, 'Local and Regional Integration Practices' (2020) <<https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/country/stories>> accessed 4 September 2020.

¹⁵⁵ See, e.g., European Commission, 'European Web Site On Integration'; Council of Europe Congress of Local and Regional Authorities, 'Migration and Integration' (2020) <<https://www.coe.int/en/web/congress/migration-and-integration>> accessed 1 September 2020.

¹⁵⁶ Refugee Resource, 'Asylum Seekers and Refugees Directory of services in Oxfordshire' (2005) <https://a16c40aa-4d1e-413d-bcf2-5119e974869a.filesusr.com/ugd/b0f019_1f3f8ed31c57414a9ab13d9df04b3a3d.pdf> accessed 13 September 2020

CHAPTER FOUR: PILOT STUDY IN OXFORD CITY: COOPERATION BETWEEN PUBLIC AUTHORITIES AND CIVIL SOCIETY FOR THE INTEGRATION OF REFUGEES

Civil society policy and integration policy in the UK have been devolved to the authorities of Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland.¹⁵⁷ This Chapter focuses on the policies in England.¹⁵⁸ This chapter aims to explore “how the Oxford City Council and civil society cooperate to integrate refugees into society” and “what are the forms, means and tools for their cooperation.” This chapter also explores the extent to which qualitative findings are compatible with the literature review, and what can be learnt from the existing experience of the pilot study in Oxford City.¹⁵⁹ In order to understand what is happening at the local level, the general framework of cooperation and integration at the national level is summarized below.

‘Despite having two universities in the City, there are not many studies looking into Oxford City specifically. This study sounds really good in that someone is looking to Oxford City.’¹⁶⁰

4.1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4.1.1. Profile of the Civil Society Sector in the UK

The UK has a long history of philanthropy and civil society. Even many of the public services in the UK, such as the origins of National Health Service, were first developed by the civil society as a response to challenges faced by the people but not addressed by the state. Later, the

¹⁵⁷See, e.g., Pete Alcock, 'From Partnership to the Big Society: The Third Sector Policy Regime in the UK' (2016) 7 Nonprofit Policy Forum 95; R. A. W. Rhodes, *Decentralizing the civil service [electronic resource] : from unitary state to differentiated polity in the United Kingdom* (Ebook central, Open University 2003). Devolution is a process of decentralisation which puts power to authorities closer to the citizen. As a result of existence of devolution on a policy field or not, the territorial extent of the policy may be England only, England and Wales, Great Britain or UK. See. also. HM Government Cabinet Office, 'Guidance on Devolution' (2013) <<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/guidance-on-devolution>> accessed 4 October 2020.

¹⁵⁸ Great Britain, Britain, UK, England may sometimes be used interchangeably but that is not a correct usage. The UK comprises Great Britain (England, Wales and Scotland) and Northern Ireland.

¹⁵⁹ According to the Office for National Statistic 2019 mid-year estimate, Oxford City’s population is 152,450. See Office for National Statistics, 'Population estimates' (2019) <<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates>> accessed 22 September 2020. Oxford City is thought to provide suitable settings to study integration phenomena as it is an immigration hub, and with its ethnic and cultural diversity, has the third-highest ethnic minority in the southeast. See Oxford City Council, 'Council Strategy 2020-2024'.

¹⁶⁰ Interview 2, 29.06.2020.

government, as the leading service provider in the Welfare State, intervened to provide and extend these services.¹⁶¹

‘The UK is an example of the Anglo-Saxon state that draws a clear boundary between state and civil society.’¹⁶² Data on the civil society sector is complicated since civil society is a contested term, and different data sources employ different definitions. According to the Third Sector Research Centre estimation (2011), there are 300,000 – 450,000 civil society organisations in the UK, on top of the 180,000 registered charities.¹⁶³ According to the charity register statistics of Charity Commission of England and Wales (updated 18 October 2018), there are 168,186 charities including religious charities (which are out of the civil society definition of this study), with the majority being micro and small.¹⁶⁴

NCVO recorded that based on 2017-2018 data of 166,592 charities, the voluntary sector contributed £18.2bn to the economy, representing about 0.9% of total GDP. The number of people who worked in the voluntary sector was about 910,000 people in June 2019, which is equivalent to 2.8% of the UK workforce. In the UK, civil society organisations (CSOs) operate in many subsectors - among them social services are the largest subsector. There are various CSOs in the UK either providing integration services or campaigns for integration. Philanthropy is a vital income stream for civil society. In this regard, the public is the largest income source for the sector (47% in 2017-2018), and it is followed by the government (29% in 2017-2018).¹⁶⁵

4.1.2. Public-Civil Society Cooperation in the UK

The rise of public-civil society cooperation in the UK goes back to the economic recession of the 1970s that resulted in a shift in understanding that the government is the sole provider of

¹⁶¹ HM Government Cabinet Office, 'Civil Society Strategy: Building a Future That Works for Everyone' (2018) <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/732765/Civil_Society_Strategy_-_building_a_future_that_works_for_everyone.pdf> accessed 30 October 2020.

¹⁶² Rhodes, *Decentralizing the civil service [electronic resource] : from unitary state to differentiated polity in the United Kingdom.* (2003)

¹⁶³ John Mohan and others, 'Entering the lists: what can be learned from local listings of third sector organisations? Results from a study of Northern England' <<http://www.nr-foundation.org.uk/downloads/lists-final-190711.pdf>> accessed 9 October 2020.

¹⁶⁴ The Charity Commission, 'Charity Statistics (2018)' <<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/charity-register-statistics>> accessed 22 September 2020.

¹⁶⁵ For statistics see The National Council for Voluntary Organisations, 'Policy and Research' <<https://www.ncvo.org.uk/policy-and-research>> accessed 22 September .

public goods and services and paved the way for growth in the use of public-private partnership in the UK, as in many other countries.¹⁶⁶ In parallel, beginning with the 1970s and continuing in 1980s and 1990s, UK public administration experienced a transition accordingly, commonly referred to as the New Public Management (NPM) where the provision of public services depended more on plural forms of delivery involving the private sector and civil society sector, as the concepts of pluralism and partnership were at the heart of the NPM.¹⁶⁷ Osborne called this transition as ‘the move to a contract culture’ in which the voluntary and community sector is seen merely as a service provider whereby their involvement was limited to policy implementation to respond to complex social and economic problems but not policy formulation. Osborne highlights the devalued campaigning and advocacy roles of civil society in this period. Osborne points out a change in perspective through the election of the New Labour Government in the UK in 1997, whereby the role of the civil society in the policy formulation was acknowledged in addition to its role in the implementation of the policies. ‘Within such a model, emphasis in government policy is increasingly being placed on the contribution that the VCO sector can make to mobilizing local communities and in giving voice to minority views.’¹⁶⁸

This shift in approach can be interpreted as the inclusion of the democracy perspective into public-civil society cooperation, which was previously motivated by functionalist concerns. The UK had a Labour Government between 1997-2010, a Coalition Government 2010-2015, and a Conservative Government 2015-present, with different political discourses; from third-way discourse to Big Society discourse. During this period, the UK experienced economic recessions which in turn resulted in massive reductions in public expenditure, significant cuts in financial support for the civil society, and promotion of smaller government. However, Alcock has suggested that all these changes have not resulted in a major policy change in public-civil society relations.

‘A number of the key features of the policy environment have in fact remained fairly constant. These include commitments to increasing the role of third sector organisations in the delivery of public services, seeking to promote new forms of investment in the sector and promoting citizen action and community organisation, and the maintaining of a dedicated office at the centre of government to lead on these and other related policy initiatives.’¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁶ Some scholars address public-civil society cooperation as a specific form of public-private partnership (PPP). See. Osborne, *Public-Private Partnerships : Theory and Practice in International Perspective*.

¹⁶⁷ Peters and Pierre, 'Governance without Government? Rethinking Public Administration'.

¹⁶⁸ Osborne, *Public-Private Partnerships : Theory and Practice in International Perspective*.

¹⁶⁹ Alcock, 'From Partnership to the Big Society: The Third Sector Policy Regime in the UK'.

Alcock explains this continued relationship between the civil society and the government, and continuity in underlying trends and policy initiatives despite changing political discourses and the economic and political environment as a consequence of the interdependence of the state and the third sector. 'This was because, whatever the up-front political rhetoric, state support for the third sector in the UK was well-established within government by the beginning of the new century, and largely welcomed and embraced by sector bodies.'¹⁷⁰

Regulatory Means and Tools

The Compact, which was an innovative tool and a model for some other countries, is one of the key documents of public authorities-civil society cooperation in England.¹⁷¹ The first national Compact was established in 1998 in cooperation with the government and civil society organisations. The Compact was updated in 2009.¹⁷² The Compact was renewed in 2010 after the establishment of the coalition government in accordance with the priorities of the new government.¹⁷³ The Compact sets out the principles and commitments governing public-civil society cooperation and the duties and responsibilities of both public authorities and civil society organisations in England. After the introduction of the national Compact, many local authorities have developed their own local Compacts since 2003 under the guidance of national Compact.¹⁷⁴ The Compacts were not a legally binding document. They required the commitment of both public authorities (at national, regional, local levels) and civil society actors to implement their principles. In his article dated 2016, Alcock, by referencing the closing down of the "associated institutions"¹⁷⁵, states that 'The Compact itself was retained, but was slimmed down and, without its associated supporting agency, was soon marginalised in most government departments.'¹⁷⁶ Civil Society Strategy, which was published by the

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹⁷¹ HM Government Cabinet Office, 'The Compact on Relations Between Government and the Voluntary and Community Sector in England' (1998) <http://www.compactvoice.org.uk/sites/default/files/compact_1998.pdf> accessed 3 February 2020.

¹⁷² HM Government Cabinet Office, 'The Compact on Relations Between Government and the Third Sector in England' (2009) <http://www.compactvoice.org.uk/sites/default/files/the_compact_2009.pdf> accessed 3 February 2020.

¹⁷³ HM Government Cabinet Office, 'The Compact' (2010) <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/61169/The_20_Compact.pdf> accessed 27 January 2020.

¹⁷⁴ Oxfordshire Compact 2010 <<https://www2.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/sites/default/files/folders/documents/communityandliving/ourworkwiththeommunities/oxfordshirepartnership/oxfordshiresafercommunities/oxfordshirecompact/OxfordshireCompactandcodes2012.pdf>> accessed 22 January 2020.

¹⁷⁵ See in the next heading (*Institutional Means and Tools*).

¹⁷⁶ Alcock, 'From Partnership to the Big Society: The Third Sector Policy Regime in the UK'.

government in August 2018, outlining a ten-year vision for government-civil society relations, assures that 'The government will renew its commitment to the principles of the Compact.'¹⁷⁷

Civil Society Strategy 2018 set out a vision for a more cooperative approach. The Strategy emphasises that the government should bring together the resources of government, business, and civil society to reduce social problems such as integration, loneliness, ageing, digital inclusion, etc. and to enable a better life for all citizens. This emphasis implies an increasing public-civil society cooperation in the future. Besides Civil Society Strategy, a cooperative approach was embedded in many policy fields and reflected in many policy papers, such as loneliness strategy,¹⁷⁸ and integrated communities' strategy.¹⁷⁹

Institutional Means and Tools

In the UK, there is the Minister for Civil Society in the Cabinet, who leads on the civil society agenda. There is the Office for Civil Society within the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, which is responsible for policy relating to volunteers, charities, social enterprises and public service mutuels. The Commission for the Compact which was responsible for oversight of the Compact was closed in 2011. Compact Voice, which is a charity representing the voluntary and community sector on the Compact and works to support partnerships across sectors both locally and nationally, last updated its webpage in 2016.¹⁸⁰ These mean that associated supporting agencies of the Compact are not active anymore.

In the UK, there are many examples of ad hoc structures enabling cooperation with civil society. For instance, in 2018, the Office for Civil Society carried out a public engagement exercise on Civil Society Strategy with the participation of charities.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁷ HM Government Cabinet Office, 'Civil Society Strategy: Building a Future That Works for Everyone'.

¹⁷⁸ HM Government Department for Digital Culture Media and Sport, 'A Connected Society: A Strategy for Tackling Loneliness – Laying the Foundations for Change' (2018) <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/936725/6.48_82_DCMS_Loneliness_Strategy_web_Update_V2.pdf> accessed 30 October 2020.

¹⁷⁹ HM Government Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government, 'Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper' (2018) <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/777160/Integrated_Communities_Strategy_Government_Response.pdf> accessed 20 September 2020.

¹⁸⁰ For further details see Compact Voice (2016) <<http://www.compactvoice.org.uk/about-compact/short-history-compact>> accessed 22 September 2020.

¹⁸¹ HM Government Cabinet Office, 'Civil Society Strategy: Building a Future That Works for Everyone'.

There are also specific programmes that have been introduced to support civil society involvement in the decision-making process. For instance, The Innovation in Democracy Programme (2018-2020) supported three local authorities to involve residents in decision-making to tackle local issues.¹⁸² The programme also aimed to strengthen local civil society by encouraging participation in local institutions.

Financial Means and Tools

UK central and local government provide financial support to civil society in the forms of grant funding and contract funding. There are also other means and tools in the UK supporting civil society. For instance, The National Lottery Community Fund grants money raised by lottery players to civil society across the country.¹⁸³ There are also similar financial support structures at the local level. Community Foundations are another substantial source of funding for civil society in the UK.¹⁸⁴ The dormant accounts scheme that was established in 2011 is a unique source of funding for civil society. Banks and building societies channel money from dormant accounts that have remained untouched for 15 or more years and where the customer is no longer accessible.¹⁸⁵

Endeavours of charities and social enterprises to develop their enterprise models are also supported through various means, such as the Access Foundation.¹⁸⁶ “Blended Finance”¹⁸⁷, which means a mixture of funding from various resources, is another financial means available. The Community First Endowment Match Challenge promoting philanthropy is another fund

¹⁸² HM Government, Department for Digital Culture Media Sport and Communities & Local Government Ministry of Housing, 'The Innovation in Democracy Programme (iIDP)' (2020) <[¹⁸³ Previously called as the Big Lottery Fund, after 29 January 2019 had a new brand name and became known as The National Lottery Community Fund. For more information see The National Lottery Community Fund <<https://www.tnlcommunityfund.org.uk/>> accessed 1 November 2020.](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/innovation-in-democracy-programme-launch#:~:text=The%20programme%20ran%20from%20November,a%20difference%20by%20being%20involved.&text=This%20led%20to%20people%20having,local%20policy%20development%20and%20delivery.> accessed 28 December 2020</p></div><div data-bbox=)

¹⁸⁴ For more information see UK Community Foundations <<https://www.ukcommunityfoundations.org/>> accessed 2 November 2020.

¹⁸⁵ Commission on Dormant Assets, 'Tackling dormant assets Recommendations to benefit investors and society' (2017) <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/596228/Tackling_dormant_assets_-_recommendations_to_benefit_investors_and_society_1_.pdf> accessed 1 November 2020.

¹⁸⁶ HM Government Cabinet Office, 'Civil Society Strategy: Building a Future That Works for Everyone'.

¹⁸⁷ 'The government has partnered on funds like the Arts Impact Fund, Dementia Discovery Fund, Northern Cultural Regeneration Social Investment Fund, and Building Connections Fund which have all attracted a mix of funding from different sources to collectively focus on a specific theme or issue.' *ibid*

composed of individual and corporate donations and government contributions which has enabled donating to local charities since 2010.¹⁸⁸ #GivingTuesday, a day dedicated to raising money to support good causes, helps to fund local charities and projects in local communities.¹⁸⁹ The UK government also supports charities with substantial tax exemptions. In respect of 2018-19, the total amount of relief to charities was estimated to be approximately £3.8 billion.¹⁹⁰ There are also financial support packages to the civil society to tackle problems on specific policy fields such as integration. In other words, issue-based funding support is also available.

The Means and Tools of Capacity Building

There are various capacity building programmes dedicated to improving the capacity of civil society. For instance, the Small Charities Fundraising Training programme aims to enhance the fundraising skills of small charities.¹⁹¹ Community Organising, which aims to bring together people with common interests, improve their understanding in the sense of collective power and motivate them to cooperate to achieve a social action is also a unique capacity-building tool.¹⁹² Then these Community Organisers may participate in the policy-making process for a change of policy. By 2020, the number of trained community organisers was believed to be 10,000 in total since 2010.¹⁹³

On-line Means and Tools

The NCVO reported in 2019 that 36% of voluntary sector employers believe their staff are missing digital skills.¹⁹⁴ It is also stated that the public sector is doing worse than the voluntary sector on digital skills. This digital gap is a severe challenge for the utilisation of online means and tools that has the potential to maximise cooperation. According to the Lloyds Bank Charity Digital Index 2019, only 56% of charities have all six Essential Digital Skills (Communicating,

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

¹⁸⁹ Giving Tuesday <<https://www.givingtuesday.org.uk/>> accessed 4 September 2020.

¹⁹⁰ HM Revenue & Customs, 'National Statistics Table 2 - UK charities: tax reliefs (last updated 27 June 2019)' <<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/cost-of-tax-relief>> accessed 3 September 2020.

¹⁹¹ HM Government Cabinet Office, 'Civil Society Strategy: Building a Future That Works for Everyone'.

¹⁹² Community Organisers <<https://www.corganisers.org.uk/>> accessed 7 September 2020

¹⁹³ HM Government Cabinet Office, 'Civil Society Strategy: Building a Future That Works for Everyone'.

¹⁹⁴ The National Council for Voluntary Organisations, 'Digital Skills in the Charity Sector ' (posted on 19 August 2019) <https://blogsncvo.org.uk/2019/08/19/digital-skills-in-the-charity-sector/?gclid=CjwKCAjwTj2FBhAuEiwAIKu19iOjhzeSZZUhbboqQSd9Bi0B8kdzDckfmngd0of_3Cc6Z8ximUjVPxoCO1gQAvD_BwE> accessed 8 September 2020.

Creating, Managing Information, Problem Solving, Transacting, Cybersecurity).¹⁹⁵ According to the HM Government Civil Society Strategy 2018, 2% of charities (around 3,500) struggle to access basic digital tools, and 26% find it hard to attract or retain digital talent.¹⁹⁶ The Digital Skills Partnership and Local Digital Skills Partnerships are programmes created to tackle the digital skills gap in the collaboration of public, private and civil society sectors.¹⁹⁷

In the UK, there are online one-stop consultation platforms at national (GOV.UK) and local levels. For instance, in 2018, the Office for Civil Society carried out a public engagement exercise on Civil Society Strategy through GOV.UK and received 513 responses shaping the Strategy.¹⁹⁸

4.1.3. Integration of Refugees in the UK

Since 1995, the UK has resettled over 32,025 refugees.¹⁹⁹ According to UNHCR records, there were 133,094 refugees in the UK at the end of 2019.²⁰⁰ These numbers show that there are two groups of refugees in the UK: resettled refugees and recognised refugees.²⁰¹ Accordingly, integration of refugees in the UK refers to the integration of the “recognised refugees” who arrived in the UK as asylum seekers and gained refugee status under the asylum process; and “resettled refugees” under resettlement schemes.

The UK, as a signatory state to the 1951 Refugee Convention, is obliged to grant protection to those who are granted refugee status on the grounds of the Refugee Convention, including integration measures. Moreover, the UK has obligations stemming from international human rights law, international humanitarian law, and “the EU law.”²⁰² In addition to these, despite

¹⁹⁵The Lloyds Bank has measured the Basic Digital Skills of charities since 2014. To invest in improving the digital skills of the Charities, Lloyds Bank Academy offers free training. See LLOYDS Bank, 'UK Charity Digital Index 2019' <https://www.lloydsbank.com/assets/resource-centre/pdf/charity_digital_index_2019.pdf> accessed 12 September 2020.

¹⁹⁶ HM Government Cabinet Office, 'Civil Society Strategy: Building a Future That Works for Everyone'.

¹⁹⁷HM Government Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, Digital Skills Partnership at <https://digitalskillspartnership.blog.gov.uk/> accessed 26 September 2020.

¹⁹⁸ HM Government Cabinet Office, 'Civil Society Strategy: Building a Future That Works for Everyone'.

¹⁹⁹ The mentioned number is calculated based on the numbers of resettled refugees under each resettlement scheme mentioned in David Bolt, *An inspection of UK Refugee Resettlement Schemes (November 2019 – May 2020)* (2020).

²⁰⁰ UNHCR, 'Asylum in the UK' (2020) <<https://www.unhcr.org/asylum-in-the-uk.html>> accessed 1 October 2020.

²⁰¹ For the definitions see footnote 110.

²⁰² The UK transition period to leave the EU ended on 31 December 2020. There are new rules from 1 January 2021. See UK Parliament House of Lords Library, 'Brexit: Refugee protection and asylum policy (17 September,

not implementing a separate integration law, successive UK governments have introduced several laws, policies and measures that facilitate the integration of refugees into UK society.

The integration of refugees is a relatively new concept in the UK. ‘Refugee integration emerged as a key policy goal in 2000 when the New Labour government set out its desire to make refugees ‘full and equal citizens.’’²⁰³ The timing of refugee integration as a key policy goal coincided with “community cohesion” policies that were established in the UK in 2001 as an attempt to tackle disadvantages and inequalities in the society. In the last two decades, in parallel with the increasing concerns on migration, community cohesion has started to be an issue high on the agenda. Community Cohesion policies have aimed to develop a positive vision for diverse societies, by which the diversity of people’s backgrounds is appreciated and valued, and people from all backgrounds have similar life opportunities, and are empowered to interact with each other in a positive manner to build trust.²⁰⁴ Since then, various guidelines, action guides, reports, standards, programmes on community cohesion, community engagement, community integration, most of them by the Home Office, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, and the Local Government Agency, have been adopted and published.²⁰⁵ Today, one of the key laws contributing to the integration of refugees is the Equality Act 2010. It provides a legal framework to protect people against discrimination because of one’s colour, nationality, ethnic or national origins; and to increase equality of opportunity for all by putting equality at the centre of policy-making process.²⁰⁶ Despite not explicitly referring to “refugees” or “migrants”, the Equality Act 2010 protects everyone in the UK without discrimination and imposes duties on “public authorities”²⁰⁷ that apply to both refugees and migrants.²⁰⁸ In this regard, public authorities, including local authorities, have a public sector equality duty to promote equality of opportunity. The other key legislation is the Localism Act 2011 that empowered local authorities and devolved administrations to

2020)’ <<https://lordslibrary.parliament.uk/brexit-refugee-protection-and-asylum-policy/>> accessed 29 September 2020.

²⁰³ Jenny Phillimore, 'Implementing Integration in the UK: Lessons for Integration Theory, Policy and Practice' (2012) 40 Policy & Politics 525.

²⁰⁴ See the Website of Professor Ted Cantle. Professor Ted Cantle was appointed by the Home Secretary to Chair the Community Cohesion Review Team in 2001 and prepared the Report known as ‘the Cantle Report’ including recommendations on community cohesion. See Ted Cantle, 'About Community Cohesion' <<http://tedcantle.co.uk/about-community-cohesion/#bcc>> accessed 18 July 2020.

²⁰⁵ Ibid

²⁰⁶ Equality Act 2010 <<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents>> accessed 18 July 2020.

²⁰⁷ For the list of public authorities see ibid Schedule 19.

²⁰⁸ See Equality and Diversity Forum, 'Refugees, migrants and the Equality Act 2010 A briefing for refugee and migrant community organisations,' (2011) <https://www.equallyours.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/EDF-Briefing_Community-Organisations_Web_draft-3.pdf> accessed 23 September 2020

implement integration strategies in accordance with their local priorities.²⁰⁹ Devolution of power to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, and the decentralisation of power from central government to local communities were the outcome of the NPM reforms.²¹⁰ Whilst immigration policy is not a devolved policy and responsibility for migration policy remains with the Home Office, integration policy is a devolved policy issue in the UK.

The UK has offered refugee resettlement programmes whereby selected refugees can come and settle in the UK since 1995.²¹¹ These programmes are an important means for the integration of refugees. Up until now, the Home Office has operated four resettlement programmes in partnership with the UNHCR and the IOM and with the voluntary support of local governments. These resettlement schemes are: 1) The Mandate Refugee Scheme launched in 1995. It has no annual committed quota. The scheme resettles refugees who have a close family member in the UK.²¹² The inspection report notes that, up until the first quarter of 2020, 435 people resettled under this scheme.²¹³ 2) The Gateway Protection Programme, was launched in 2004. The scheme aims to resettle 750 refugees per year. Since its beginning up until the first quarter of 2020, Gateway had resettled 9,996 refugees.²¹⁴ 3) The Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme - SVPRS, was launched in 2014. In 2017, the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme was expanded to include non-Syrian nationals - (S)VPRS. The target was to resettle 20,000 refugees by 2020. According to the Home Office records, there were 19,768 resettled refugees (99.6% Syrian nationals) resettled under the (S)VPRS between 2015-2020. 4) The Vulnerable Children's Resettlement Scheme (VCRS) was launched in April 2016. The target was to resettle 3000 children under this scheme. According to the Home Office records, there were 1,826 resettled refugees resettled under the VCRS between 2016-2020.²¹⁵ The inspection

²⁰⁹ Localism Act 2011 <<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/contents/enacted>> accessed 24 September 2020.

²¹⁰ Rhodes, *Decentralizing the civil service [electronic resource] : from unitary state to differentiated polity in the United Kingdom*.

²¹¹ See, e.g., Bolt, *An inspection of UK Refugee Resettlement Schemes (November 2019 – May 2020)*; Michael Collyer and others, 'A long-term commitment: integration of resettled refugees in the UK' (University of Sussex 2018) <<https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=4375-resettled-refugees-report-web.pdf&site=252>> accessed 2 October 2020; Hannah Wilkins, 'Refugee Resettlement in the UK (Briefing Paper Number 8750, 6 March 2020)' (*House of Commons Library*, accessed 29 August 2020).

²¹² UNHCR, 'UNHCR Resettlement Handbook-Country Chapters' (2018) <<https://www.unhcr.org/protection/resettlement/4a2ccf4c6/unhcr-resettlement-handbook-country-chapters.html>> accessed 29 September 2020.

²¹³ Bolt, *An inspection of UK Refugee Resettlement Schemes (November 2019 – May 2020)*.

²¹⁴ Ibid.

²¹⁵ Home Office National Statistics, 'How many people do we grant asylum or protection to?' (published 21 May 2020) <<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/immigration-statistics-year-ending-march-2020/how-many-people-do-we-grant-asylum-or-protection-to>> accessed 30 September 2020.

report notes that, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there have been no refugee resettlements under any UK scheme since 12 March 2020 at the time of writing (September 2020).²¹⁶

In addition to resettlement schemes, the UK also has the community sponsorship scheme whereby community sponsors take financial responsibility for refugees who are already being resettled in the UK under either the (S)VPRS or the VCRS schemes. Of those resettled under (S)VPRS and VCRS, 449 refugees have been resettled with the financial support of the community sponsor group since the scheme began in 2016.²¹⁷

The (S)VPRS and the VCRS ended in 2020. The government has announced that its plan for the coming years is to consolidate the (S)VPRS, the VCRS, the Gateway and the community sponsorship scheme into one resettlement scheme – the UK Resettlement Scheme (UKRS). The target of the new scheme is to resettle 5000 refugees in the first year.²¹⁸ The Mandate Scheme will continue as it is.

Local authorities participated in the (S)VPRS and VCRS voluntarily. Each local authority received a fixed five-year tariff for each resettled refugee and additional tariffs for health costs, access to benefits and work, English language support and children’s education. There are different models of resettlement delivery that could be adopted by the local authorities. These are: delivery of all services in-house, commissioning of certain elements to civil society organisations, joint commissioning of certain services with other local authorities, contracting the whole scheme out to the civil society organisations.²¹⁹

In addition to the schemes specifically attributed to the integration of refugees, there are other means and tools contributing to the integration of broader target groups (migrants), including refugees. In this context, the Controlling Migration Fund (CMF) launched in 2016 by the government is another tool to support local authorities to respond and mitigate the impact of

²¹⁶ This information is relevant up until at the time of writing of the report that is mid-September 2020. See Bolt, *An inspection of UK Refugee Resettlement Schemes (November 2019 – May 2020)*.

²¹⁷ Home Office National Statistics, 'How many people do we grant asylum or protection to?' (published 21 May 2020) '.

²¹⁸ See, e.g., Wilkins, 'Refugee Resettlement in the UK (Briefing Paper Number 8750, 6 March 2020)'.

²¹⁹ Local Government Association, 'Syrian Refugee Resettlement a Guide for Local Authorities' (2016) <https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Syran%20refugee%20resettlement%20a%20guide%20for%20local%20authorities_0.pdf> accessed 4 May 2020.

migration on their communities. The CMF budget for 2016-2020 was £100m.²²⁰ The Integration Area Programme is another tool to support local authorities to respond to integration challenges. Today, there are five local authorities participating in the programme.²²¹

In 2018, the UK Government announced the Integrated Communities Strategy, which is a broad policy aiming to create a more robust and more integrated society by tackling the barriers to integration.²²² As stated above, the Equality Act 2010 set an equality duty for public authorities to protect people against discrimination and putting equality at the centre of policy-making process. 'The Integrated Communities Strategy goes further, calling on public authorities to set an equality objective outlining specific activity to promote integration.'²²³ The Green Paper defines integration as "a two-way street".

'Integration is a shared responsibility and is a two-way process between migrants and their local communities. Our expectation that people who come to live in this country will strive to integrate must be coupled with providing them with the opportunities, expectations and the environment to enable them to do that successfully.'²²⁴

The Strategy highlights public-civil society cooperation and commits to 'work with civil society and others to increase the integration support available to help refugees overcome the barriers to integration.'²²⁵ The Green Paper was followed by an Action Plan in 2019 including actions specifically addressing the integration of refugees such as actions on English-language training, employment, mental health, etc. The Strategy and its Action Plan apply to England only. Devolved authorities and some cities have also developed their own integration strategies.²²⁶

²²⁰ Home Office, 'Controlling Migration Fund: prospectus (last updated 10 September 2018)' <<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/controlling-migration-fund-prospectus>> accessed 6 May 2020.

²²¹ HM Government Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government, 'Guidance-Integration Area Programme (published 16 May 2019)' <<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/integration-area-programme>> accessed 2 June 2020.

²²² HM Government Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government, 'Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper'.

²²³ Local Government Association, 'Building Cohesive Communities an LGA Guide' (2019) <https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/10.31%20Community%20cohesion%20guidance_04.2.pdf> accessed 28 June 2020.

²²⁴ HM Government Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government, 'Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper'

²²⁵ Ibid.

²²⁶ See, e.g., Greater London Authority, *The Mayor's Strategy For Social Integration* (2018) <https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/final_social_integration_strategy.pdf> accessed 13 September 2020; Scottish Government Local Government and Communities Directorate, 'New Scots: Refugee Integration Strategy 2018 to 2022' (2018) <<https://www.gov.scot/publications/new-scots-refugee-integration-strategy-2018-2022/>> accessed 13 September 2020

The Strategy introduced a government-funded Cohesion and Integration Network to improve the capacity of leaders and practitioners in the public, private and civil society sectors through trainings and information-sharing. The Strategy also introduced a new fund for integration: the Integrated Communities Innovation Fund.²²⁷ In recognition of the benefits of the resettlement schemes for the resettled refugees, and as an acknowledgement of the need for more support for recognised refugees, the Integration Strategy declared an increase to the integration support available to recognised refugees through Integrated Communities Innovation Fund as well. The Fund complements the CMF and Integration Area Programmes by supporting innovative ideas to encourage integration. Funding was available for 2018/19 and 2019/20.

As stated in Chapter 2, MIPEX is a tool to measure migrant integration policies based on 167 policy indicators under 8 policy fields.²²⁸ According to the MIPEX 2019 Index, the UK scored 56 on the MIPEX 100-point scale and was therefore defined as under halfway favourable policies. The UK first developed its country indicators of integration in 2002 to evaluate the effectiveness of the Challenge Fund and the European Refugee Fund, funded projects that mostly aimed to support the integration of refugees within the UK.²²⁹ In 2019, new sets of indicators were identified under 14 key domains of integration to complement the Integrated Communities Strategy and other related strategies.²³⁰ Key principles of the updated Indicators of Integration Framework are: integration is multi-dimensional (dependent on multiple factors), multi-directional (requires the involvement of all stakeholders in society), requires taking responsibility (by newcomers, receiving communities and government at all levels), context-specific (specific to a particular place, time, and person). The fourteen key domains of integration are identified as central to integration: work, housing, education, health and social care, leisure, bonds, bridges, links, communications, culture, digital skill, safety, stability, rights and responsibilities. Although the listed indicators are not mandatory, they are - for national and local actors - to be used in the planning, monitoring and evaluation of integration actions and projects.

²²⁷ HM Government Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government, 'Integrated Communities Innovation Fund' (2018) <<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/integrated-communities-innovation-fund>> accessed 18 November 2020.

²²⁸ Migrant Integration Policy Index 2020.

²²⁹ Alastair Ager and Alison Strang, *Indicators of Integration: final report (Development and Practice Report 28)* (Home Office 2004).

²³⁰ UK Home Office, *Indicators of Integration (third edition)*.

Another tool that is worth mentioning within the context of integration are the Strategic Migration Partnerships.²³¹ There are 12 partnerships across England, Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland. Despite being funded by the Home Office, they are independent of the Home Office and led by local governments. The role of the partnerships is to coordinate and support implementation of national programmes in asylum and refugee schemes and devolved migration priorities. Partnerships contribute to sharing of knowledge and expertise in respect of resettlement schemes.

In addition to the government-funded initiatives which contribute to the integration of migrants, there are various other privately funded programmes in the UK, such as the Inclusive-Cities Initiative supporting 12 UK cities and their local partners (including civil society) to build more inclusive cities.²³² Another privately funded programme is The Community Integration Awards, which aims to recognise and support projects or initiatives doing promising work in respect of integration and cohesion in the UK.²³³

The above-mentioned Integrated Communities Strategy recognises the importance of local authorities in addressing integration challenges, as they are on the frontline of this challenge. Based on this background, the section below will present the results of the empirical study conducted at local level in England to explore public-civil society cooperation with regard to the integration of refugees.

²³¹ See, e.g., East of England Strategic Partnership for Migration <<https://smp.eelga.gov.uk/>> accessed 27 September 2020.

²³² University of Oxford COMPAS, 'Inclusive Cities' (2018) <<https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/project/inclusive-cities/>> accessed 3 November 2020.

²³³ Community Integration Awards <<https://www.integrationawards.uk/>> accessed 3 November 2020.

4.2. FINDINGS OF THE EMPIRICAL STUDY

4.2.1. Terminology

The term "civil society" is not a commonly used term in the geographical ambit of this study. Instead, the terms "voluntary and community sector/groups, charities, nonprofits" are used by the key informants.²³⁴

*'Civil Society Organisation rarely comes up as a term within the Council.'*²³⁵

*'in the Council (...) there has not ever been much talk about civil society. Just kind of feeds its way in different ways. It is never seen as a thing in itself.'*²³⁶

4.2.2. Statistical Challenges

The total number of refugees living in Oxford City is unknown. One of the interviewees stated that a charity has tried to make an estimation regarding the number of refugees in the City by interviewing their "clients."²³⁷ In this regard, there is an anecdotal estimation of 6000 refugees in the City.²³⁸ Another interviewee stated that 'the Oxford City Council tried to do a bit of work on who is living in Oxford City that does not have English as a first language and they think it is about 3000-4000 people.'²³⁹ There is no agreed data available for the total number of refugees living in Oxford City. One can reach the scattered data of refugees through the records of civil society organisations that provide frontline services²⁴⁰ or public authorities within the context of their services.²⁴¹

²³⁴ Despite this finding, the term "civil society" will be used rest of this study for two reasons: 1) to ensure integrity with the previous Chapters and 2) because the term "civil society" is believed to be more indicative of both advocacy and service provider functions of the civil society.

²³⁵ Interviewee 2 (29 June 2020)

²³⁶ Ibid.

²³⁷ Clients mean the people whom these organisations serving for.

²³⁸ Interviewee 2 (29 June 2020)

²³⁹ Interviewee 5 (3 August 2020)

²⁴⁰ See e.g., Refugee Resource <<https://www.refugeeresource.org.uk/publications>> accessed 3 November 2020.

²⁴¹ The (S)VPRS programme oversees 30 refugee families in 5 years.

*'There has always been a continual problem with data around the number of refugees and asylum seekers. We don't know. This is not something that the Home Office provides. They give regional statistics, but they don't give local authorities' statistics.'*²⁴²

*'Getting data on refugees and migrants is notoriously difficult. Because of the very nature of that, their physical mobility of moving around, it is very difficult for us to get... We have got fairly good data on ethnic makeup of Oxford, but that does not give us immigration status.'*²⁴³

Similarly, there is no centralized list of information regarding the total number of civil society actors that are active in dealing with the integration of refugees living in Oxford City. It is estimated that 4,500 civil society organisations operate in Oxfordshire and that 53% of them are based in Oxford City.²⁴⁴ However, there is no way of finding how many of the 53% organisations deal with the integration of refugees. It is not an easy task to prepare a list of civil society actors dealing with the integration of refugees because there are two groups: 1- those organisations that are specifically dealing with refugees 2- those organisations dealing with a broader group of people including refugees. In particular, it is not an easy task to find the second group as they may not use specifically the word “refugee” in their “activities description”.

*'There are lots of lists of voluntary and community organisations, but there is no centralised list for this information.'*²⁴⁵

4.2.3. Stakeholders for Cooperation

Integration services are fragmented and spread out over various departments within the City Council such as the Communities and Neighbourhoods Unit, the Housing and Property Services, the Policy and Partnership Team, etc. These departments deal with the policies and problems on “issue-based” matters such as “difficulties in housing” but not “specific group-based” ones, such as “refugees”. For instance, the Housing Services deals with difficulties in

²⁴² Interviewee 2 (29 June 2020)

²⁴³ Ibid.

²⁴⁴ Local Government Association, 'Oxfordshire County Council Voluntary and Community Sector Peer Challenge Report (March 2018 Final v2)' (2018)

<<https://www2.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/sites/default/files/folders/documents/communityandliving/OxfordshireVCSPeerChallengeReport.pdf>> accessed 5 November 2020.

²⁴⁵ Interviewee 2 (29 June 2020)

the housing of people but has no recourse to public funds regardless of a person being a refugee, etc.²⁴⁶

*'If you are a refugee having a certain issue, you contact the Council on a certain issue, not as a refugee.'*²⁴⁷

The City Council cooperates with formal and institutionalised civil society actors such as charities in the implementation of integration policies.²⁴⁸ CSOs cooperating with Oxford City Council can be grouped into two types: 1- specifically providing services for refugees 2- providing services (such as housing, mental health, social care) for a broader group range of people, including refugees. For instance, in Oxford City, Asylum Welcome and Refugee Resource are specifically dealing with refugees, while Connection Support and Aspire have broader target groups, including refugees.²⁴⁹

The CSOs are selected either through the contracting of service level agreements or a bidding process, both of which commission CSOs to deliver specific services. There is no finding of selection criteria in respect of service level agreements. It is understood that service level agreements are contracted with 'trusted suppliers'²⁵⁰ based on previous experience. Regarding the bidding process, it is expressed that the bidding process is incredibly complex and by its very nature excludes many organisations because they do not have any capacity or knowledge.²⁵¹

It is established that there are various issue-based groups such as the Housing Partnerships, the ESOL Coordination Group, the Refugee Employability Stakeholders' Group, the Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Vulnerable Migrants Partnership. There is no publicly available information about their agenda, participants, selection criteria for participants, and meeting minutes. This makes it hard to assess the stakeholders and selection criteria for CSOs.

²⁴⁶ Ibid.

²⁴⁷ Ibid.

²⁴⁸ For this reason, the term "civil society organisations (CSOs)" will be used during the rest of this study instead of "civil society actors" where appropriate.

²⁴⁹ In Oxford City, there are refugee-led community groups. However, there is no formal cooperation mechanism enabling the cooperation of these groups with the City Council.

²⁵⁰ Interviewee 4 (3 August 2020)

²⁵¹ Interviewee 2 (29 June 2020)

4.2.4. Drivers for Cooperation

There are multiple drivers for cooperation that are compatible with the theoretical framework. These drivers can be grouped into democracy perspective and functionalist perspective. The democracy perspective is based on the discourse on inclusiveness and diversity, including support for pro-refugee policies. Cooperation with civil society is believed to contribute to having a diverse and inclusive city.

*'It is really enriching existing communities, different migrants coming in, different things we can experience together. To embrace those different cultures around the city... That is such a huge accomplishment.'*²⁵²

*'If you want to have a good and integrated society, you should listen to people, and you should be working with voluntary and community groups because they often popped up for a purpose. They have a common interest in pursuing a particular policy.'*²⁵³

With respect to the functionalist perspective, diverse needs of the refugee population, lack of knowledge and expertise in specific fields, and financial difficulties are the incentives for public-civil society cooperation. Refugees in Oxford City are a diverse group of people. For instance, some are illiterate with no education. There are other groups of refugees who are well educated. They are from different social and economic backgrounds. Refugees are often very severely traumatised and need adequate medical support. One of the main needs of refugees is increasing their employability skills. The City Council does not have the capacity, knowledge, expertise, and resources to address these diverse and specific needs in-house.

*'These diversities require tapping into different resources.'*²⁵⁴

*'There is no way that Oxford City Council could do these on its own. It does not offer all those services. It recognises that the Charities have a huge amount of experience, a huge amount of knowledge, and expertise that the City Council needs.'*²⁵⁵

²⁵² Interviewee 3 (30 June 2020)

²⁵³ Interviewee 1 (11 June 2020)

²⁵⁴ Interviewee 3 (30 June 2020)

²⁵⁵ Ibid

Civil society actors work with refugees on the ground on a day-to-day and a one-to-one basis. In this regard, civil society is acknowledged as knowing far more than the Council in respect of specific needs. A desire to get better knowledge and understanding about the needs of refugees motivates the City Council to cooperate. Key informants from both CSOs and the City Council agree that no one organisation has all the skills and expertise to be able to support those refugee families alone. Working in partnership, each organisation brings its different resources and capacities to the situation.

*'We are good at something; other organisations are good at another thing. We work together, so that whole effort is combined to make a stronger proposition and solution.'*²⁵⁶

*'Public authorities and civil society complement each other.'*²⁵⁷

Lack of sufficient finance motivates both parties to cooperate.²⁵⁸

*'There are some fantastic volunteers out there providing services to people which we just don't have the finances to do.'*²⁵⁹

Civil society needs financial support from the public authorities in the provision of services.²⁶⁰ Besides, formalization of the provision of services motivates civil society to cooperate.

*'Cooperation with public authorities means not only to get money but also to get an infrastructure that formalizes the provision of services. This means a bit more commitment and formalizes the responsibility.'*²⁶¹

²⁵⁶ Interviewee 4 (3 August 2020)

²⁵⁷ Ibid

²⁵⁸ In the UK, local governments have three main sources of revenue: government grants, council tax, business rates. Local authority "spending power" has fallen by 18% since 2010 largely due to the reductions in central government grants. This means that local authorities have had to find ways to do with less. Local authorities' cooperation with civil society is one of the ways of delivering services with less income. See Institute for Government, 'Local government funding in England (March 10, 2020)' <<https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/explainers/local-government-funding-england>> accessed 6 November 2020.

²⁵⁹ Interviewee 1 (11 June 2020)

²⁶⁰ See, e.g., the Annual reports and financial statements of the Refugee Resource available at <<https://www.refugeeresource.org.uk/publications>>

²⁶¹ Interviewee 6 (7 August 2020)

Findings point out that CSOs' own perception of their role is more from a functionalist perspective than a democracy perspective. The CSOs explain their role more within a service provision framework (a service provider) than campaigning and advocacy for refugees' rights and integration policies (a right-based advocator). However, there are examples of campaigning and advocacy functions of civil society.

*'There was great pressure put on the City Council by the community to become a city of safety. Then, the leaders of the City Council recognised that there was such a strength amongst the community, and they moved on agreeing to take part in the City of Sanctuary project'*²⁶²

Remarkably, the democracy perspective is voiced more by public authorities than by civil society.

*'Sitting in a room by myself making decisions.... I don't actually think that makes for good decisions. I think it allows better decisions if you are working cooperatively.'*²⁶³

4.2.5. Means and Tools for Cooperation

Oxford City Council's means and tools to strengthen and to cooperate with civil society can be mainly explored under the City Council's "working principles"²⁶⁴, "consultation process"²⁶⁵, and "communities' policies."²⁶⁶ In addition to these general means and tools, a "cooperation" approach is embedded in policy fields. As a result, sector-specific cooperation mechanisms have been developed accordingly, as in the case of the field of integration.

4.2.5.1. Institutional Means and Tools

There is not an umbrella department/unit/person assigned to coordinate the relations with civil society within the City Council that can also act as a monitoring, evaluation, and dispute resolution unit between parties.

²⁶² Interviewee 7 (17 August 2020)

²⁶³ Interviewee 1 (11 June 2020)

²⁶⁴ Oxford City Council, 'How the Council Works'

<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20050/how_the_council_works> accessed 22 October 2020.

²⁶⁵ Oxford City Council, 'Consultations' <<https://consultation.oxford.gov.uk/>> accessed 22 October 2020.

²⁶⁶ Oxford City Council, 'Communities' <<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20007/communities>> accessed 22 October 2020.

Oxford City Council is engaged in several strategic partnerships, involving various stakeholders, including civil society.²⁶⁷ Among them, the Oxford Strategic Partnership, founded in 2003, is the Oxford City's Local Strategic Partnership. The Partnership brings together representatives from local public agencies, business, and the civil society sector to shape policies and priorities for Oxford City and share resources. However, looking at the composition of the Steering Committee and sub-groups of the Partnership, it is considered that civil society representation is limited. There is no evidence that it includes CSOs which are dealing with the integration of refugees exclusively.

Community Partnerships based on localities, bringing together different CSOs within that community and the City Council's officers, have the potential to be an effective means for cooperation on integration policies. However, there are not enough findings to clarify their full members and their agenda.²⁶⁸

The Oxford Community Centres' Steering Group, made up of representatives from the civil society sector, councillors, and senior Council officers, has the potential to be an effective tool for cooperation and to contribute to integration policies.²⁶⁹ However, there is not a reference to the integration of refugees in the 2016-2020 Strategy for Community Centres.²⁷⁰

There are issue-based, multi-agency platforms held with the participation of CSOs, universities, and the City Council, where integration related issues are discussed periodically, and stakeholders exchange information about what they are doing with each other, such as the "Refugee, Migrant Stakeholder Employability Group" and the "Vulnerable Migrant Coordination Group". However, there is limited knowledge about them, as their agenda, selection of participants, meeting minutes, etc. are not publicly available.

²⁶⁷ Oxford City Council, 'Strategic partnerships'

<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20172/partnerships/502/strategic_partnerships> accessed 22 October 2020.

²⁶⁸ Oxford City Council, 'Community Partnerships'

<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20102/community_partnerships> accessed 22 November 2020.

²⁶⁹ There are 19 community centres in Oxford, many of which are owned by the Oxford City Council; and a majority are managed by Community Associations made up of local workers and volunteers. See Oxford City Council, 'Community Centres'

<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/directory/21/community_centres%3E%20accessed%2022%20January%202021> accessed 22 November 2020.

²⁷⁰ Oxford City Council, 'Oxford City Council's Community Centre Strategy 2016-2020 '

<https://www.slc.uk.com/wp-content/uploads/CommunityCentreStrategyFull_WEBv3.pdf> accessed 22 November 2020.

4.2.5.2. Regulatory Means and Tools

Oxford City Council's Constitution sets the citizens' rights to participate in council, cabinet, and committee meetings. Although the participation of citizens is embedded in the Constitution, civil society actors' participation - which differs from citizens' participation - is not embedded in it.²⁷¹

Oxford City Council has two main policy documents: the Council Strategy²⁷² and the Local Plan.²⁷³ While there is a reference to cooperation with local voluntary and community groups in the draft Council Strategy 2020-2024, there is no reference to cooperation in the Local Plan 2016-2036.

Corporate governance is a system that enables local authorities to connect with their communities. Oxford City Council stated its commitment to good corporate governance and prepared a Code of Corporate Governance accordingly.²⁷⁴ However, the necessary Community Strategy has not been prepared yet. The current Oxford 2050 vision statement also declares commitment to work closely with the voluntary and community sector.²⁷⁵

As stated before, the Compact is one of the key documents setting out the principles and commitments governing public-civil society cooperation in England. After the introduction of the national Compact, many local authorities have developed their own local Compacts since 2003. Although there is no evidence of a city-level Compact, Oxford City Council is a signatory to the Oxfordshire Compact, among other statutory organisations.²⁷⁶ However, there is no finding in any of the City Council's policy documents referencing the Compact in its relations with the civil society sector. There is no finding that the Compact Steering Committee is still

²⁷¹ Oxford City Council, 'Constitution (May 2020)' <<https://mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?Cid=477&MId=5990&Ver=4&Info=1>> accessed 21 November 2020.

²⁷² Oxford City Council, 'Council Strategy 2020-24' <<https://consultation.oxford.gov.uk/consult.ti/Corpstrat/consultationHome>> accessed 24 November 2020.

²⁷³ Oxford City Council, 'Oxford Local Plan 2016-2036' <https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20067/planning_policy/1311/oxford_local_plan_2016-2036> accessed 24 November 2020.

²⁷⁴ Oxford City Council, 'Corporate Governance' <https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20050/how_the_council_works/361/corporate_governance> accessed 24 November 2020.

²⁷⁵ Oxford 2050, 'People and Communities' <<https://oxford2050.com/people-and-communities/>> accessed 24 November 2020.

²⁷⁶ Oxfordshire Compact 2010.

active. These findings imply that Oxford City Council does not retain a local version of the “Compact” in respect of its relations with the civil society sector.

‘Remarkably, we are not aware of Compact.’²⁷⁷

The Civil Society Strategy 2018 is the most recent document which sets out a vision for a more cooperative approach between public authorities and CSOs in the UK. However, there are no findings in any of the City Council’s policy documents referencing the Strategy.

It is established that service level agreements and bidding contracts under (S)VPRS and CMF where the City Council and CSOs agreed to fulfil a certain function at a certain price/cost are accepted as the main regulatory document of cooperation.

4.2.5.3. Financial Means and Tools

In Oxford City, grant supports are awarded to those CSOs which have projects on promoting community activities and cohesion, tackling social inequality, protecting the natural environment and biodiversity, improving community safety, and promoting people’s involvement in arts. Findings show that refugee communities have benefited from the projects supported by these grants as well.²⁷⁸ Similarly, the Oxford Lottery raises funds for local voluntary and community groups in Oxford.²⁷⁹ There are also examples of service procurement which will be mentioned below under tailor-made means and tools for cooperation.

4.2.5.4. The Means and Tools of Capacity Building

Despite being limited, there are means and tools of capacity building, such as training. For instance, the Oxford City Council organised a workshop to improve the capacity of CSOs on how to bid for funding.²⁸⁰

²⁷⁷ Interviewee 5 (3 August 2020)

²⁷⁸ Oxford City Council, 'Grants for voluntary and community groups'

<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20044/grants/277/grants_for_voluntary_and_community_groups> accessed 24 November 2020.

²⁷⁹ Oxford City Council, 'Oxford Lottery'

<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20007/communities/1314/oxford_lottery> accessed 25 November 2020.

²⁸⁰ Interviewee 2 (29 June 2020)

4.2.5.5. Online Means and Tools

At the Oxford City level, there is an online one-stop public consultation platform (<https://consultation.oxford.gov.uk>) that can contribute to the first two levels of cooperation: information sharing and consultation. All opened and closed consultations are available on this platform. However, there are no findings of how the City Council has judged the feedback to the consultations. It is not clear how the inputs were used and what their impact was on the consulted policies. These deficiencies are weaknesses of online consultations to enable effective dialogue and partnership between stakeholders. In addition, there are two concerns about online consultation. The first is its accessibility to a portion of society due to the digital gap. The second one is its accessibility to a part of the community due to the language barrier as consultation is in English. Websites, e-mails and online meeting tools are other means and tools facilitating cooperation.

4.2.5.6. Tailor-Made Means and Tools for Cooperation on the Integration of Refugees

Oxford is a City of Sanctuary which means a welcoming place of safety for people who are fleeing violence and persecution. It is declared that, as a City of Sanctuary, the aim is to enable everyone who comes to live in Oxford to take advantage of all the city offers.²⁸¹ There is an emphasis on diversity and equality within the Council. There is an equality and diversity advisor in the Council who works with different community groups to improve their access to the Council.²⁸² There is also a Cabinet Member (Councillor) for supporting local communities and promoting inclusive communities. Introductory videos are developed by the Council to improve the understanding of newly arrived migrants, asylum seekers and refugees on local government works and services. All these contribute to creating an enabling environment for the integration of refugees.

Oxford City Council created the role of Migrant Champion for Oxford City in 2019. One of the Councillors with a migrant background was elected as Oxford's first Migrant Champion. It was

²⁸¹City of Sanctuary UK <<https://cityofsanctuary.org/>> accessed 18 November 2020; Oxford City Council, 'Newly arrived communities, refugees and asylum seekers' <https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20042/equality_diversity_and_inclusion/1334/newly_arrived_communities_refugees_and_asylum_seekers> accessed 18 November 2020.

²⁸² Interviewee 2 (29 June 2020)

announced that the Migrant Champion ‘will be working with migrants and refugees, helping them to access and connect with local services and advice centres, and ensuring their needs are considered, and voices heard in Council policy.’²⁸³ In this respect, the Migrant Champion position can contribute to the integration of refugees and increasing cooperation with civil society in the form of a bridge between the City Council and the CSOs.

There are currently two programmes running within the Oxford City Council that directly impact refugees. These are the CMF and the (S)VPRS. They have separate budgets and are both funded by the government. The CMF is an overall, overarching fund that is open to all migrants within the City while (S)VPRS is specifically for resettled refugees. The CMF supports local authorities to respond and mitigate the impact of migration on their communities. Oxford City Council is one of the local authorities awarded funding through CMF. The Council had two successful proposals and will use awarded funding for the eight projects. After the Council received the funding from the government, it went out to tender on several projects. A service level agreement or a grant agreement is drawn up with the organisations. Many of the projects have been postponed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Examples of funded services are employment-related ESOL classes, mentoring and volunteering opportunities for refugees, asylum-seekers and vulnerable migrants; information documents about support services, supporting access to accommodation, research on tackling the exploitation of migrants and human trafficking.²⁸⁴

The Oxford City Council participated in the (S)VPRS at an early stage in 2015. Oxford City Council also participated in the Vulnerable Children's Resettlement Scheme (VCRS) in 2016; this aims at the resettlement of vulnerable children and their immediate families. At the time of this study, the Council has resettled thirty families in total in both schemes, four of which are under the VCRS. Although most families are from Syria under these schemes, there are also a few families from Sudan and Iraq.²⁸⁵

²⁸³Oxford City Council, 'Oxford's first Migrant Champion announced' <https://www.oxford.gov.uk/news/article/1128/oxford_s_first_migrant_champion_announced> accessed 16 November 2020

²⁸⁴Oxford City Council, 'Newly arrived communities, refugees and asylum seekers'

²⁸⁵ There is one vulnerable refugee family resettled in 2018 by the Community Sponsorship Programme. A faith-based community group provided all the resettlement support for this refugee family. See *ibid*. However, faith-based community groups are out of the civil society definition of this study.

The City Council has identified a support package for the resettled families. The services in the package have been provided by CSOs based on service level agreements of different durations. The services provided include greeting at the airport, initial orientation including setting up with doctors and creating banks accounts, plus all sorts of basic practical needs, access to housing and health, getting children to schools, ESOL classes, work-based ESOL classes, development of employability skills, therapy, helping mental health, and helping them to deal with the trauma of relocating. The target of the scheme is that, after the 5-year programme, refugee families become fully independent, and are able to stand on their own two feet. From 2020 the (S)VPRS, the VCRS, the Gateway and the community sponsorship schemes are going to be consolidated into a single settlement scheme – the UK Resettlement Scheme. The Council had not made a decision about taking extra families in the new scheme at the time of interviews.²⁸⁶ This study argues that CSOs should be included in the initial consultation and decision-making process alongside public authorities/agencies.

Integration services are fragmented and spread out over various departments. There is no umbrella department/unit/person assigned to coordinate their works, and CMF and (S)VPRS. However, the two programmes' offices sometimes work together to deal with certain issues. For instance, after finding out that the NHS does not offer interpreting services for refugees, (S)VPRS and CMF offices cooperated and raised this issue with the NHS not only for Syrian refugees but whole migrant communities.²⁸⁷ One of the interviewees stated that the City Council's Communities Team works with all migrants (not only with refugees) who have come into the city to get them integrated into the local community.²⁸⁸ However, the Communities Team's role as a coordinating unit could not be identified through the findings. Further investigation is needed.

CMF and SVRPS do not cover overall integration domains but focus on specific fields such as housing, employment and employability, health, and language learning. There are also multi-agency meetings that are held and are issue-based rather than discussing the overall phenomenon of integration.

²⁸⁶ Interviewee 3 (30 June 2020)

²⁸⁷ Ibid

²⁸⁸ Ibid

In recognition of the benefits of the resettlement schemes for resettled refugees, the Integrated Communities Strategy, announced in 2018 by the government, declared an increase to the level of integration support available to recognised refugees as well and introduced the Integrated Communities Innovation Fund. The Fund complements the CMF by supporting innovative ideas to encourage integration.²⁸⁹ Funding was available for 2018/19 and 2019/20. There are no findings that the Integrated Communities Strategy was embedded in the City's policies, or that the Integrated Communities Innovation Fund was utilised by the public authorities and CSOs in the City. Several cities have developed their own integration strategies for refugees and migrants.²⁹⁰ There is no finding that the Oxford City Council has a separate integration strategy.

The position of Local Authority Asylum Support Liaison Officer is another initiative of the government to facilitate the integration of recognised refugees.²⁹¹ The Officer facilitates the integration of recognised refugees by providing them information and advice on how to access housing, health, employment, and language skills, and so on. There is no finding that Oxford City has a Local Authority Asylum Support Liaison Officer.

4.2.5.7. Community Hubs as a Means for Cooperation on Refugees' Integration

Community hubs such as museums, community centres, and libraries have great potential to support the integration of refugees, not only for offering physical space for gatherings and social interaction, etc. but also for their potential to lead integration through various projects and programmes.²⁹² In Oxford City, there is evidence that stakeholders tap into some of these resources and have developed innovative approaches that can help the integration of refugees into society. For instance, the Multaka project, started in 2018, is being delivered jointly by the Pitt Rivers Museum and the History of Science Museum in cooperation with local charities

²⁸⁹ The Fund aims to address causes of poor integration such as labour market disadvantage, residential segregation, segregation in schools, a lack of meaningful social mixing, and the lack of English proficiency. See HM Government Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government, 'Integrated Communities Innovation Fund'.

²⁹⁰ See footnote 226.

²⁹¹ See UK Parliament, 'Refugees: Homelessness Question for Home Office UIN 267364, tabled on 20 June 2019' <<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2019-06-20/267364>> accessed 21 November 2020. See also, Hannah Wilkins and others, *Support for Refugees after Receiving Asylum Decision* (House of Commons Library, Number CDP-2020-0042, 2 March 2020).

²⁹² For instance, the potential role of libraries in supporting integration is recognised in the HM Government Department for Digital Culture Media and Sport, 'Libraries Deliver: Ambition for Public Libraries in England 2016-2021'

<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/579207/Libraries_Deliver_-_Ambition_for_Public_Libraries_in_England_2016_to_2021_accessible_version_pdf> accessed 13 November 2020.

(Asylum Welcome, Connection Support and Refugee Resource) and community groups (Syrian Sisters).²⁹³ There is no finding of the City Council's cooperation with local charities and museums in the implementation of the Multaka project or similar projects at museums for the integration of refugees.

*'I would say Multaka has been very successful in terms of English language development and in terms of engaging with voluntary groups' home country history and culture and putting that into a cultural experience for us as the indigenous population here. So, it works both ways.'*²⁹⁴

Another community hub in the City is that of community centres.²⁹⁵ Although there are findings that some community centres have developed projects to support refugees- especially women refugees economically and socially - there is no finding of a project developed in cooperation with the City Council.

Another community hub in the City is libraries. Oxfordshire County Council is responsible for the libraries. There are no findings of any project implemented in libraries for the sake of integration of refugees.

4.2.5.8. Other Means and Tools for Cooperation

Ad-hoc and informal meetings, and chats are an important part of cooperation besides regular and formal meetings. As an example, Oxford City Council organised a two-day event where the Council got together with CSOs as well as refugees, other public authorities and agencies such as the police, NHS, the social housing team from the Council, the Communities team, etc. to share their work with refugee families. The event was an exercise in involving refugees in the design of policies, to make the policies more effective and better tailored to the needs of people with lived experience.²⁹⁶

*'It is a start: trying to get agendas and policies from the bottom up not from all the people at the top.'*²⁹⁷

²⁹³ Multaka aimed to create volunteer opportunities (tour guides in Arabic) and work experience for migrants (including refugees) at museums, and to help their integration with the local community by sharing their knowledge, skills, history, and culture. This experience helped them to develop their English language skills, learn new skills, gain work experience, build confidence and go forward to find work. See Pitt Rivers Museum, 'Multaka-Oxford' <<https://www.prm.ox.ac.uk/multaka-oxford-0>> accessed 9 November 2020.

²⁹⁴ Interviewee 5 (3 August 2020)

²⁹⁵ Oxford City Council, 'Community Centres'.

²⁹⁶ Interviewee 3 (30 June 2020)

²⁹⁷ Ibid.

4.2.6. Domains of Cooperation

For the identification of domains of cooperation, fourteen domains which are listed in the Indicators of Integration Framework 2019 were proposed to the interviewees. It is established that the integration of refugees is a relatively new concept in Oxford City. There are currently two programmes running within the Oxford City Council that exclusively target integration: CMF and (S)VPRS. Within these programmes, the City Council cooperates mainly with four charities in the implementation of integration services. Main domains that fall under this cooperation are work, housing, communication (ESOL training), culture, and health and social care. Civil society fills in the gaps and covers other domains by themselves which are less prioritized by public policies such as: bonds, bridges, and links. There is no finding that these programmes use the Indicators of Integration Framework 2019 as an anchor in identifying the domains of integration and indicators to be included in their programmes.

As mentioned above, besides CMF and (S)VPRS, refugees are provided with issue-based support under a fragmented structure where the responsibilities are distributed among different departments. Further study is needed to identify whether these departments cooperate with civil society organisations in any of these fourteen domains.

4.2.7. Steps of the Policy-Making Cycle Where Cooperation Takes Place

In this study, the policy-making cycle is identified as a process involving six steps: agenda-setting, drafting of the policy, adoption of the policy, implementation/service provision, monitoring, evaluation of the policy. Cooperation between the City Council and the CSOs is more common at implementation step/service provision through the projects and service level agreements under CMF and (S)VPRS. Other steps of the policy-making cycle are City Council-dominated. However, civil society is involved in agenda-setting, drafting of the policy, monitoring, and evaluation to a certain extent. The City Council drafts a tender package under (S)VPRS. It is a broad statement, a broad agenda where the Council defines the domains it prioritises. Once the contractor is selected, then it has some involvement in how the priorities can be achieved, what works well, and what does not.

Bids under CMF are primarily written by the Council. This means that CSOs do not have a direct influence on the outputs, outcomes, targets, key performance indicators, etc., but they

have an input in the overall idea. These ideas can be raised on various platforms such as refugee assemblies organised either by the Council or the CSOs.

This study argues that the concentration of cooperation at the implementation step is the result of the lack of a formalized local integration policy. If there were a city-level integration strategy, the involvement of the CSOs in the whole policy-making cycle would be possible.

There are monitoring meetings in cooperation with the charities which have a contractual relationship with the City Council, within the context of (S)VPRS where parties monitor the wellbeing of those refugee families serviced under the (S)VPRS and discuss an exit strategy for them. However, there is not an overall monitoring, or evaluation of the integration process encompassing both resettled and recognised refugees.

4.2.8. Level of Cooperation

Information-sharing, dialogue and consultation best describe the levels of cooperation between the City Council and CSOs in the field of the integration of refugees. Information sharing, dialogue and consultation are initiated either by the City Council or by a CSO.

*'Oxford City Council comes to us or we go to them with proposals. This is what we call a two-way street.'*²⁹⁸

A true partnership has not been established yet. Partnership is accepted as more than a contractual relationship. Partnership, which is the highest form of cooperation, implies shared responsibilities and shared power in each step of the policy-making process mentioned below.²⁹⁹ However, in the current management of the policy-making cycle of the integration, CSOs have limited say over policy outcome. As the City Council remains the responsible body when it comes to spending public money, the Council has the final say on implemented projects. Furthermore, it is argued that 'the partnership needs to reflect sufficiently broad participation by staff in both agencies (public and nonprofit) to foster a high level of ownership and self-

²⁹⁸ Interviewee 5 (3 August 2020)

²⁹⁹ See footnote 54 CoE partnership definition is expanded by adding from Jo Blundell, 'Are we rallying together? Collaboration and public sector reform'

reliance.³⁰⁰ In the current case, it is established that the number of people involved in the integration policies of the Oxford City Council is small.

*'We can't honestly say we are a partnership because partnership is shared power. But that is not the case. City council will have always ultimate power because it is their money.'*³⁰¹

4.2.9. Monitoring of Cooperation

There are procedures to monitor the delivery of the projects and service level agreements through key performance indicators, but there is no finding of a monitoring mechanism and indicators exclusively focussing on the City Council's cooperation with CSOs which tracks what is working and what is not working. Projects are monitored and continuously evaluated but not the cooperation process in itself. In parallel, there is not an assigned conflict resolution mechanism between parties guaranteeing efficient functioning of cooperation. There is not a cost-benefit analysis of cooperation comparing the provision of services in-house by the City Council or by the CSOs in cooperation with the Council.

4.2.10. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Future Cooperation

The COVID-19 pandemic has changed the whole context and way of doing work all over the world. There will be repercussions of these changes in almost all policy fields, including integration and cooperation. The efforts for the integration of migrants and refugees may gain momentum in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic in many European countries.

*'The coronavirus crisis showed once again that migrants and refugees contribute in a crucial way to our societies. However, across Europe many still face challenges in finding accommodation or accessing employment, education, or healthcare. We need to step up our work on integration at EU level.'*³⁰²

³⁰⁰ Austin, 'The Changing Relationship Between Nonprofit Organizations and Public Social Service Agencies in the Era of Welfare Reform'.

³⁰¹ Interviewee 7 (17 August 2020)

³⁰² The EU Commission Commissioner for Home Affairs Ylva Johansson, 'Integration of migrants: Commission launches a public consultation and call for an expert group on the views of migrants (Press Release 22 July 2020)' <https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP_20_1364> accessed 22 August 2020.

This recognition is expected to accelerate the development of future integration policies. However, on the other hand, the COVID-19 pandemic period has slowed down the integration process as face-to-face dialogue and social contact - the facilitators of integration – have been put on hold during this period.

The COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in creating new needs and instruments to do work. For instance, in Oxford City, up until the COVID-19 pandemic, refugee families were receiving face-to-face support, including home visits to check whether they were well. They were joining English language classes physically. During the COVID-19 pandemic, these home visits and language classes have been carried out virtually. The refugees needed improvement of their digital literacy, online English language training, etc. Any future public-civil society cooperation agenda should consider these arising needs.

Many of the projects to be implemented under the CMF have been on hold due to the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the findings of the empirical study show that the COVID-19 pandemic has put extra pressures on the workload of both public officers and civil society staff who support refugees in Oxford City. For instance, one of the public officials explained that:

*'I became aware that the refugee families may not have had enough information about COVID-19 and its impact due to the language barrier. Therefore, I spent a lot of time translating documents, getting documents translated, making sure they are translated properly, and they meet the needs of all those families and forwarding that information to charities so they can share that with their refugees as well.'*³⁰³

There are contrasting ideas about future public-civil society relations after the COVID-19. A popular view on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on future relations is that public-civil society cooperation will get stronger for four reasons:

- 1- The role of civil society is acknowledged and appreciated by many people.

*'During the COVID-19 pandemic, public authorities see more how presence of civil society within the refugee community is strong. They keep providing services to the refugee communities.'*³⁰⁴

³⁰³ Interviewee 3 (30 June 2020)

³⁰⁴ Interviewee 6 (7 August 2020)

‘COVID-19 has changed a lot. The Council is now looking to change how we work. It is much more community focussed. So, the Council is looking at ways in which it can bring together community groups more.’³⁰⁵

- 2- Public authorities have become much more flexible in the way that they are working because they have fostered a number of changes during the COVID-19 pandemic. This means that lots of space presents itself for CSOs to influence public policies.

‘There is lots of space for influence. Which beforehand I would argue was not necessarily as easy within a Council.’³⁰⁶

- 3- New civil society actors have emerged, and the civil society ecosystem has broadened during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The number of potential civil society actors that public authorities can cooperate with has increased. This means that a need to establish links and communication channels with these newly arising community groups has arisen.

‘The COVID-19 pandemic has led to an amazing outpouring of volunteers in the city. New community groups have formed to support the community.’³⁰⁷

- 4- The strength of online platforms to reach more people was experienced and appreciated by many people.

The COVID-19 pandemic has changed the type of meeting and communication from face-to-face to online. The findings show that cooperation between public authorities and CSOs in the ongoing services has gone on as usual but has transferred to online platforms. Online platforms became the means of maintaining cooperation. Both public officers and civil society staff – even those who were not technology-minded before- said that they have embraced the fact that they have to use the online platform more than before and that they have got used to using it. Having virtual meetings means that more people can participate in discussions than before. There were various constraints (such as logistic ones) to handle an all-inclusive consultation process with a high number of CSOs as it is not possible to have a meeting with all organisations

³⁰⁵ Interviewee 2 (29 June 2020)

³⁰⁶ Ibid.

³⁰⁷ Interviewee 1 (11 June 2020)

in one place. However, the adaptation of both public authorities and CSOs to online platforms compulsorily may pave the way for engaging with a broader number of CSOs than ever in the future in the policy-making process. The crucial point here is that there still exists the digital divide not only in terms of access but also in terms of digital literacy. This digital gap should be addressed to enjoy the full benefit of the online means and tools in public-civil society cooperation.

*'...having virtual meetings means that more people can come and vote.'*³⁰⁸

Another view on the future of public-civil society cooperation argues that there is a risk of weakening cooperation. Financial constraints and difficulties of the COVID-19 pandemic imposed on both public authorities and civil society may weaken cooperation. Public funds are the main means and tools for cooperation. However, the COVID-19 pandemic has posed an unprecedented challenge to the public authorities' budgets and resulted in changes in their priorities. These challenges may cause a reduction in the budget devoted to integration and push integration policies into the background. This reduction, in turn, may decrease the pace of public-civil society cooperation in respect of the integration of refugees.

*'Local authorities' budgets have been affected quite dramatically because they had to spend thousands of thousand on housing homeless people during this period of COVID-19.'*³⁰⁹

*'Local authorities may not be able to provide as much as they had done in the past.'*³¹⁰

Similarly, the results of a survey carried out between 23 March – 12 May 2020 shows that 84% of charities reported a decrease in their total income due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The impact of coronavirus was expected to have a significant impact on charity finances for the year ahead.³¹¹

³⁰⁸ Interviewee 2 (29 June 2020)

³⁰⁹ Interviewee 7 (17 August 2020)

³¹⁰ Interviewee 7 (17 August 2020)

³¹¹ Charity Finance Group, 'Charities are facing a £12.4bn shortfall in income for the year due to impact of coronavirus (18 June 2020)' <<https://cfg.org.uk/12bnshort>> accessed 28 November 2020.

4.3. OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- ❖ Overall, public-civil society cooperation is concentrated on the implementation step/service provision. The role of civil society is limited in other steps of the policy-making cycle. The motivation for cooperation mainly arises from functionalist concerns based on the diverse needs of the population, lack of knowledge and expertise, and financial difficulties. The main domains of integration that fall under cooperation are work, housing, communication (ESOL training), culture, and health and social care. Information-sharing, dialogue and consultation best describe the levels of cooperation between the City Council and CSOs in the field of integration of refugees. A true partnership has not been established yet.

- ❖ The term “voluntary and community sector” has come to be used more commonly in the geographical ambit of this study rather than the term “civil society”. This study argues that the term “voluntary and community sector” puts more emphasis on the service delivery function of civil society than its advocacy role. It is believed that the use of the term “civil society” will pave the way for an understanding of civil society also as a campaigner and advocate in the policy-making process. This study prefers to use the term "civil society" because the term "civil society" is believed to be more indicative of both advocacy and service provider functions. In public-civil society cooperation, a holistic approach recognising the diverse roles, functions and purposes of the civil society should be adopted. Moreover, raising awareness of the different steps of the policy-making cycle and the different levels of cooperation may help to highlight the diverse roles of civil society and increase cooperation in other steps of the policy-making cycle.

- ❖ Oxford City Council has taken initiatives in respect of “public-civil society cooperation” without using that terminology. Instead, it is discussed under other terminologies, such as partnership, community engagement, community involvement, etc. Although the Council tries to increase community involvement and reach out to different organisations and community groups, and commissions the delivery of certain services, these are not done under the terminology of public-civil society “cooperation.”

- ❖ Public-civil society cooperation is embedded in Oxford City Council’s Corporate Plan and Code of Corporate Governance. However, to develop a more coherent approach to cooperation, public-civil society cooperation should be mainstreamed in all the principal documents of the Council, including the City Council’s Constitution, Local Plan. Furthermore, “cooperation” as the vision and value of the Council should encompass as many policy fields as possible, including integration policies. This understanding should be reflected in the main policy documents explicitly.
- ❖ Currently, service level agreements and bidding contracts where the City Council and CSOs agreed to fulfil a certain function at a certain price/cost are accepted as the main regulatory document of cooperation. This means that there are no umbrella guiding principles for cooperation. Underpinning principles, management structures, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms and indicators of successful cooperation should be identified, and a clear framework for cooperation should be set out in the planned Community Strategy for Oxford and accompanying policy papers. The national Compact, local Compacts and Civil Society Strategy 2018 can be used as guidance documents in the preparation of this Strategy.
- ❖ Within Oxford City Council there is no umbrella department/unit/person assigned to look at cooperation from a broad overall perspective. Monitoring of cooperation, and cost-benefit analysis of the cooperation are overlooked. A department/unit/person, responsible for public-civil society cooperation, identifying and coordinating opportunities for cooperation, would strengthen the existing cooperation environment and act as a monitoring, evaluation, and dispute resolution unit in respect of this cooperation. This umbrella structure might search for online means and tools, and tailor-made means and tools designed for specific policy fields, to increase cooperation. Financial means and tools supporting cooperation should be also developed.
- ❖ There are no findings of CSO’s own strategy regarding cooperation with public authorities. This study suggests that CSOs should also develop their own internal strategy and set out principles to guide them in their cooperation with public authorities. These strategies and principles would ensure civil society’s adherence to their identity, values, independence, autonomy, etc.

- ❖ Integration of refugees is a relatively new concept in Oxford City, as in many European cities. The main strengths of existing cooperation are a willingness to cooperate and to promote the integration of refugees by both parties. Political motivations matter in integration policies. Any change in political choice or political willingness to promote the integration of refugees and thereby to allocate resources to it will have repercussions on any existing cooperation.
- ❖ One of the weaknesses of the existing cooperation is that cooperation with civil society on integration issues is programme-based (SVPRS and CMF) rather than overall policy-based. Another weakness is the lack of centralisation within the Council. Integration services are fragmented and spread out over various departments. There is no umbrella department/unit/person overseeing how integration is dealt with, setting the indicators for integration, and monitoring and evaluating progress on integration. An umbrella structure might contribute both to the development of an overall approach on integration policies and to coordination among the various departments. Another weakness of current cooperation is the top-down approach in the decision-making process. A bottom-up approach can be developed by increasing the role of the CSOs in other steps of the policy-making cycle beyond just the implementation step.
- ❖ Challenges to existing cooperation are sustainable financial resources devoted to the integration policies; the strict and complicated rules in spending public money; and asymmetries in power between parties. As the public authorities finance the cooperation mechanism, they have the final say over policies to be implemented.
- ❖ CMF and (S)VPRS are the main means of public-civil society cooperation in respect of the integration of refugees. The regulatory and institutional frameworks of cooperation are mainly directed by the regulatory and institutional framework of these programmes. However, these two programmes do not cover overall integration domains but rather focus on specific fields such as housing, employment and employability, health, and language-learning. New cooperation mechanisms are needed to cover other domains.
- ❖ Since cooperation for the integration of refugees is primarily mainstreamed through CMF and (S)VPRS, this cooperation may not be sustainable if the City Council does not participate in the next rounds of schemes and funding. However, there already exists

a range of regulatory, institutional, financial, capacity-building means and tools that are established and utilised to interact with civil society. These means and tools would be a significant opportunity for sustainable cooperation if they were strengthened and utilised to this end. For instance, the City Council should include refugee-assisting CSOs in such existing partnership mechanisms as: the Oxford Strategic Partnership; Community Partnerships; Community Centres' Steering Committees, etc. There are also some issue-based cooperation platforms within the City where some of the refugee-assisting CSOs participate. However, there is limited knowledge of their agendas, selection of participants, meeting minutes, etc., as these are not publicly available. In this regard, there is a need to put further efforts into being fully adherent to the principles of cooperation such as clarity, openness, and transparency in respect of the management of cooperation and institutional set-up. A mapping study presenting current cooperation mechanisms on integration across the City Council would also help to take a snapshot of the existing situation, to facilitate better planning for the future.

- ❖ The development of a locally focused integration strategy for refugees and migrants and accompanying indicators for success, based on a cooperative approach, may strengthen public-civil society cooperation. HM Government's Integrated Communities Strategy 2018 and Indicators of Integration Framework 2019 can be used as a guidance document during the preparation of this Strategy and accompanying indicators.
- ❖ There is a lack of information on key statistics. Statistics on the number of refugees and the refugee-assisting CSOs in Oxford City are needed to identify (i) the size of the target group for integration and (ii) potential partners for cooperation in order to calculate needs and capacity assessments effectively.
- ❖ Findings show that resources are not the same for resettled and recognised refugees. "Resettled" refugees receive more integration support than "recognised" refugees. Integration support for resettled refugees is covered under a formalised structure with a dedicated budget. For instance, all the resettled refugees who come to Oxford via (S)VPRS receive a kind of orientation support regarding public services and social life. They receive support for improving their English language skills, employability, etc. Recognised refugees, on the other hand, manage to live without such support. Recognised refugees do not receive exclusive attention with regard to their integration.

Support for them is scattered. Recognised refugees may apply to the City Council on issue-based matters, and they may get support as part of category of people who have no recourse to public funds. This differentiation of opportunity bears a risk of animosity between these two groups of refugees.

- ❖ The position of Local Authority Asylum Support Liaison Officer is a government initiative designed to facilitate the integration of recognised refugees. Oxford City Council does not have one. The recruitment of an Asylum Support Liaison Officer may help to narrow the gap between resettled and recognised refugees.
- ❖ The findings of the study highlight the role of good personal relations, trust, and face-to-face dialogue between stakeholders in respect of cooperation. Public officers and civil society members trust each other and believe in each other's honesty in their relationships. This high-level of trust is grounded on past experiences and good personal relations and is based on constant communication and dialogue.³¹² In this regard, there is a risk of deterioration of cooperation in case of changes in the team members if good relations and trust cannot be built up with new people. Joint training, programmes, workshops, etc. that bring together public officers and civil society members can help avoid this risk and build good relations and identification of opportunities for future cooperation.

Last, but not least, cooperation in the integration of refugees can be defined as a “learning process” for both parties. They both learn from each other's experiences and adapt along the way. CSOs learn about the policy-making process and management of a policy. Both parties figure out each other's strengths and weaknesses with regard to the integration of refugees and evolve their cooperation accordingly. It is a two-way learning process. Public-civil society cooperation for the integration of refugees is a form of on-the-job training.

³¹² The literature also points out the role of trust among stakeholders in motivating shared responsibility. For further discussion on the role of trust and face-to-face dialogue see Ansell and Gash, 'Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice'.

CONCLUSION

This study explored the drivers, forms, principles, policies, means and tools of cooperation in general, and cooperation for the integration of refugees in particular. The questions raised in this study were: How do public authorities and civil society cooperate? What are the forms, pre-conditions, basic principles, policies, means and tools for public-civil society cooperation?

This study suggests that, although it is important to share best practices in order to learn from each other, there cannot be a one-size-fits-all way to public-civil society cooperation either across countries or across various institutions and policy fields within the same country because there are too many variables. Each cooperation experience is unique and requires to be developed by taking these variables into account. These variables include, but are not limited to, the competences of the public authorities, the roles and functions of civil society actors, their motivations, the legal environment for civil society in the country, political support for cooperation, the institutional setting for cooperation, human and financial resources devoted to cooperation, etc. Furthermore, from the civil society perspective, there may be some civil society actors with the capacity to cooperate but are not interested in cooperation, while conversely there may be others with lack of a capacity to cooperate but are interested in cooperation. From the public authorities' perspective, some civil society actors may not be accepted as eligible for cooperation due to their lack of capacity despite their willingness, or public authorities may be reluctant to cooperate due to political reasons with a group of civil society actors having capacities to cooperate. The latter approach breaches the principle of non-discrimination and inclusiveness in identifying potential partners for cooperation. This study suggests, in such a complex and multi-variable environment, that no single theory adequately describes drivers for public-civil society cooperation. Contrary to the studies considering public-civil society cooperation solely through the lens of the motivations and initiatives of public authorities, this study argues that civil society is not a passive partner in this relationship and that its motivations must not be discarded in studies focussing on public-civil society cooperation. Cooperation is achieved through the willingness and final decisions of both parties. In this regard, this study suggests that any proposed theoretical framework on public-civil society cooperation should be comprehensive, so to include civil society's incentives to cooperate. In parallel, not only public authorities but also civil society actors may initiate cooperation out of functional concerns or democratic concerns. Public authorities may initiate cooperation either to comply with legislation if the cooperation is mandatory or on its own

initiative, out of functional concerns or democratic concerns. While the theoretical framework of this study points out the functional concerns or democratic concerns for cooperation, the empirical part of this study reveals that cultural and political ethos should not be discarded as a driver for cooperation.

Public authorities and civil society may either cooperate within the policy-making cycle of a policy/strategy/law/regulation, or sporadically due to various reasons such as emergencies, efforts of the civil society to create an agenda that is not in the programme of the governments, etc. Cooperation is not a monolithic structure. Instead, as proposed by the CoE, it is multi-level. Levels of cooperation (information-sharing, consultation, dialogue, partnership) may differ across policy-fields, and across different stages of policy-making cycles (agenda-setting, drafting of the policy, adoption of the policy, implementation/provision of services, monitoring, evaluation).

In such a complex and multi-variable environment, both public authorities and civil society actors should be aware of each other's competences, capacities, and fields of interest. Moreover, they should be aware of the opportunities each step of policy-making cycles offers for cooperation, as well as the various levels of cooperation. In other words, they should know the venues for cooperation that exist and the forms of cooperation that they can develop. In this regard, this study suggests the *mapping* of the cooperation environment in the policy field in question in order to identify the existing situation (in a specific policy field), all potential parties to cooperate and their potential contributions, taking into account the policy-making cycles because, for instance, not every civil society actor provides services or has the capacity to monitor the outcomes. Either a public authority or a civil society organisation may lead this mapping study.

The mapping study should also include challenges to cooperation. This mapping study may also show the capacity improvement needs of civil society and necessary measures such as capacity-building training to address them. The civil society actors may not be aware of the effective entry points to make their contributions. In this regard, for civil society actors, identification of "*entry points*"³¹³ to the policy-making process will be helpful to identify the routes to involve in each step of the policy-making cycle. These routes might include institutional means and

³¹³ As an example, for entry-point mapping see, e.g., USAID Health Finance and Governance Project, 'Entry Point Mapping: A Tool to Promote Civil Society Engagement On Health Finance and Governance'.

tools such as partnership committees, working groups, steering committees, councils, etc., or online tools such as one-point consultations as in the case of the UK, or tailor-made means and tools as in the case of the integration of refugees in the pilot study. Without a mapping study, there is a risk that potential public authorities, and departments/units in authority, and civil society actors which may be able to cooperate may be left out of the consideration. Similarly, without an analysis of entry points for each step of the policy-making cycle, civil society organisations may overlook potential areas in which to cooperate and routes that they can enter.

Not denying the existence and contributions of sporadic cooperation to social good, this study suggests that sustainable, continuous, and efficient cooperation is possible through the institutionalisation of cooperation supported by governing principles, rules, and procedures. Additionally, the pilot study showed that trust and good relations between parties are as crucial as enabling regulatory and institutional frameworks for cooperation. For instance, public authorities trust in civil society's expertise and knowledge in a specific policy field. However, building trust is a lengthy process based on previous relations. Face-to-face dialogue contributes a lot to trust-building and good relations. In this regard, joint training, programmes, workshops, common spaces, etc. that bring together public officers and civil society members can help build good relations, trust, and identification of opportunities for cooperation. Mutual respect between civil society and public authorities by considering each other's roles and responsibilities is another important aspect of cooperation. For instance, civil society should recognise public authorities' accountability and statutory duties. Public authorities should recognise civil society as an independent actor that may have opposing views on policy debates.

There are several issues identified in this study that deserve attention in respect of future public-civil society cooperation for the integration of refugees. Firstly, to ensure a coherent and sustainable approach, "public-civil society cooperation" should be mainstreamed in all relevant policy documents, including sector specific ones, and a clear framework for cooperation should be set out. Integration measures should also be mainstreamed in all relevant policy portfolios. The necessary means and tools for cooperation should be developed, including tailor-made ones for integration. These means and tools should not be dominated by public authorities' perspective, but rather they should be developed by considering the perspectives of both public authorities and civil society. This study suggests that civil society organisations should also develop their own internal strategy and set out principles that guide them during their cooperation with public authorities. Secondly, to fully realise the potential for cooperation, the

cooperation approach should be embedded not only in the service provision step but in all steps of the policy-making cycle. Thirdly, success indicators for both “cooperation” in itself, and for the “integration of refugees” should be developed. Fourthly, particular attention should be paid to broaden the cooperation landscape, ensuring the inclusion of both recognised and resettled refugees into the target group. Cooperation should also involve refugee-led civil society organisations to better address the needs on the ground. Finally, there should be a higher structure/umbrella structure, responsible for monitoring, evaluating, and reformulating the cooperation and resolving disputes among the parties.

In conclusion, it is worth noting that the COVID-19 pandemic’s uncertainties illustrate that the future context in which public, private and civil society sectors operate might be significantly different from the current context. This shift in the context might have both threats and opportunities for future cooperation. Threats arise from shrinking public budgets that can be devoted to integration policies. Opportunities arise from raised awareness of the role of civil society in tackling social problems, increasing flexibility in the way of dealing with public authorities, broadening the civil society ecosystem, together with raising awareness about online platforms and their ability to reach more people.

Recommendations for future academic studies:

- ❖ Because of this variety of terminology and the contested nature of the terms, in any similar study it is recommended that concepts (for instance, civil society) and their scope (for instance whether faith groups, universities, etc. included in the definition or not) should be clarified.

- ❖ Integration processes involve a range of different services within the competence of a range of public authorities or a range of departments within the same public authority/agency. The public authority in this investigation is limited to the Oxford City Council due to the constraints mentioned in the Methodology section. For this reason, this study does not claim to have all the answers in respect of the cooperation landscape in Oxford City. In similar studies that do not have similar constraints, other public authorities/agencies/institutions/community hubs such as the County Council, the NHS, police, Colleges, Community Centres, museums, libraries are recommended to be included

in the case study, in order to take a wider picture of the cooperation in the fourteen domains of integration referred in this study.

- ❖ Community hubs such as museums, community centres, and libraries have great potential to support the integration of refugees, not only by offering physical space for gatherings and social interaction, etc. but also for their potential to lead integration through various projects and programmes. This study suggests that it is worth conducting specific research on possibilities for cooperation between public authorities, civil society organisations and community hubs in supporting the integration of refugees in the City.

- ❖ Comparative studies deepen the understanding of the different forms, means and tools of cooperation in different national and local contexts. A comparative study is recommended to compare forms, means and tools of cooperation in different cities hosting significantly different numbers of refugees to see whether the size of the target group has a significant impact on the cooperation set-up.³¹⁴

³¹⁴ For instance, in Turkey there are cities hosting more than 300.000 refugees. This number is bigger than the total number of refugees hosted by many European countries. See UNHCR, 'Turkey Fact Sheet (July 2019)' <<https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/71061.pdf>> accessed 4 December 2020.

APPENDIX 1 - Interview Templates - Questions

(In each question, guidance is given in respect of the terms, concepts, and terminology, if needed)

1. Could you please introduce yourself and your organisation?
2. How many refugees (resettled and recognised) live in Oxford City currently? How many refugees have been supported in the last five years by your organisation?
3. How many civil society actors serve in Oxford City? How many of them deal with the integration of refugees?
4. Which forms of cooperation (information sharing, consultation, dialogue, partnership) best describe your cooperation with civil society in Oxford City in the field of integration of refugees? (the question is for key informants from the City Council)

Which forms of cooperation (information sharing, consultation, dialogue, partnership) best describe your cooperation with the City Council in Oxford City in the field of the integration of refugees? (the question is for key informants from civil society)

5. In which steps of the policy-making cycle of integration of refugees, cooperation exists? (1-Agenda setting 2-Drafting of the policy 3-Adoption of the policy 4-Implementation/service provision 5-Monitoring 6-Evaluation)
6. In which domains of integration (work, housing, education, health and social care, leisure, bonds, bridges, links, communications, culture, digital skill, safety, stability, rights and responsibilities) cooperation exists?
7. Which civil society actors has your organisation cooperated with for the integration of refugees in Oxford City? Are there any other public authorities/public agencies than the City Council that cooperates with civil society for the integration of refugees in Oxford City?
8. What are the drivers for your organisation to cooperate with civil society? (the question is for key informants from the City Council)

What are the drivers for your organisation to cooperate with public authorities/agencies? (the question is for key informants from civil society)

9. What are the key regulatory frameworks (law, regulation, compact, strategy, policy, code of conduct, etc.) that public-civil society cooperation in Oxford City is based on? Does your organisation have a policy document promoting cooperation?
10. What is the key institutional framework (contact person/unit/department, committees, working groups, etc.) and the highest body facilitating public-civil society cooperation in Oxford City? Does your organisation have a dedicated unit responsible for cooperation?

11. In addition to the regulatory and institutional means and tools, what other means and tools were developed (online, financial, capacity building, etc.) for public-civil society cooperation in Oxford City?
12. How is existing cooperation structured and how does it function?
13. What are the strengths and weaknesses of existing cooperation?
14. What are the challenges affecting public-civil society cooperation on integration policies in Oxford City?
15. Is there a monitoring mechanism and success indicators for cooperation?
16. How may the COVID-19 pandemic affect the future of public-civil society cooperation?
17. Is there anything else you would like to add?

APPENDIX 2 - Ethical Documentation

A) E-mail Template



.../...../..... (Date)

Name of organisation

Dear

My name is Duygu YARDIMCI, and I'm currently conducting a postgraduate research project as a part of my LLM by Research degree in the Oxford Brookes University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, School of Law.

My research aims at exploring the drivers, basic principles, policies, forms, and mechanisms for the public-civil society cooperation and its contribution to the integration of refugees. A Participant Information Sheet giving more information about the research is attached.

Within the context of this research, I am interested in potential participants from public institutions and civil society organisations based in Oxfordshire that are either:

- 1- already involved in any structure within the context of public-civil society cooperation/strategic partnership/collaboration and/or management of refugee and asylum seeker policies, social integration policies
- or
- 2- having the potential to contribute to the integration policies

In this context, I am writing to request your assistance in recruiting participants from for a 40 minutes interview to get their valuable contributions.

You can assist me either by allowing me to access the contact information of the relevant persons or sharing my contact information and attached documents with relevant persons, so they contact me if they are interested in participating.

Interviews with semi-structured questions will last up to 40 minutes. **Skype interview will be used as a face-to-face interview is not possible due to COVID-19.** Skype interviews will be arranged for a time of the participant's convenience. Questions will aim at exploring drivers for public-civil society cooperation, forms of cooperation, means and tools developed for effective cooperation, strength and weaknesses of cooperation in the targeted policy field (integration of refugees).

Participation is voluntary and that participants are free to withdraw at any time, without giving a reason. Please find attached the relevant Consent Form. Confidentiality, privacy, and anonymity of data of the participants will be ensured. The result of the research will be included

as an output in the LLM by Research thesis. The findings of the research will be summarized in a research paper and will be available to all participants upon an e-mail request.

If this is possible, please could you e-mail me at (xxxxx) to confirm that you are willing to allow access to the participants from providing they agree to take part in or share my contact information and attached documents with potential participants.

I hope that you find the research study of interest and will be interested in assisting with it. Please feel free to contact me if you have any queries. Alternatively, you may wish to contact my supervisor, [Dr Sonia Morano-Foadi, Director of Studies, Reader in Law, School of Law, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Oxford Brookes University, Director of Postgraduate Research Students, E-mail: xxxxx, Phone number: xxxxx) if you would like a reference or other information.

Many thanks for taking the time to read this, and I hope to hear from you soon.

Yours sincerely,

Duygu YARDIMCI
LLM by Research Student
School of Law, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Oxford Brookes University
e-mail: xxx
Phone: xxx

ANNEXES

- 1- Participant Information Sheet
- 2- Consent Form

B) Participant Information Sheet



AN INVESTIGATION OF THE DRIVERS, PRINCIPLES, POLICIES, FORMS AND MECHANISMS FOR EFFECTIVE PUBLIC AUTHORITIES-CIVIL SOCIETY COOPERATION

Dear Participant,

You are being invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide whether to take part, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take the time to read the following information carefully.

What is the purpose of the study?

The relationship between the public authorities and civil society has increasingly gained importance especially due to the growing understanding that complex challenges, such as climate change, poverty, immigration, most recently pandemics, etc. facing society in the globalised world cannot be solved by the state alone. The literature review shows that many studies have been undertaken to set a theoretical ground for the public authorities and the civil society cooperation. What is missing in the literature is that “how is public-civil society cooperation realised in practice? What are the tools, mechanisms, strength and weaknesses of the cooperation? In other words, the information regarding the practical aspect of the cooperation is missing. This research aims to explore these practical aspects of public-civil society cooperation.

Why have I been invited to participate?

You are invited to the interview due to your experience in at least one of these: civil society organisation, public institution, public-civil society cooperation, integration policies, refugee policies, partnership development. Your perspective of the **role of public-civil society cooperation** for refugees’ integration, and your personal experiences regarding drivers, strengths and weaknesses of existing cooperation is very valuable for this research to assess public-civil society cooperation as a useful policy instrument for integration or not.

Do I have to take part?

It is up to you to decide whether to take part in this research study. If you decide to take part, you will be given this information sheet along with a privacy notice that will explain how your data will be collected and used and be asked to give your consent. If you decide to take part, you are still free to withdraw at any time up to the analysis of the data and without giving a reason.

What will happen to me if I take part?

You will participate in a confidential and anonymous, semi-structured interview session lasting around 40 minutes. This will be arranged for a time and date of your convenience. A Skype interview will be used as a face-to-face interview is not possible due to COVID-19.

The interview session will be conducted in two sections. First, you will be asked questions about your current role, position, and experience in civil society organisations and/or public institutions. Then, secondly, you will be asked questions exploring drivers for public-civil society cooperation, challenges for public-civil society cooperation, existing forms of cooperation, means and tools developed to cooperate, strengths and weaknesses of existing cooperation in the integration of refugees.

With your consent, taken through the consent form, the interviews will be audio-recorded and transcribed for the purposes of enhancing the accuracy of the qualitative analysis of the data. The transcription will be sent back to you for feedback. This process allows you to ensure that the meaning of what you are trying to say is conveyed in the transcription. It allows you to reconsider what you have said and to add and/or delete any information. With your permission, I may also include some anonymised quotes in the publications.

Possible disadvantages and risks of taking part in the research.

Possible disadvantages and risks of taking part in the research are expected to be minimal. Any potential risk would be related to the identification of the participant. However, confidentiality, privacy and anonymity are an utmost priority of this research as explained below.

The time of the participants taken for the interview is a disadvantage of the research.

What are the possible benefits of taking part?

The participant will be an important contributor to the literature by furthering our understanding of the topic. But also, taking part in the research is a learning practice for the participant, which in turn will contribute to their professional career. Moreover, the participant will have the opportunity to obtain the findings of the research. The findings of the research may contribute to the development of new policies and practices that the participant will benefit from in the long run.

Will what I say in this study be kept confidential?

All information collected about the participant will be kept strictly confidential. Your interview responses will be confidential (subject to legal limitations). Any personal, identifying information provided by the participant will be separated from the data during the collection of data. Notes and recordings will be anonymised and stored within an encrypted folder, accessible only to the researcher Duygu YARDIMCI. Access to the data will be granted to only those who are authorised and have a "need to know". Ensuring confidentiality, privacy, and anonymity of data of the participants are of utmost importance for the researcher. Your responses and identity will not be discussed with any fellow interviewees. To protect anonymity pseudonyms and codes, such as civil society member A, public authority staff B will be used. In cases where anonymity cannot be assured for any reason, the participant will be informed.

Research data will always be kept securely. Data will be stored on a personal laptop protected by passwords, firewalls, anti-virus software, encryption and other measures that protect data from unauthorised individuals, loss, theft, or modification. If the data is not stored on a personal laptop, it will be stored on Google Drive, for which the University has a security agreement. Devices and paper documents will be protected from misuse or theft by storing them in locked areas. Devices or sensitive documents will never be left unattended in public locations.

The data generated during the research will be kept securely in electronic form till I graduate, hopefully by the end of 2021 at latest, unless the supervisory team considers there is an advantage to storing it for longer. When data is no longer necessary for University-related purposes, it will be disposed of/erased appropriately, so that their previous contents cannot be recovered and misused.

What should I do if I want to take part?

In order to participate in this study, you will need to take time to read this participant information sheet completely, sign the consent form and share it with researcher Duygu YARDIMCI via e-mail (XXX) no later than 30 May 2020.

What will happen to the results of the research study?

The result of the research will be included as an output in the LLM by Research thesis. The findings of the research will be summarised in a research paper and will be available to all participants upon an e-mail request.

Who is organising and funding the research?

I am conducting the research as a postgraduate student at Oxford Brookes University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, School of Law. My sponsor, covering my tuition fees and living expenses during my study at Oxford Brookes University for one year, is the Jean Monnet Scholarship Programme, which is funded by the EU. I was awarded the Jean Monnet Scholarship at the end of a very competitive selection process applied for by 1500 candidates. (From 1500 candidates 180 scholars were awarded the scholarship.)

Who has reviewed the study?

The research has been approved by the University Research Ethics Committee, Oxford Brookes University.

As a reminder, if you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at the contact details provided below. Alternatively, you may wish to contact my supervisor, Dr Sonia Morano-Foadi (Director of Studies, Reader in Law, School of Law, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Oxford Brookes University, Director of Postgraduate Research Students, E-mail: XXXX, Phone number: XXX). Furthermore, if you have any concerns about the way in which the study has been conducted, you can contact the Chair of the University Research Ethics Committee on ethics@brookes.ac.uk.

Thank you for taking the time to read the information sheet and I hope to speak with you soon!

Yours sincerely,

Duygu YARDIMCI
LLM by Research Student
School of Law
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Oxford Brookes University
e-mail: XXX
Phone: XXX

C) Consent Form



CONSENT FORM

Full title of Project: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE DRIVERS, PRINCIPLES, POLICIES, FORMS, AND MECHANISMS FOR EFFECTIVE PUBLIC AUTHORITIES-CIVIL SOCIETY COOPERATION

Name, position and contact details of the researcher and supervisory team:

Researcher:

Duygu Yardimci

LLM by Research Student

School of Law

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Oxford Brookes University

e-mail: xxx

Phone: xxx

Supervisory team:

Dr Sonia Morano-Foadi (Director of Studies)

Reader in Law, School of Law, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Oxford Brookes University

Director of Postgraduate Research Students

E-mail: xxx

Phone number: xxxx

Law school: xxx

<http://www.law.brookes.ac.uk/>

Professor Peter W Edge (Second Supervisor)

Professor of Law, School of Law, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Oxford Brookes University

E-mail: xxxx

Phone number: xxx

Law school: xxx

<http://www.law.brookes.ac.uk>

Please initial box

- 1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.
- 2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving reason.
- 3. I agree to take part in the above study.

Please initial box

- 4. I understand that the interview will be audio-recorded

Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 5. I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------

Name of Participant	Date	Signature
Name of Researcher	Date	Signature

D) Privacy Notice



Privacy notice for research participants

This privacy notice provides information on how Oxford Brookes University collects and uses your personal information when you take part in one of our research projects. Please refer to the research participant information sheet for further details about the study and what information will be collected about you and how it will be used.

Oxford Brookes University (OBU) will usually be the Data Controller of any data that you supply for this research. This means that we are responsible for looking after your information and using it properly. The exception to this is joint research projects where you would be informed on the participant information sheet as to the other partner institution or institutions. This means that they will make the decisions on how your data is used and for what reasons. You can contact the University's Information Management Team on 01865 485420 or email info.sec@brookes.ac.uk.

Why do we need your data?

Your data is needed for a research study aiming at:

- (1) An exploration of the drivers and basic principles setting the ground for public-civil society cooperation
- (2) An exploration of policies and forms of cooperation
- (3) An exploration of mechanisms for developing effective public-civil society cooperation

OBU's legal basis for collecting this data is:

- You are consenting to provide it to us; and/or,
- Processing is necessary for the performance of a task in the public interest such as research.

What type of data will Oxford Brookes University use?

Personal identifying data will not be used. Pseudonyms will be used.

Data gathered from interviewees' comments about:

- drivers for civil society to cooperate with public authorities
- strengths and weaknesses of civil society affecting the decision to cooperate with public institutions
- drivers for public authorities to cooperate with civil society
- strengths and weaknesses of public authorities affecting the decision to cooperate with civil society
- the most important elements/basic principles in terms of the relationship between civil society and public institutions

- opportunities for public-civil society cooperation
- challenges for public-civil society cooperation
- role of public-civil society cooperation in fostering integration of refugees
- existing forms of cooperation
- means and tools developed to ensure public-civil society cooperation
- strength and weaknesses of existing cooperation

Who will OBU share your data with?

Data may be stored in the google drive for which the university has an agreement with Google.

Will OBU transfer my data outside of the UK?

No

What rights do I have regarding my data that OBU holds?

- You have the right to be informed about what data will be collected and how this will be used.
- You have the right of access to your data.
- You have the right to correct data if it is wrong.
- You have the right to ask for your data to be deleted.
- You have the right to restrict the use of the data we hold about you.
- You have the right to data portability.
- You have the right to object to the university using your data.
- You have rights in relation to using your data in automated decision making and profiling.

Where did OBU source my data from?

Data regarding the contact information for the participants may come from:

- 1- interviews provided by other participants,
- 2- gatekeepers,
- 3- websites of the organisations itself,
- 4- websites of the potential recruitment platforms and venues,

Are there any consequences of not providing the requested data?

There are no consequences of not providing data for this research. It is purely voluntary.

Will there be any automated decision-making using my data?

There will be no use of automated decision-making in the scope of UK Data Protection and Privacy Legislation.

How long will OBU keep your data?

The data generated in the course of the research will be kept securely in electronic form till the student graduates, hopefully by the end of 2021 at latest, unless the supervisory team considers there is an advantage to storing it for longer.

Who can I contact if I have concerns?

In the event of any questions about the research study, please contact the researcher in the first instance (contact details in the study participant information sheet). If you have any concerns about the way in which the study has been conducted, contact the Chair of the University Research Ethics Committee at ethics@brookes.ac.uk. For further details about information security contact the Data Protection Officer at: brookesdpo@brookes.ac.uk or the Information Management team on info.sec@brookes.ac.uk

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AbouAssi K and others, 'Use and Perceptions of the Availability of Local Government and Nonprofit Services in Diverse Urban Settings' (2019) 48 *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* pp975
- Addink H and Addink H, *Good Governance: Concept and Context* (Oxford University Press 2019)
- Ager A and Strang A, *Indicators of Integration: final report (Development and Practice Report 28)* (Home Office 2004)
<<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110218141321/http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/dpr28.pdf>> accessed 23 September 2020
- Ager A and Strang A, 'Understanding Integration: A Conceptual Framework' (2008) 21 *Journal of Refugee Studies* 166
- Akman K, 'Local Governments and NGO Cooperation in Migration Management' (2018) 1 *Uluslararası Yönetim Akademisi Dergisi* 452
- Alam K and Imran S, 'The digital divide and social inclusion among refugee migrants' (2015) 28 *Information Technology & People* 344
- Alcock P, 'From Partnership to the Big Society: The Third Sector Policy Regime in the UK' (2016) 7 *Nonprofit Policy Forum* 95
- Ansell C and Gash A, 'Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice' (2008) 18 *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 543
- Austin MJ, 'The Changing Relationship Between Nonprofit Organisations and Public Social Service Agencies in the Era of Welfare Reform' (2003) 32 *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 97
- Bădescu M and Bădescu A, 'The Origin and Evolution of Civil Society' (2018) IV *Journal of Law and Public Administration* 27
- Bator FM, 'The Anatomy of Market Failure' (1958) 72 *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 351
- Bennett JT, *To profit or not to profit: The commercial transformation of the nonprofit sector*, edited by Weisbrod, B.A. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998, XII+340 pp., cloth (1999)
- Benoit F, *Public Policy Models and Their Usefulness in Public Health: The Stages Model* (2013)
- Bevir M, *Key concepts in governance* (SAGE Publications Ltd 2008)
- Bode I and Brandsen T, 'State-third Sector Partnerships: A short overview of key issues in the debate' (2014) 16 *Public Management Review: Government-third Sector Partnerships: Evidence and Cross-national Comparisons* 1055

- Bolt D, *An inspection of UK Refugee Resettlement Schemes (November 2019 – May 2020)* (2020) <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/933956/An_inspection_of_UK_Refugee_Resettlement_Schemes.pdf> accessed 1 October 2020
- Brisbois MC, 'Natural resource industries and the state in collaborative approaches to water governance: a power-based analysis' (PhD Thesis, University of Waterloo 2015)
- Broadhead J, 'Inclusive Cities Inclusive practices for newcomers at city level and examples of innovation from overseas' (Compas, 2017) <<https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Inclusive-Cities-Background-Paper-Oct-2017-FINAL.pdf>> accessed 6 October 2020
- Cantle T, 'About Community Cohesion' <<http://tedcantle.co.uk/about-community-cohesion/#bcc>> accessed 18 July 2020
- Carling J, 'What is the meaning of migrant?' <<https://meaningofmigrants.org/>> accessed 17 July 2020
- Charity Finance Group, 'Charities are facing a £12.4bn shortfall in income for the year due to impact of coronavirus (18 June 2020)' <<https://cfg.org.uk/12bnshort>> accessed 28 November 2020
- CIVICUS, 'Civic Freedoms and the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Snapshot of Restrictions and Attacks ' (2020) <<https://monitor.civicus.org/COVID19/>> accessed 22 June 2020
- CIVICUS, 'State of Civil Society Report 2020' (2020) <https://www.civicus.org/documents/reports-and-publications/SOCS/2020/SOCS2020_Executive_Summary_en.pdf> accessed 29 May 2020
- City of Sanctuary UK <<https://cityofsanctuary.org/>> accessed 18 November 2020
- Clegg S and Haugaard M, *The SAGE handbook of power* (Handbook of power, SAGE 2009)
- Cohen JL and Arato A, *Civil society and political theory* (Studies in contemporary German social thought, MIT Press 1992)
- Collyer M and others, 'A long-term commitment: integration of resettled refugees in the UK' (University of Sussex 2018) <<https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=4375-resettled-refugees-report-web.pdf&site=252>> accessed 2 October 2020
- Commission on Dormant Assets, 'Tackling dormant assets Recommendations to benefit investors and society'(2017) <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/596228/Tackling_dormant_assets_-_recommendations_to_benefit_investors_and_society__1_.pdf> accessed 1 November 2020
- Community Integration Awards <<https://www.integrationawards.uk/>> accessed 3 November 2020
- Community Organisers <<https://www.corganisers.org.uk/>> accessed 7 September 2020

- Compact Voice (2016) <<http://www.compactvoice.org.uk/about-compact/short-history-compact>> accessed 22 September 2020
- Coston JM, 'A Model and Typology of Government-NGO Relationships' (1998) 27 *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 358
- Council of the European Union Justice and Home Affairs Council, 'The Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy' (2004) <https://www.eesc.europa.eu/resources/docs/common-basic-principles_en.pdf> accessed 20 July 2020
- Council of Europe, '12 Principles of Good Governance' (2008) <<https://www.coe.int/en/web/good-governance/12-principles>> accessed 29 March 2020
- Council of Europe Conference of INGOs, 'Code of Good Practice for Civil Participation in the Decision-making Process' (Adopted by the Conference of INGOs at its meeting on 1st October 2009, CONF/PLE(2009)CODE1 2009)
- Council of Europe European Committee on Local and Regional Democracy, 'Strategy for Innovation and Good Governance at Local Level' Strasbourg, 6 September 2011, CDLR(2011)37' (2011)
- Council of Europe Co-operation Group to Combat Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking in Drug, 'Government interaction with Civil Society: Policy paper on government interaction with civil society on drug policy issues: Principles, ways and means, opportunities and challenges' (Adopted at the 79th meeting of the Permanent Correspondents of the Pompidou Group, P-PG (2015) 4 Final <<https://rm.coe.int/government-interaction-with-civil-society-policy-paper-on-government-i/168075b9d9>> accessed 28 April 2020 2015)
- Council of Europe Committee of Ministers, 'Guidelines for civil participation in political decision making' (Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 27 September 2017 at the 1295th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies, CM(2017)83-final 2017)
- Council of Europe Conference of INGOs, 'Code of Good Practice for Civil Participation in the Decision-making Process Revised' (Adopted by the Conference of INGOs on 30 October 2019)
- Council of Europe, 'Human Rights Handbook for Local and Regional Authorities Vol.1 ' (2019) <<https://rm.coe.int/the-congress-human-rights-handbook-vol-1-en/168098b094>> accessed 25 July 2020
- Council of Europe Congress of Local and Regional Authorities, 'Migration and Integration' (2020) <<https://www.coe.int/en/web/congress/migration-and-integration>> accessed 1 September 2020
- Craig G, Taylor M and Parkes T, 'Protest or Partnership? The Voluntary and Community Sectors in the Policy Process' (2004) 38 *Social Policy & Administration* 221
- Denzin NK and Lincoln YS, *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (Handbook of qualitative research, Fifth edn, Sage 2018)
- DeWiel B, 'A Conceptual History of Civil Society: From Greek Beginnings to the End of Marx' (1997) Vol. 6 *Past Imperfect* 3

East of England Strategic Partnership for Migration <<https://smp.eelga.gov.uk/>> accessed 27 September 2020

Edwards M and Ehrenberg J, *The History of Civil Society Ideas* (Oxford University Press 2012)

Equality Act 2010 <<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents>> accessed 18 July 2020

Equality and Diversity Forum, 'Refugees, Migrants and the Equality Act 2010 A Briefing for Refugee and Migrant Community Organisations,' (2011) <https://www.equallyours.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/EDF-Briefing_Community-Organisations_Web_draft-3.pdf> accessed 23 September 2020

European Commission, 'European Governance - A White Paper' (Communication) COM(2001) 428 final - Official Journal C 287 of 12.10.2001

European Commission, 'Immigration, Integration and Employment' (Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Brussels, 3.6.2003) COM (2003) 336 final. (2003)

European Commission, 'Empowering Local Authorities in Partner Countries for Enhanced Governance and More Effective Development Outcomes' (Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions) COM (2013) 280 final

European Commission, 'Using EU Indicators of Immigrant Integration' (2013) <https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/e-library/documents/policies/legal-migration/general/docs/final_report_on_using_eu_indicators_of_immigrant_integration_june_2013_en.pdf> accessed 11 September 2020

European Commission, 'Promoting Good Governance - European Social Fund thematic paper' (2014) <[file:///C:/Users/Duygu/Downloads/esf_technicalpaper_good_governance_en%20\(2\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/Duygu/Downloads/esf_technicalpaper_good_governance_en%20(2).pdf)> accessed 28 July 2020

European Commission, 'Action Plan on the Integration of Third Country Nationals' (Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions) COM(2016) 377 final, (2016)

European Commission, 'Special Eurobarometer 477 – Wave EB90.1 – Kantar Public, Democracy and Elections' (2018) <file:///C:/Users/Duygu/Downloads/ebs_477_sum_en.pdf> accessed 28 March 2020

European Commission, 'Local and Regional Integration Practices' (2020) <<https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/country/stories>> accessed 4 September 2020

European Commission, 'European Web Site on Integration' (2020) <<https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/network/european-integration-network-2>> accessed 4 September 2020

- European Commission DG NEAR, 'Guidelines for EU Support to Civil Society in Enlargement Countries, 2014-2020' <https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhoodenlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/civil_society/doc_guidelines_cs_support.pdf> accessed 28 April 2020
- European Commission, 'The EC Reveals Its New EU Action Plan on Integration and Inclusion (2021-2027)' (2020) <<https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/news/the-ec-presents-its-eu-action-plan-on-integration-and-inclusion-2021-2027>> accessed 6 December 2020
- European Commission EUROSTAT, 'Migrant Integration' <<https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/migrant-integration/data>> accessed 27 August 2020
- European Commission, 'Action Plan: Partnership on Inclusion of Migrants and Refugees' <https://ec.europa.eu/futurium/en/system/files/ged/action_plan_inclusion_of_migrants_and_refugees.pdf> accessed 21 September 2020
- European Council on Refugees and Exiles, 'Position on the Integration of Refugees in Europe' (1999) <<https://www.refworld.org/docid/3df4d3874.html>> accessed 7 October 2020
- European Economic and Social Committee, 'Civil Society Against COVID-19' (2020) <<https://www.eesc.europa.eu/en/initiatives/civil-society-against-covid-19>> accessed 9 December 2020
- European Union Capacity4Dev Public Group on Civil Society, 'Roadmaps' <<https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/public-governance-civilsociety/wiki/roadmaps>> accessed 3 April 2020
- European Union, Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community [2007] OJ C306/01
- Feischmidt M (ed), Pries L (ed), and Cantat C (ed), *'Refugee Protection and Civil Society in Europe'* (Palgrave Macmillan; 1st ed. 2019)
- Finke B, *Civil society participation in EU governance* (SUB Hamburg Carl von Ossietzky 2011)
- Foucault M and Gordon C, *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977* (Power-knowledge, Harvester Wheatsheaf 1980)
- Giddens A, *The third way: the renewal of social democracy* (Polity Press 1998)
- Giving Tuesday <<https://www.givingtuesday.org.uk/>> accessed 4 September 2020
- Greater London Authority, *The Mayor's Strategy For Social Integration* (2018) <https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/final_social_integration_strategy.pdf> accessed 13 September 2020
- Greenwood J, 'Organized Civil Society and Democratic Legitimacy in the European Union' (2007) 37 *British Journal of Political Science* 333

Gronbjerg KA, 'Patterns of Institutional Relations in the Welfare State: Public Mandates and the Nonprofit Sector' (1987) 16 Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 64

HM Government Cabinet Office, 'The Compact on Relations Between Government and the Voluntary and Community Sector in England' (1998) <http://www.compactvoice.org.uk/sites/default/files/compact_1998.pdf> accessed 3 February 2020

HM Government Cabinet Office Office, 'The Compact on Relations Between Government and the Third Sector in England' (2009) <http://www.compactvoice.org.uk/sites/default/files/the_compact_2009.pdf> accessed 3 February 2020

HM Government Cabinet Office, 'The Compact' (2010) <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/61169/The_20Compact.pdf> accessed 27 January 2020

HM Government Cabinet Office, 'Guidance on Devolution' (2013) <<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/guidance-on-devolution>> accessed 4 October 2020

HM Government Cabinet Office, 'Civil Society Strategy: Building a Future that Works for Everyone'(2018) <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/732765/Civil_Society_Strategy_-_building_a_future_that_works_for_everyone.pdf> accessed 30 October 2020

HM Government Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport, 'Libraries Deliver: Ambition for Public Libraries in England 2016-2021' (2016) <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/579207/Libraries_Deliver_-_Ambition_for_Public_Libraries_in_England_2016_to_2021_accessible_version.pdf> accessed 13 November 2020

HM Government Department for Digital Culture Media & Sport, 'A Connected Society a Strategy for Tackling Loneliness – Laying the Foundations for Change' (2018) <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/936725/6.4882_DCMS_Loneliness_Strategy_web_Update_V2.pdf> accessed 30 October 2020

HM Government Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government, 'Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper' (2018) <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/777160/Integrated_Communities_Strategy_Government_Response.pdf> accessed 20 September 2020

HM Government Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government, 'Integrated Communities Innovation Fund' (2018) <<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/integrated-communities-innovation-fund>> accessed 18 November 2020

HM Revenue & Customs, 'National Statistics Table 2 - UK Charities: Tax Reliefs (last updated 27 June 2019)' (<<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/cost-of-tax-relief>> accessed 3 September 2020)

Home Office, 'Community Sponsorship Scheme Launched for Refugees in the UK' (2016) <<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/community-sponsorship-scheme-launched-for-refugees-in-the-uk>> accessed 28 August 2020

Home Office, 'Controlling Migration Fund: prospectus (last updated 10 September 2018)' <<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/controlling-migration-fund-prospectus>> accessed 6 May 2020

Home Office, 'Indicators of Integration (third edition)' (2019) <<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/home-office-indicators-of-integration-framework-2019>>

Home Office National Statistics, 'How many people do we grant asylum or protection to? (published 21 May 2020)' <<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/immigration-statistics-year-ending-march-2020/how-many-people-do-we-grant-asylum-or-protection-to>> accessed 30 September 2020

Howlett DPSM and others, *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems* (Oxford University Press 1995)

ICNL, 'Models to Promote Cooperation between Civil Society and Public Authorities' (2013) <<https://www.icnl.org/post/assessment-and-monitoring/models-to-promote-cooperation-between-civil-society-and-public-authorities>> accessed 30 March 2020

Institute for Government, 'Local Government Funding in England (March 10, 2020)' <<https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/explainers/local-government-funding-england>> accessed 6 November 2020

Interviewee 1 (11 June 2020)

Interviewee 2 (29 June 2020)

Interviewee 3 (30 June 2020)

Interviewee 4 (3 August 2020)

Interviewee 5 (3 August 2020)

Interviewee 6 (7 August 2020)

Interviewee 7 (17 August 2020)

- IOM, *World Migration Report 2018* (2017)
 <https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/country/docs/china/r5_world_migration_report_2018_en.pdf> accessed 28 July 2020
- IOM, *World Migration Report 2020* (2019)
 <https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/wmr_2020.pdf> accessed 25 July 2020
- Jo Blundell FR, Tanyah Hameed, Clare FitzGerald, 'Are we rallying together? Collaboration and public sector reform' (2019) Government Outcomes Lab, University of Oxford, Blavatnik School of Government
- Johansson TECCfHAY, 'Integration of Migrants: Commission Launches a Public Consultation and Call for an Expert Group on the Views of Migrants (Press Release 22 July 2020)'
 <https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP_20_1364> accessed 22 August 2020
- LLOYDS Bank, 'UK Charity Digital Index 2019' <https://www.lloydsbank.com/assets/resource-centre/pdf/charity_digital_index_2019.pdf> accessed 12 September 2020
- Local Government Association, 'Building Cohesive Communities an LGA Guide' (2019)
 <https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/10.31%20Community%20cohesion%20guidance_04.2.pdf> accessed 28 June 2020
- Local Government Association, 'Oxfordshire County Council Voluntary and Community Sector Peer Challenge Report (March 2018 Final v2)' (2018)
 <<https://www2.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/sites/default/files/folders/documents/communityandliving/OxfordshireVCSPeerChallengeReport.pdf>> accessed 5 November 2020
- Local Government Association, 'Syrian Refugee Resettlement a Guide for Local Authorities' (2016)
 <https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Syran%20refugee%20resettlement%20a%20guide%20for%20local%20authorities_0.pdf> accessed 4 May 2020
- Localism Act 2011 <<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/contents/enacted>> accessed 24 September 2020
- Lukes S, *Power: a radical view* (Studies in sociology, Second expanded edn, Palgrave Macmillan 2005)
- Matsunaga Y, Yamauchi N and Okuyama N, 'What Determines the Size of the Nonprofit Sector?: A Cross-Country Analysis of the Government Failure Theory' (2010) 21 Official Journal of the International Society for Third-Sector Research 180
- Mayblin L and James P, 'Asylum and refugee support in the UK: civil society filling the gaps?' (2019) 45 Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies 375
- Migrant Integration Policy Index 2020 <<https://www.mipex.eu/>> accessed 17 December 2020
- Ministry of Housing Communities Local Government, 'Guidance-Integration Area Programme' (2019)
 <<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/integration-area-programme>> accessed 2 June 2020

- Mishra R, *The welfare state in capitalist society: policies of retrenchment and maintenance in Europe, North America and Australia* (Studies in international social policy and welfare, Harvester Wheatsheaf 1990)
- Mishra VK, 'The Role of Global Civil Society in Global Governance' (2012) Vol.03No.04 Beijing Law Review 4
- Mohan J and others, 'Entering the lists: what can be learned from local listings of third sector organisations? Results from a study of Northern England' <<http://www.nr-foundation.org.uk/downloads/lists-final-190711.pdf>> accessed 9 October 2020
- Morano-Foadi S and Andreadakis S, *Protection of Fundamental Rights in Europe: The Challenge of Integration* (Springer 2020)
- Morano-Foadi S and Malena M, *Integration for Third-Country Nationals in the European Union [electronic resource]: the Equality Challenge* (Elgaronline, Edward Elgar 2012)
- Morano-Foadi S, Croce CD and Lugosi P, 'Refugees' Integration into the Labour Market: Discharging Responsibility in the UK' in Jesse M (ed), *European Societies, Migration, and the Law: The 'Others' amongst 'Us'* (Cambridge University Press 2020)
- Morano-Foadi S, 'Solidarity and Responsibility: Advancing Humanitarian Responses to EU Migratory Pressures' (2017) 19 European Journal of Migration and Law 223
- Najam A, 'The four-C's of third sector-government relations: Cooperation, confrontation, complementarity, and co-optation' (2000) 10 Nonprofit Management and Leadership 375
- OECD, *Working Together for Local Integration of Migrants and Refugees* (2018) OECD Publishing, Paris
- Office for National Statistics, 'Population Estimates' (2019) <<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates>> accessed 22 September 2020
- Osborne S, *Public-Private Partnerships: Theory and Practice in International Perspective* (Taylor & Francis Group 2000)
- Oxford 2050, 'People and Communities' <<https://oxford2050.com/people-and-communities/>> accessed 24 November 2020
- Oxford Brookes University, 'Research Ethic Statement' <<https://www.brookes.ac.uk/research/research-ethics-statement/>> accessed 6 January 2020
- Oxford City Council, 'Communities' <<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20007/communities>> accessed 22 October 2020
- Oxford City Council, 'Consultations' <<https://consultation.oxford.gov.uk/>> accessed 22 October 2020

- Oxford City Council, 'How the Council Works'
<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20050/how_the_council_works> accessed 22 October 2020
- Oxford City Council, 'Strategic partnerships'
<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20172/partnerships/502/strategic_partnerships> accessed 22 October 2020
- Oxford City Council, 'Oxford's first Migrant Champion announced'
<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/news/article/1128/oxford_s_first_migrant_champion_announced> accessed 16 November 2020
- Oxford City Council, 'Newly arrived communities, refugees and asylum seekers'
<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20042/equality_diversity_and_inclusion/1334/newly_arrived_communities_refugees_and_asylum_seekers> accessed 18 November 2020
- Oxford City Council, 'Constitution (May 2020)'
<<https://mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=477&MId=5990&Ver=4&Info=1>> accessed 21 November 2020
- Oxford City Council, 'Community Centres'
<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/directory/21/community_centres%3E%20accessed%2022%20January%202021> accessed 22 November 2020
- Oxford City Council, 'Community Partnerships'
<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20102/community_partnerships> accessed 22 November 2020
- Oxford City Council, 'Oxford City Council's Community Centre Strategy 2016-2020 '
<https://www.slc.uk.com/wp-content/uploads/CommunityCentreStrategyFull_WEBv3.pdf> accessed 22 November 2020
- Oxford City Council, 'Corporate Governance'
<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20050/how_the_council_works/361/corporate_governance> accessed 24 November 2020
- Oxford City Council, 'Council Strategy 2020-24'
<<https://consultation.oxford.gov.uk/consult.ti/Corpstrat/consultationHome>> accessed 24 November 2020
- Oxford City Council, 'Grants for voluntary and community groups'
<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20044/grants/277/grants_for_voluntary_and_community_groups> accessed 24 November 2020
- Oxford City Council, 'Oxford Local Plan 2016-2036'
<https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20067/planning_policy/1311/oxford_local_plan_2016-2036> accessed 24 November 2020

- Oxford City Council, 'Oxford Lottery' <https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20007/communities/1314/oxford_lottery> accessed 25 November 2020
- Oxfordshire Compact 2010 <<https://www2.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/sites/default/files/folders/documents/communityandliving/ourworkwithcommunities/oxfordshirepartnership/oxfordshiresafercommunities/oxfordshirecompact/OxfordshireCompactandcodes2012.pdf>> accessed 22 January 2020
- Parsons T, 'On the Concept of Political Power' (1963) 107 *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 232
- Pedraza-Farina L, 'Conceptions of civil society in international lawmaking and implementation: a theoretical framework' (2013) 34 *Michigan Journal of International Law* 605
- Peters BG and Pierre J, 'Governance without Government? Rethinking Public Administration' (1998) 8 *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART* 223
- Phillimore J, 'Implementing Integration in the UK: Lessons for Integration Theory, Policy and Practice' (2012) 40 *Policy & Politics* 525
- Pitt Rivers Museum, 'Multaka-Oxford' <<https://www.prm.ox.ac.uk/multaka-oxford-0>> accessed 9 November 2020
- Powell FW, *The politics of civil society: big society and small government* (University Press Scholarship Online, Second edn, The Policy Press 2013)
- Rebecca S, *Pandemic Solidarity Mutual Aid during the Covid-19 Crisis* (Pluto Press 2020)
- Refugee Resource, 'Publications' <<https://www.refugeeresource.org.uk/publications>> accessed 3 November 2020
- Refugee Resource, 'Asylum Seekers and Refugees Directory of services in Oxfordshire' (2005) <https://a16c40aa-4d1e-413d-bcf2-5119e974869a.filesusr.com/ugd/b0f019_1f3f8ed31c57414a9ab13d9df04b3a3d.pdf> accessed 13 September 2020
- Rhodes RAW, *Decentralizing the civil service [electronic resource]: from unitary state to differentiated polity in the United Kingdom* (Ebook central, Open University 2003)
- Rhodes RAW, *Network Governance and the Differentiated Polity* (Oxford University Press 2017)
- Saidel J, 'Resource Interdependence: The Relationship Between State Agencies and Nonprofit Organisations' (1991) 51 *Public Administration Review* 543
- Salamon LM, 'Of Market Failure, Voluntary Failure, and Third-Party Government: Toward a Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State' (1987) 16 *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 29

- Salamon LM, *The state of nonprofit America* (Ebook central, Brookings Institution Press 2002)
- Schmid H, 'The Role of Nonprofit Human Service Organisations in Providing Social Services: A Prefatory Essay' (2004) 28 *Administration in Social Work* 1
- Scholte JA, 'Civil society and democracy in global governance' (2002) 8 *Global Governance* 281
- Scholten P, Penninx R and Garcés–Mascareñas B, *The multilevel governance of migration and integration* (2016)
- Scottish Government Local Government and Communities Directorate, 'New Scots: Refugee Integration Strategy 2018 to 2022' (2018) <<https://www.gov.scot/publications/new-scots-refugee-integration-strategy-2018-2022/>> accessed 13 September 2020
- Spencer S (ed.), 'Refugees and Other New Migrants: A Review of the Evidence on Successful Approaches to Integration' (2006) The University of Oxford's Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS)
- Spencer S and Charsley K, 'Conceptualising integration: a framework for empirical research, taking marriage migration as a case study' (2016) 4 *Comparative Migration Studies* 18
- Spencer S and Delvino N, 'Cooperation between government and civil society in the management of migration: Trends, opportunities and challenges in Europe and North America' (2018) The University of Oxford's Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS)
- Spencer S and Delvino N, 'Municipal activism on irregular migrants: the framing of inclusive approaches at the local level' (2019) 17 *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies*
- Stoker G, 'Governance as theory: five propositions' (2018) 68 *International Social Science Journal* 15
- Strang A and Ager A, 'Refugee Integration: Emerging Trends and Remaining Agendas' (2010) 23 *Journal of Refugee Studies* 589
- Şimşek D and Çorabatır M, 'Challenges and Opportunities of Refugee Integration in Turkey' (2016) Research Centre on Asylum and Migration (IGAM) <https://trboellorg/sites/default/files/hb_rapor_duezlt_1904173pdf> accessed 21 October 2020
- The Charity Commission, 'Charity Statistics (2018)' <<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/charity-register-statistics> > accessed 22 September 2020
- The National Council for Voluntary Organisations, 'Digital Skills in the Charity Sector' (posted on 19 August 2019) (<https://blogs.ncvo.org.uk/2019/08/19/digital-skills-in-the-charity-sector/?gclid=CjwKCAjwTJ2FBhAuEiwAIKu19iOjhzeSZZUhbboqQSd9Bi0B8kdzDckfmngd0of_3Cc6Z8ximUjVPxoCO1gQAvD_BwE> accessed 8 September 2020
- The National Council for Voluntary Organisations, 'Policy and Research' <<https://www.ncvo.org.uk/policy-and-research>> accessed 22 September

- The National Lottery Community Fund <<https://www.tnlcommunityfund.org.uk/>> accessed 1 November 2020
- TUSEV, 'Standards and Good Practices for Public Funding of Civil Society Organisations' (2020) <https://siviltoplum-kamu.org/en/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/SITKIKamuFonlariRapor_EN.Final_.pdf> accessed 25 July 2020
- UK Community Foundations <<https://www.ukcommunityfoundations.org/>> accessed 2 November 2020
- UK Parliament, 'Refugees: Homelessness Question for Home Office UIN 267364, tabled on 20 June 2019' <<https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2019-06-20/267364>> accessed 21 November 2020
- UK Parliament House of Lords' Library, 'Brexit: Refugee protection and asylum policy (17 September, 2020)' <<https://lordslibrary.parliament.uk/brexit-refugee-protection-and-asylum-policy/>> accessed 29 September 2020
- UN DESA Population Division, *International Migration 2019* (2019) Report ST/ESA/SER.A/438
- UN DESA Sustainable Development, 'The 17 Goals' <<https://sdgs.un.org/goals>> accessed 18 September 2020
- UN Department of Global Communications Civil Society Unit, 'Stories from the Civil Society COVID-19 Response' (2020) <<https://mailchi.mp/un/civilsocietycovid-19>> accessed 9 December 2020
- UNDP, 'UNDP and Civil Society Organisations A Toolkit for Strengthening Partnerships' (2006) <<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/2141UNDP%20and%20Civil%20Society%20Organisations%20a%20Toolkit%20for%20Strengthening%20Partnerships.pdf>> accessed 3 April 2020
- UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States, A Handbook on Non-State Social Service Delivery Models: A guide for policy makers and practitioners in the CIS region(2012) <http://www.bcnl.org/uploadfiles/documents/analyses/undpecnl_handbook_on_social_contracting_2012.pdf> accessed 2 April 2020
- UN General Assembly, *Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees*, 28 July 1951, United Nations, Treaty Series, 189: 137.
- UN General Assembly, *Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees*, 31 January 1967, United Nations, Treaty Series, 606: 267
- UN General Assembly, *Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration*, UN Doc. A/RES/73/195 (Dec. 19, 2018)
- UN General Assembly, *Global Compact on Refugees*, UN Doc. A/73/12 (2018)

- UNHCR, 'Executive Committee Conclusion on Durable Solutions and Refugee Protection, No. 56 (XL)' (1989) <<http://www.unhcr.org/41b041534.html>> accessed 14 September 2020
- UNHCR, 'International Conference on the Reception and Integration of Resettled Refugees, 25-27 April 2001 - Norrköping, Sweden. ICRIRR: Principles, 27 April 2001' (2001) <<https://www.refworld.org/docid/404dd9ab4.html>> accessed 7 October 2020
- UNHCR Department of International Protection Resettlement Section, 'Refugee Resettlement. An International Handbook to Guide Reception and Integration, September 2002,' (2002) <<https://www.refworld.org/docid/405189284.html>> accessed 7 October 2020
- UNHCR, 'Refugee Resettlement: An International Handbook to Guide Reception and Integration' (2002) <<https://www.refworld.org/docid/405189284.html>> accessed 6 October 2020
- UNHCR, 'Handbook for Self-Reliance' (2005) <<http://www.unhcr.org/44bf7b012.pdf>> accessed 14 September 2020
- UNHCR, 'Master Glossary of Terms, June 2006, Rev.1' (2006) <<https://www.refworld.org/docid/42ce7d444.html>> accessed 20 September 2020
- UNHCR, 'Resettlement Handbook, 2011' (2011) <<https://www.refworld.org/docid/4ecb973c2.html>> accessed 11 September 2020
- UNHCR Regional Representation for Central Europe, 'Refugee Integration and the Use of Indicators: Evidence From Central Europe' (2013) <<https://www.refworld.org/pdfid/532164584.pdf>> accessed 20 July 2020
- UNHCR, 'Resolve conflicts or face surge in life-long refugees worldwide, warns UNHCR Special Envoy ' (2014) <<https://www.unhcr.org/news/press/2014/6/53a42f6d9/resolve-conflicts-face-surge-life-long-refugees-worldwide-warns-unhcr-special.html>> accessed 26 July 2020
- UNHCR, 'Worldwide displacement hits all-time high as war and persecution increase' (2015) <<https://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2015/6/558193896/worldwide-displacement-hits-all-time-high-war-persecution-increase.html#:~:text=It%20said%20the%20number%20of,seen%20in%20a%20single%20year>> accessed 25 July 2020
- UNHCR, 'Evaluation of UNHCR's Emergency Response to the influx of Syrian Refugees into Turkey - Full Report, 2016, ES/2016/03,' (2016) <<https://www.refworld.org/docid/58bd6e674.html>> accessed 20 September 2020
- UNHCR, 'UNHCR viewpoint: 'Refugee' or 'migrant' – Which is right?' (2016) <<https://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2016/7/55df0e556/unhcr-viewpoint-refugee-migrant-right.html#:~:text=We%20say%20refugees%20when%20we,legal%20definition%20of%20a%20refugee>> accessed 25 September 2020
- UNHCR, 'A guide to international refugee protection and building state asylum systems Handbook for Parliamentarians N° 27' (2017) < <https://www.unhcr.org/3d4aba564.pdf>> accessed 20 July 2020

- UNHCR, 'UNHCR Resettlement Handbook-Country Chapters' (2018) <<https://www.unhcr.org/protection/resettlement/4a2ccf4c6/unhcr-resettlement-handbook-country-chapters.html>> accessed 29 September 2020
- UNHCR, 'Turkey Fact Sheet (July 2019)' <<https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/71061.pdf>> accessed 4 December 2020
- UNHCR, 'Asylum in the UK' (2020) <<https://www.unhcr.org/asylum-in-the-uk.html>> accessed 1 October 2020
- UNHCR, 'Figures at a Glance' (2020) <<https://www.unhcr.org/figures-at-a-glance.html>> accessed 25 July 2020
- The University of Oxford's Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS), 'Inclusive Cities' (2018) <<https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/project/inclusive-cities/>> accessed 3 November 2020
- USAID Health Finance and Governance Project, 'Entry Point Mapping: A Tool to Promote Civil Society Engagement On Health Finance and Governance' (2014) <https://www.hfgproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/EPM-Tool-6_2015.pdf> accessed 4 April 2020
- van Harten EB, 'Integration Impossible? Ethnic Nationalism and Refugee Integration in Bulgaria' in Jesse M (ed), *European Societies, Migration, and the Law: The 'Others' amongst 'Us'* (Cambridge University Press 2020)
- Weber M, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology* (University of California Press. 1978)
- Welfens N and Pisarevskaya A, 'The 'Others' amongst 'Them' – Selection Categories in European Resettlement and Humanitarian Admission Programmes' in Jesse M (ed), *European Societies, Migration, and the Law: The 'Others' amongst 'Us'* (Cambridge University Press 2020)
- Wilkins H and others, *Support for Refugees after Receiving Asylum Decision* (House of Commons Library, Number CDP-2020-0042, 2 March 2020)
- Wilkins H, 'Refugee Resettlement in the UK' (House of Commons Library, Briefing Paper Number 8750, 6 March 2020) <<https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-8750/>> accessed 29 August 2020
- Woods N, 'Good Governance in International Organisations' (1999) 5 *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organisations* 39
- World Economic Forum, 'World Scenario Series: The Future Role of Civil Society' (2013) <http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_FutureRoleCivilSociety_Report_2013.pdf> accessed 22 July 2020
- Young DR, 'Complementary, supplementary or adversarial: A theoretical and historical examination of government-nonprofit relations in the U.S.' in Steurele TBaCE (ed), *Government and nonprofit Organisations: The challenges of civil society* (The Urban Institute. 1999)