The Mainstreaming of Integration Governance and Social Work in the Local Integration of Immigrants[1]

Roman Baláž, Lucia Čemová

Dr. Roman Baláž[2] is a researcher at the Institute for Public Policy and Social Work and an assistant professor at the Department of Social Policy and Social Work, FSS MU. His research topics include possibilities and limits of social work with immigrants, comprehensive assessment of problems of immigrants, structural conditions of social work performance.

Lucia Čemová[3] is a PhD. student at the Department of Social Policy and Social Work, FSS MU. Her research interest revolving around topics such as life of the minorities, local immigrant integration and community integration stems from experience as a helping professional within this issue.

Abstract
OBJECTIVES: The aim of the presented paper is to answer the question "How can social work promote the mainstreaming of integration governance in the local integration of immigrants?" THEORETICAL BASE: The relevant theoretical concepts of the research questions are conceptualized so that they connect two occasionally linked knowledge bases of migration studies and social work in the final discussion. METHODS: The presented paper is a theoretical analysis that emphasizes logical argumentation based on Kuhn's conception of cumulative science. OUTCOMES: Supporting individuals, optimising interactions and influencing power structures are presented as the possibilities of how social work can promote the mainstreaming of integration governance in the local integration of immigrants. SOCIAL WORK IMPLICATIONS: The mainstreaming of integration governance offers a conceptual framework that is useful for 1) releasing social work practice from the target group perspective and 2) understanding how power structures (e.g. integration policy or social work practice itself) could produce negative phenomena such as institutional or state racism.

---

[2] Contact: Roman Baláž, Ph.D., Institute for Public Policy and Social Work, Faculty of Social Studies, Masaryk University, Joštova 10, 602 00 Brno; balrom@mail.muni.cz

[3] Contact: Mgr. Lucia Čemová, Department of Social policy and Social work, Faculty of Social Studies, Masaryk University, Joštova 10, 602 00 Brno; cemoval@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The issue of immigration and integration of societies obtaining their new members is gradually gaining importance due to the widely spreading and strengthening of globalisation. In the ageing and economically developing Europe, migration is considered one of the answers to undesirable demographic changes and a lacking work force. European countries have started to open up their borders to both highly and low qualified work migrants, which has triggered even more migration through family reunion (i.e. chain migration). Furthermore, geopolitical factors have recently led several countries to wars that have resulted in the need for people to seek asylum in Europe, where they are often coming unprepared to completely different environments and life conditions from what they were accustomed to in their home countries.

In addition to the issue of integrating new members of society, the national states' attitudes to migration have been becoming an important issue. The European Union, national states and political parties have been shattering their views on the nature of the problem of immigration, the definition of immigrants, and appropriate solutions and their practical implementation. The existing system and its professionals who support and control immigrants are under enormous pressure, and their almost every even minor step is under the constant surveillance of disparate media. The immigration and integration of migrants is no longer just a technical problem, as was the case in previous years. Today, it has become a political issue and, as such, has become very confusing. Like almost every political issue, various political interests of different groups (sometimes apparent and sometimes hidden interests of political parties, state and self-governing organisations, non-profit organisations, civic initiatives, etc.) shape the integration of immigrants. Among other things, these groups have divided members of society and their responses to immigration and have destabilized the integration strategies that were institutionalised in the past.

Migration flows and political or civic responses to them, however, mean and require changes in societies to react to the dynamic transformation of composition of the societies. Whether we are considering the migration connected to the global movement of capital or the war conflicts, in either case, measures need to be forged towards integrating the societies to prevent social exclusion, inequality and conflicts. The term integration has become a mantra of policy-makers. The word itself, however, is highly ambiguous, can be adapted by different paradigms and cannot be politically neutral.

In this article, we draw on the current trends identified among academics, practitioners and international and European institutions. We strive to find and use a theoretical concept that would support the building of bridges between the divided actors in the process of immigrant integration. This concept is referred to as the "mainstreaming of integration governance".

Firstly, we draw on the scholarship that identifies the changes in the nature of migration in the age of globalisation that has had a great impact on the complex composition of immigrant populations. Secondly, we acknowledge the paradigm interculturalism as the starting point for the contemporary migration policies. Thirdly, we would like to point out the importance of critical reflection on the identification and reification of the "target groups" in social policy. All three of these crucial aspects of integration policy are reflected in the concept of the mainstreaming of integration governance, a concept that we believe would be useful for many cities and states to adapt. We argue that this concept is especially useful for promoting structural integration, as well as integration into the formal organisations of the social institutions. We presume that equal access to these formal organisations serves as the core of social integration.

As discussed below, besides mainstreaming of integration governance, we also understand social work as an important tool for "bridging" members of society. It is no coincidence that we are considering how social work could promote the mainstreaming of integration governance in the local integration of immigrants.

In short, the aim of this paper is to answer the question "How can social work promote the mainstreaming of integration governance in the local integration of immigrants?" To answer

this question, we will 1) describe how we understand the integration of migrants and associated terms such as superdiversity, interculturalism and local integration, 2) introduce the concept of the mainstreaming of integration governance, 3) and describe social work with immigrants. The discussion then focuses on answering the research question.

From the methodological point-of-view, this article is a theoretical analysis that summarizes the possible links between migration studies and social work. The article draws from relevant Anglo-Saxon literature, peer-reviewed journals, reviewed monographs, encyclopaedias and dictionaries. The main concepts of the research question are conceptualized in the individual chapters. In the creation of this conceptualization, we draw on Kuhn's theory of cumulative science (Kuhn, 1963, and his followers). That is, the created and presented knowledge of this article uses a convention that was reasoned by certain prerequisites from relevant theories. From this point of view, we consider it necessary to define our assumptions, and the ideas that result from them.

MIGRANT INTEGRATION

The word integration at the most general level means the process or state of integration of particular parts into a functional unit. In relation to immigration, we refer to social integration, which Lockwood (1964) defines as "the inclusion of individuals in the system, the creation of relationships between them and their attitudes towards society. It is the result of conscious and motivated interaction and cooperation between individuals and groups."

Integration in relation to migration has become a major issue in recent years not only in social policy, but also in general and political discourse on migration. Although the concept of "integration" is widely used, there is no generally accepted definition. Integration can be considered a "target state" and a "process" that leads to achieving this target state (Castles et al., 2002; Bosswick, Heckmann, 2006; Ager, Strang, 2008). In this paper, we focus on the process of integrating immigrants as a set of targeted and intertwined measures of national and supranational institutions, organisations, programs and projects.

It is not the aim of this text to provide an exhaustive definition of integration. Instead, the text focuses on what Bosswick and Heckmann (2006) call structural integration, that is, the acquisition of civil rights and access to the main institutions of society.

A possible comprehensive view of social structures offers an institutional analysis anchored in structural functionalism and social ecological theory. Sociologists (Berger, Luckmann, 1991 and their followers) assume that societies have created routinely expected ways of meeting the needs or solving the problems of the members of the society through what we refer to as "institutions". These may be named according to the areas of need or the problems to be addressed. The society of people in the Czech Republic thus has institutions of health, safety, work, education, leisure, etc. Within these institutions, we can expect the activities of informal subjects (e.g. friends, various social groups, colleagues and working groups, neighbours), formal organisations (e.g. hospitals, schools, nurseries, police, army, firefighters, employers, various authorities, service providers) and formal entities, whose activities are not necessarily tied to organisations (e.g. the privileged positions of fully-fledged professions such as doctors, notaries, executives, psychotherapists, various consultants). In this paper, we focus only on the structure of formal institutions (i.e. organisations and professional experts independent of organisations), leaving the informal bodies of institutions aside.

We presume that equal access to the formal organisations of social institutions is an essential foundation for structural integration, which is linked to other dimensions of integration (e.g. interaction, culture and identification) (Bosswick, Heckmann, 2006).

We also assume that the concept of the mainstreaming of integration governance can be an effective tool for supporting the structural integration of immigrants. In the following part, we define the theoretical backgrounds that are crucial to the mainstreaming of integration governance.

Who, how and where to integrate?

In the past decades, the thinking about approaches to immigrant integration has changed considerably. Major changes have occurred in three areas: 1) the perception of the population of immigrants as a highly heterogeneous group; 2) understanding the importance of the relationships among various groups in society; and 3) understanding the importance of local governances in the process of setting up integration measures. All these shifts are key starting points for the mainstreaming of integration governance; hence, we will be discussing them in this chapter in more detail.

Superdiversity as a characteristic of contemporary migration

In this text, we use the word immigrant as a composite category that refers to every person who lives for some time in the country to which he or she has immigrated. Division into different categories of immigrants can be seen in the vocabulary used by governance that distinguishes, for example, EU citizens and third-country nationals, different types of residence permits (e.g. work, family reunification, international protection), and qualified (expatriate) and unskilled labour migrants.

The usage of different categories in connection with integration (or the excessive emphasis on their importance) has been questioned considerably over recent decades (e.g. Castles, 2002). The nature of transnational migration has dramatically changed due to factors such as the emergence of supranational entities like the European Union, the globalized market, the discourse of internationalization in various business areas, and the academia that greatly facilitates labour migration. If the period between the 1960s and 1990s was characterized by the immigration of members of large, organised and relatively homogeneous national and ethnic communities for specific purposes (e.g. Germany recruited workers from Turkey; Britain was opened up to the inhabitants of their former colonies; or the Vietnamese trainees coming to no-longer existing Czechoslovakia on the basis of international agreements, etc.), the current migration can be characterized by the movement of extremely heterogeneous populations in terms of country of origin, residence status, social class, language, religion, etc. (Vertovec, 2010) In the Czech Republic, for instance, there are immigrants from about 190 countries (MICR, 2017) with about 160 types of residence permits (MICR, 2018). They come as students, professors, skilled workers in multinational companies, low-skilled workers, family members, and so on. These and other factors, according to Vertovec (2010), constitute the current nature of superdiversity migration. Superdiversity is defined by a dynamic combination of variables such as the country of origin (including many other characteristics – ethnicity, language(s), religion, regional and local identities, cultural values and practices), reasons for migration (labour migration, family reunion, international protection, asylum) and residency status (Vertovec, 2010). These variables, together with the factors related to human and social capital, location (material conditions, presence of other migrants and ethnic minorities) and the access to local authorities, service providers and local residents (Vertovec, 2010), determine the outcomes of integration. For this reason, simply dividing immigrants into categories lacks purpose, especially when designing social policy measures.

The substantial question, therefore, is how to integrate the societies so that social policy measures can respond to a broad spectrum of needs for a possibly large diversity of the population. Because traditional integration paradigms have not taken into account the superdiversity factor, it is now necessary to look for new theoretical frameworks that could encompass the diversifying societies.

Interculturalism as an integration paradigm

Historically (until the 1990s), three approaches to the integration of immigrants existed in Europe, according to Baršová and Barša (2005). Firstly, the *ethnically–exclusive model* (adapted in Germany) did not deal with immigrant rights or cultural differences, and counted on the fact that, based on "non-integration", the labour migrants would move back sooner or later. Secondly, the *assimilation*

model, which applied in France, provided equal rights for all who assimilated into the existing society. Thirdly, the *pluralistic (multicultural)* model adapted, for instance, in the UK was based on the premise of the existence of ethno-cultural communities that were respected and perceived as a legitimate part of a wider political entity.

Since the 1990s, these different approaches have begun to converge as the disadvantages of each of them have emerged. On the one hand, the emphasis on non-discrimination and respect for human rights, and the internally differentiating societies have eliminated the legitimacy of the assimilation requirement (as assimilation is seen as symbolic violence and there is a loss of a clear answer to the question "assimilation into what?") (Baršová, Barša, 2005). On the other hand, the communitarian multiculturalism that originally aimed to promote equality in society was rather suspected of dividing it by promoting various national-ethnic and religious identities. At the same time, when taking into account the superdiversity of the population, according to Vertovec (2010), it is no longer possible to divide immigrants into several homogeneous groups (communities) and create specific measures for them. Hence, today we speak about "post-multiculturalism" as the contemporary era of integration approaches (e.g. Vertovec, 2010; Kymlicka, 2010; Bradley, 2013). Post-multiculturalist measures are often referred to as *diversity policies* that deliberately work with the assumption of a high degree of social diversity. They do not try to reduce the diversity, but rather to adapt so they can benefit from it. New approaches should, on the one hand, respect diversity and, on the other, promote the common identity of members of civil society (Baršová, Barša, 2005).

Scholten, Collett, Petrovic (2017) suggest *interculturalism* as a new paradigm suitable for adaptation as a framework for social policies. Interculturalism meets the requirement of respecting both intercultural and inter-individual differences, while supporting the interactions of different groups and creating unity in society as a functional heterogenous whole. Zapata-Barrero (2015) talks about the intercultural turnover at the level of the European institutions. There are several approaches to interculturalism (e.g. Cantle, 2005; Kymlicka, 2010; Bouchard, 2011; Zapata-Barrero, 2015). According to Zapata-Barrero (2015), however, all of these share a fundamental emphasis on the importance of interactions among people with different backgrounds and the belief that this fact was neglected in previous diversity policies, which mainly focused on safeguarding the cultural rights of immigrant groups. According to Zapata-Barrero (2015), three basic principles of interculturalism can be considered:

- Exchange and promotion of positive interactions – not only at the level of interpersonal contact, but also at the level of fighting stereotypes and discrimination. Developing intercultural competences should serve to transform conflict into meaningful interaction.
- Equality and access to civil rights to ensure respect for and understanding of this group of residents as equal and equally important. This would also serve to reproduce interculturalism.
- The perception of diversity as an asset – redesigning institutions to deliberately incorporate and benefit from diversity, which would promote equal opportunities in sectors such as education, employment, entrepreneurship and public administration (Zapata-Barrero, 2015).

Interculturalism appears to be a paradigm responding to the challenges of a diversifying society that needs a certain level of interconnection. These links are important, on the one hand, at the level of common identities and social cohesion, and, on the other, at the level of interactions taking place in particular physical spaces. For this reason, emphasis has been placed on the local levels of integration governance in recent decades.

Local integration and intercultural cities
Despite the fact that cities have for a long time been considered entities only implementing integration policies created by central governance (Schiller 2015), in the last decades, the idea of

city autonomy in the formulation and implementation of integration policies has been spreading profoundly (Sassen, 1991). As immigration tends to concentrate mainly in medium and large cities where job opportunities are created (Penninx et al., 2004), the interaction space between the host society and immigrants can be found in the very specific contexts of streets, neighbourhoods, schools, jobs, public spaces and local organisations (Penninx, 2009). While immigration as such is still a question of the territorial sovereignty of nation states, the issue of integration is more about the social boundaries (Caponio, Borkert, 2010) and the identities that are being encountered, created and changed within these interacting spaces (Uitermark, Rossi, Van Houtum, 2005). Gebhardt (2015) states that cities are de facto guarantors of migrant rights, while national governance remains the domain of "gatekeepers" of policy-making and controlling subsidies.

Caglar and Glick-Schiller (2009) criticize methodological nationalism, that is, the idea of "national society" being the main referential frame of integration. This in their view creates a false impression that a nation-state acts as a homogeneous society and space. On the contrary, they draw attention to the uniqueness of the local contexts, which, due to the current and past unequal influence of global capital (neoliberal restructuring), display completely different social and economic conditions for the integration of immigrants, often quite different from the rest of the "national society".

At the same time, the local governments have the greatest interest in successful integration because they profit from it in that they are in the front line being negatively affected by globalization and its possible negative consequences. Additionally, immediate proximity and hence the potential ability to identify and respond to problems faster, more flexibly and more efficiently than other levels of governance make cities the ideal administrators of integration issues (Penninx et al., 2004).

Therefore, in recent decades, local integration, that is, integration at the urban level has been an important topic. The Milan Declaration and many conferences show a high level of attention of the European institutions towards the processes, practices and policies of local integration. Local solutions and strategies are considered crucial to identifying, developing and spreading new integration models across Europe (Caponio, Borkert, 2010).

Local policies may have varying levels of (in)dependence on national policies. For example, in Spain, the status of "padrón" (received by all the inhabitants of the city) made it possible for citizens to be part of health care irrespective of their legal status. In other cities, the "city card" works as an official legal identity that opens access to both public and private services such as housing and a bank account (Gebhardt, 2015). On the other hand, some research (e.g. Emilsson et al., 2015) in recent years has shown a turn to the subordination of local policies to the national governance, in connection with the securitization discourse.

Despite the securitization discourses, an increasing number of cities are concerned with interculturalism as a new approach to integration policies. Platforms such as Eurocities and Intercultural cities are being developed at European and global levels to promote cities in successful intercultural policies. According to Zapata-Barrero (2015), interculturalism appears to be "the most pragmatic answer to the specific interests of cities and plans for the future."

Intercultural cities are, according to White (2018), cities that intentionally use diversity and anti-discrimination paradigms to facilitate long-term constructive interactions among citizens of different origins. The basis is the recognition of diversity as the characteristic of the urban population, without putting too much emphasis on differences (e.g. through specific policies). On the other hand, the movement of intercultural cities believes that solely celebrating different cultural traditions is not enough. There has to be a deliberate attempt to overcome discrimination and inequality.

MAINSTREAMING OF INTEGRATION GOVERNANCE

The above-mentioned assumptions (i.e. superdiversity, paradigm of interculturalism and local integration) are the basis for the concept of mainstreaming of integration governance. *Mainstreaming* can be seen as a set of measures or a set of rules to coordinate measures of social policy. Initially it has been developing in the context of gender equality, the inclusion of people with disabilities and the protection of the environment (Scholten, Breugel, 2018). In general, mainstreaming means spreading the responsibility and control over a certain area of social policy to various institutions, sectors and levels of governance, contrary to governing the area only through one institution. The concept includes two dimensions: 1) changing social policies from specific to general; and 2) changing the level of governance from centralized to polycentric (Scholten, Collett, Petrovic, 2017).

Specific vs. general measures
Embeddedness of the integration policies in general measures is central to mainstreaming of integration governance. The formulation of specific policies is based on the assumption that the more precisely the measure focuses on the target group, the more reduced the wastage is and the cheaper the achievement of the desired results will be (Sen, 1995). Specific social policies, however, require group identification, labelling and specific treatment, which are fundamentally problematic in relation to social cohesion (De Zwart, 2005). Measures that were originally designed to promote equality in society in fact can promote differences between groups and reify defined groups, thus isolating these groups and reproducing social inequality, which in principle prevents integration. The second problem is the conflict that these measures may cause - the awareness that a certain group is supported can induce the discontent of the rest of the population and reduce public support for redistribution policies.
De Zwart (2005) identifies this phenomenon, which social policy makers face as *the dilemma of recognition*. According to De Zwart (2005), the approaches to (not) target the groups based on nationality, ethnicity and race can be distinguished to three (pure) types: accommodation, denial and replacement.
- *Accommodation* is essentially a multicultural recognition policy that recognizes certain (ethnic) groups and redistribution is based on membership in these groups.
- The strategy of *denial* puts the greatest emphasis on individual rights and does not recognize the existing structure of society. It does not distinguish ethnic communities, nor the barriers their members experience in attempting to integrate, and thus does not forge measures to eliminate them.
- *Replacement* is a compromise between denial and accommodation – membership in certain groups is recognized along with the specific needs and barriers associated with it, but the aim is to construct more inclusive categories. The intention is to avoid social division on the one hand, but to enable support for disadvantaged groups on the other. This can involve policies targeting residents of certain locations, or people with a certain type of need, not pre-defined groups based on race, ethnicity, and so on.

The replacement strategy suits well the objectives of interculturalism; – it allows policies to address issues that may be specific to certain groups, but these groups do not define categories that ultimately divide society or prevent integration. It allows a focus on common values, but sensitizes itself to the perception of social problems, not as based on race or ethnicity but social inequalities. De Zwart's recognition dilemma is an important mechanism for understanding the power of social policies to divide or integrate society. If the aim of social policies is to reconcile society in values, rights, responsibilities and identities, effective measures to achieve this aim should be those that ensure equal access to meeting life needs with regard to diversity. The mainstreaming

of integration governance considers diversity as a matter of the whole society and not just that of a specific group of inhabitants, thus following the paradigm of interculturalism. It promotes equality, inter-ethnic contact, a shared feeling of belonging to a diversified society, and an attempt to avoid the reification of ethical and cultural borders as multiculturalism policies do (Scholten, Collett, Petrovic, 2017).

Polycentric governance

Another aspect of mainstreaming of integration governance is the decentralization of power and responsibility for integration policies and polycentric governance, which include two dimensions: 1) the vertical dimension of distribution to multiple levels – national, regional and local; referred to as multi-level governance; and 2) decentralization on a horizontal level – the division of responsibility among several responsible departments and unions (Scholten, Collet, Petrovic, 2017). In this way, power and responsibility over integration is spread across many stakeholders, levels and individuals.

For the purpose of our text, there is a crucial shift from specific measures for particular groups towards understanding the integration of immigrants as an agenda of formal organisation of social institutions that address the problems and needs of the entire population, thus shifting the level of governance integration to the local level.

This means that routinely expected ways of solving problems are accessible to immigrants in particular locations (such as preparing for future employment, curing a disease, obtaining a safe home); the formal organisations administering social institutions (such as labour offices, schools, hospitals, and municipal housing stock management) are able to deal with immigrants as their clients. The mainstreaming of integration governance in the local integration of immigrants is the process whereby formal organisations in a particular locality of the crystallized social institutions gradually acquire the willingness and ability to independently or routinely provide their services not only to the citizens of the given locality but also to the settled immigrants. This change can occur with the gradual opening of labour offices, schools, social housing, hospitals, etc., whose staff would be able and willing to solve problems in their location of settled immigrants directly with the immigrants, without needing mediators or agents.

However, the specific implementation of this concept involves a number of challenges, many of which deal with the micro level of interaction between immigrants and formal organisations of social institutions. We believe that social work can be an important tool in supporting the implementation of mainstreaming integration governance and can be a useful support for organisations in intercultural contact and alignment with the new agenda.

SOCIAL WORK AS A TOOL OF IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION

Before we describe social work as one of the possible tools for the integration of immigrants, it is important to realize that, in this particular text, we use the knowledge of two broad and rarely interconnected theoretical bases: migration studies and social work. The first and second chapter are based on the theoretical and empirical findings of migration studies. The third chapter is based on the theoretical and empirical findings of social work. We believe that our final entwinement in the discussion can bring interesting insights and inspiration that can significantly enhance the approaches of frontline professionals, policy-makers and institutional administrators of integration policies. As we will see in this chapter, social work seeks to establish mutually acceptable relationships among people in society, working with people as human beings regardless of age, gender, race, religion, etc. In the identity of social work, which is encoded with the non-discrimination of individuals and groups, and a basic interest in establishing mutually acceptable relations among people in society, these basic characteristics help create a bridge between social

work and contemporary migration studies. As we will see in the discussion below, social work can be more than just an appropriate tool for promoting the implementation of the mainstreaming of integration governance. Now let us focus on social work.

Social work
In the presented paper, we avoid the concept of social work as a profession, – an exclusive job with high social prestige, power, state protection and income (e.g. Greenwood, 1957; Rossides, 1998; Hodson, Sullivan, 2011). Neither do we follow the concept of social work as a specific profession with specific training and subsequent state protection in the labour market (Weber, 2009; Saks, 2010). We consistently hold the functionalist view of social work as a specific activity of helping professionals (Barber, 1963; Parsons, 1968). More specifically, we follow the socio-ecological perspective (Bartlett, 1970; Washington, Paylor, 1998; Baláž, 2017, 2018), in which social work is a specific supportive or controlling activity of helping professionals (social workers, intercultural workers, mediators, counsellors, etc.) who are trying to solve people's problems or problems with people. The central organising and unifying concept of such social work universally is the concept of person-in-environment (Hare, 2004).
From a socio-ecological perspective, a person and his/her problem are perceived in the context of the social environment in which they live, work, learn or spend leisure time. In this context, it could involve a problem in the social functioning of a particular person (Bartlett, 1970 and her followers). The problem in social functioning can be seen as 1) the inability of a person to meet the expectations of social environment subjects, 2) the disproportionality of the claims of social environment subjects to the person, and 3) the contradictory interactions between the person and the subjects of his/her social environment.
According to Washington and Paylor (1998), the problem of the person in the environment can be seen at three interconnected levels: on the level of problem interactions between an individual or a group and a community; between a citizen and the state; and between subjects in the processes of solidarity and marginalisation. The level of problem relationships between the individual and the community can have the character of (non-)functional relationships of a human being with neighbours, community, co-workers, etc. The level of problem relations between the citizen and the state can be expressed by (non-)fulfilling the statutory obligations to the state, self-governing organisations, or other organisations established by them (organisational units of the state or contributory organisations of regions, towns and municipalities). The level of problem relationships between subjects in processes of solidarity and marginalization refers to a group of problematic interactions among people in society, which is connected with the management of society, the formation of national, collective or individual identity and the fulfilment or suppression of human rights, etc.
With help and support, or under the control of social workers, the functional relationships of individuals or groups with subjects of their social environment are formed at all levels of problem interaction. After the social work assessment of a particular problem, social workers strive for 1) increasing the ability of the individual (group) to meet the expectations of the social environment subjects, 2) negotiating or promoting the adequacy of the expectations of the social environment subjects towards the individual (group), 3) optimising interaction between the individual (group) and the subjects of his/her (its) social environment.
According to the International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW, 2014), this social work performance is realized in the context of seeking social development, social cohesion or empowerment. Social workers build on the basic principles of social justice, promotion of human rights, collective responsibility (apparently in the sense of solidarity) and respect for diversity among people. We consider the use of the global definition of social work (IFSW, 2014) to be of great importance because it enables us to apply the socially ecological concept of social work in a wider social framework. Social work as a specific activity of social workers and other helping

professionals should, in terms of the IFSW definition, lead to the social development of societies and the daily fulfilment of human rights for everybody.

Social work and the integration of immigrants
In the first and second chapters, we conceptualised essential concepts related to the integration of immigrants. In short, they are based on the ideas that: some localities and their societies can acquire the nature of superdiversity; the main areas of integration are large and medium-sized cities; the mainstreaming of integration governance could be a suitable instrument of migrant integration. How can the above be linked to social work?
As was written in part 3.1, we understand social work as specific help, support or control of helping professionals (social workers, intercultural workers, mediators, counsellors, etc.) who seek to solve people's problems or problems with people in some of the above-mentioned manners. Such social work is intended to lead to the social development of societies in a given territory, to cohesion among diverse people and to the daily fulfilment of human rights.
The following social work interventions, derived from Payne's social work paradigms (Payne, 2015), are used by social workers for fulfilling their ambitious mission:
- Counselling interventions – assistance, transfer of relevant information, mediation and making resources available to actors of the problem situation, etc.
- Therapeutic interventions – care, therapy and training to secure the psychosocial well-being of a person with a problem, etc.
- Reformative/activist intervention – empowerment, promoting people's participation with problems, activism and social change, advocacy, etc.

By applying the above-mentioned perspectives of the three interconnected levels of social work, the following forms of counselling, therapeutic, and reform interventions can be implemented and realized in problematic relations between immigrants and social environment subjects. In summary, we can say that these specific social work interventions could contribute to the fulfilment of the ideal process of the local integration of immigrants. Social work interventions targeted at immigrants, subjects in their environment, and relations between immigrants and subjects can harmonize mutual interactions among the institutional actors of immigrant integration in particular locations.

DISCUSSION

In the following section, we answer the main research question: "How can social work promote the mainstreaming of integration governance in the local integration of immigrants?" Before we answer the research question, it is necessary to recall how we understand the mainstreaming of integration governance in the local integration of immigrants. It is the process whereby formal organisations in a particular locality of the crystallized social institutions gradually acquire the willingness and ability to independently and routinely provide their services not only to the citizens of the given locality but also to the settled immigrants. The above-described can be seen as a process where, for example, in Brno, Prague or Plzen, the labour offices, schools, hospitals, municipal housing administration, etc. will gradually open up. Their workers (street level administrators – see Lipsky, 2010) will be able and willing to solve the problems of settled immigrants directly with the immigrants. However, they will not be treated as foreigners – people who were defined through their different nationality, race or religion – but as people who need to solve a specific human problem, for instance, with employment, education of children, illness or housing.
Our research question can be paraphrased as a search for ways in which social work can increase the ability and willingness of formal organisations to support the solving of immigrants' problems

(or problems with immigrants) as people's problems (or problems with people). As social workers, we realize this is an issue concerning not only professionals from formal organisations but also the immigrants themselves. Table 1 gives an overview of how social work can promote the mainstreaming of integration governance in the local integration of immigrants. From the point of view of the focus of social work on 1) people with problems (immigrants), 2) subjects of the social environment (professionals of formal organisations) and 3) their mutual interaction, the following counselling, therapeutic and reformative interventions of social work can be considered.

Table 1: Possibilities how social work can promote the mainstreaming of integration governance

	Counselling interventions	Therapeutic interventions	Reformative/activist intervention
Increasing the ability of immigrants to meet the expectations of the social environment subjects	Mediating information about the problem; mediating interaction with the partner in interaction (Tatar, 1998; Valtonen, 2008; Allan, 2014; Chang-Muy, Congress, 2015)	Psychological well-being (Espin, 1987; Bhugra et al., 2013 Allan, 2014; Papadopoulos, 2002) Skills training, socio-cultural courses, training of mutually acceptable interactions (Schouler-Ocak et al., 2015)	Influencing self-awareness of immigrants, supporting immigrant participation, activating potentials of immigrants to engage in problem-solvinig (Papa et al., 2000; Tomlinson, Egan, 2002; Allan, 2014; Steimel, 2017)
Negotiating or promoting the adequacy of the expectations of the social environment subjects towards immigrants	Mediating information about the problem; mediating interaction with the partner in interaction (Truong et al., 2014; Kowal et al., 2013; Maiter, 2009)	Training for civil servants and frontline professionals; training of mutually acceptable interactions (Truong et al., 2014; Kowal et al., 2013; Maiter, 2009)	Influencing power structures; social, political and media actions to promote social change in relation to immigrants (Valtonen, 2008; Chang-Muy, Congress, 2015; Steimel, 2017)
Optimising interaction between immigrants and the subjects of their social environment	Mediation of understanding (interpreting and intercultural communication, etc.) (Valtonen, 2008; Chang-Muy, Congress, 2015)	Intercultural conflict mediation (Gutenbrunner, Wagner, 2016; Pugh, Sulewski, Moreno, 2017	Choice / change of actors, subjects, ways, spaces and terms of interaction between immigrants and the environment (Valtonen, 2008; Chang-Muy, Congress, 2015)

During the social counselling interventions, social work particularly contributes through the provision of relevant information that helps both immigrants and formal organisation professionals to address the problem. When focusing on interaction, social work seeks for understanding between immigrants and professionals of formal organisations. Social work counselling enables mutual understanding by explaining possible intercultural misunderstandings. An example may be, on the one hand, the support of the immigrant by mediating information on the system of the functioning of formal institutions addressing particular life situations, such as where to obtain a driver's license, apply for maternity leave, register with the Office of Labour, etc. On the other hand, there could be support for formal organisations in understanding the specific situations of immigration, or the support system associated with them (e.g. specifics of residence questions, the possibility of using an interpreter, assistant pedagogue, etc.). Interactions may lead to misunderstandings due to different socio-cultural assumptions. In this case, a social or intercultural worker plays a mediating role, identifies possible misunderstandings and clarifies the facts on the basis of which the misunderstanding occurred.

During therapeutic interventions, social work seeks the psychosocial well-being of the actors of interaction. It offers care, training and preparation for future interactions for both immigrants and professionals. Care for immigrants and professionals consists of specific help that could support their well-being (addressing loss, grief, post-traumatic or burnout syndrome, etc.), and that we understand as important for trouble-free interaction. Immigrants are taught how our support and control systems work; professionals are taught about the cultural specifics of people from other regions of the world; and both are trained in proven ways of interacting with each other. Thus, immigrants and professionals are satisfied, educated and trained. When focusing on interaction, the social work can then offer mediation in conflict situations. Besides the above mentioned case of psychological care, other examples of therapeutic interventions include comprehensive socio-cultural training for immigrants, cultural competence training for professionals, and intercultural conflict mediations.

Finally, **during reformative/activist interventions,** social work influences the power flow between immigrants and the professionals of formal organisations. On the one hand, it supports immigrants in self-awareness, engagement and participation in solving problems (e.g. promoting the knowledge of their rights, elucidating opportunities for political participation, supporting participation in action lobby groups aimed at changing legislation or local practice). On the other hand, social work can use the tactics of its radical branch and design social, political or media actions that prompt workers, organisations, superiors, or politicians to change existing and often discriminatory practices. When focusing on interaction, social work can then use its radical tactics to change actors, subjects, ways, spaces or terms of interaction between immigrants and the professionals of formal organisations. Examples of reformative/activist interventions include influencing existing equity instruments (legal and civic mechanisms facilitating immigrant integration) and advocacy for social change that focuses on the transformation of the local structure of power.

CONCLUSION

Immigration and the subsequent integration of diversified societies are gradually becoming one of the most important subjects of social policy in Europe. Changes in migration related to a globalizing market and geopolitical factors pose a challenge to social policy in responding to an increasingly heterogeneous society and the increasingly complex relationships within it. This article focuses on structural integration, that is, integration into the formal organisations of social institutions (e.g. housing, education, work and health). We think that the mainstreaming of integration governance, supported by social work, can be an appropriate instrument for promoting structural integration, because it is based on the essence of ensuring equal access to these institutions and the empowerment of immigrants in their autonomy. Contrary to shadow support systems or parallel structures (Pohjola, 1991; Gledhill, 1999; Mitchell, 2001; Sweeney, 2014 and others), one of the objectives of the mainstreaming of integration governance is to integrate immigrants into formal organisations of social institutions created for the majority population, and to gradually re-establish these organisations and immigrants in their mutual negotiations.

If we change the research question and ask ourselves how the mainstreaming of integration governance is useful for social work, the following questions will open a vast space for gaining new knowledge in social work: Why is it so hard to change current immigration policies, programs and approaches? Why are integration policies so concentrated and centralized? Why is there a gap between national interests and local intentions? Why is it so complicated to establish satisfactory mutual relations among actors of migrant integration? Answers to these and related questions can provide helping professionals (social workers, intercultural workers, mediators, counsellors, etc.) with fruitful insights on, for example, the following:

- Racial discrimination and other forms of racism (Fekete, 2004; Fekete, Sivanandan, 2009; Fekete, 2018);
- The growth of distrust in race relations (Pantazis, Pemberton, 2009; Ragazzi, 2016; McKendrick, Finch, 2017 and others);
- The absence of collaboration among actors at different levels and sectors of migrant integration (Penninx, 2009; Caglar, Glick-Schiller, 2009; Caponio, Borkert, 2010; Gebhardt, 2015; Zapata-Barrero, 2015 and others).

Each of these possible insights helps us understand the daily performance of social work with immigrants. It may be an understanding of the problem of institutional or state racism, in which social workers, intercultural workers and other helping professionals may inadvertently participate. It may be an understanding of the emergence of social tensions among ethnic groups that social workers, intercultural workers and other helping professionals can incite unintentionally. Alternatively, it may be an understanding of why it is so difficult to establish cooperation among social workers, intercultural workers and other helping professionals, or street-level administrators from different sectors of public administration. We believe that this will become a part of our future discussions – perhaps on the pages of this particular journal.

REFERENCES

AGER, A., STRANG, A. 2008. Understanding Integration: A Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies,* 21(2), 166–191.
ALLAN, J. 2014. Reconciling the 'Psycho-Social/Structural' in Social Work Counselling with Refugees. *The British Journal of Social Work,* 45(6), 1699–1716.
BALÁŽ, R. 2018. Komplexní posouzení: Spojení studia sociálních deviací se sociální prací. *Sociální práce,* 18(6), 26–38.
BALÁŽ, R. 2017. Profesionalita sociálních pracovníků: Známka kvality, anebo procedurální berlička? *Sociální práce,* 17(6), 131–151.
BARBER, B. 1963. Some Problems in the Sociology of the Professions. *Daedalus,* 92(4), 669–688.
BARŠOVÁ, A., BARŠA, P. 2005. *Přistěhovalectví a liberální stát: Imigrační a integrační politiky v USA, západní Evropě a Česku.* Brno: Mezinárodní politologický ústav.
BARTLETT, H. 1970. *The Common Base of Social Work Practice.* New York: NASW.
BERGER, P. L., LUCKMANN, T. 1991. *The Social Construction of Reality.* London: Penguin Books.
BHUGRA, D. et al. 2013. WPA Guidance on Mental Health and Mental Health Care in Migrants. *World Psychiatry,* 10(1), 2–10.
BOSSWICK, W., HECKMANN, F. 2006. *Integration of Migrants: Contribution of Local and Regional Authorities* [online]. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. [17. 12. 2018]. Available from: https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_files/pubdocs/2006/22/en/1/ef0622en.pdf
BOUCHARD, G. 2011. What is Interculturalism? *McGill Law Journal,* 56(2), 435–468.
BRADLEY, W. 2013. Is There a Post-Multiculturalism? [online]. *Working Paper Series Studies on Multicultural Societies No.19.* Afrasian Research Centre, Ryukoku University. [17. 12. 2018]. Available from: http://afrasia.ryukoku.ac.jp/english/publication/upfile/WP19.pdf
CAGLAR, A., GLICK SCHILLER, N. 2009. Towards a Comparative Theory of Locality in Migration Studies: Migrant Incorporation and City Scale. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 35(2), 177–202.
CANTLE, T. 2005. *Community Cohesion: A New Framework for Race and Diversity.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

CAPONIO, T., BORKERT, M. 2010. Introduction: The Local Dimension of Migration Policymaking. In: CAPONIO, T., BORKERT, M. *The local Dimension of Migration Policymaking*. Amsterdam: University Press, 9–23.

CASTLES, S. et al. 2002. *Integration: Mapping the Field* [online]. [17. 12. 2018]. Available from: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110218135832/http:/rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/rdsolr2803.doc

CHANG-MUY, F., CONGRESS, E. P. 2015. *Social Work with Immigrants and Refugees, Second Edition: Legal Issues, Clinical Skills, and Advocacy*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.

DE ZWART, F. 2005. The Dilemma of Recognition: Administrative Categories and Cultural Diversity. *Theory and Society*, 34(2), 137–169.

EMILSSON, L. et al. 2015. Review of 103 Swedish Healthcare Quality Registries. *Journal of Internal Medicine*, 277(1), 94–136.

ESPIN, O. M. 1987. Psychlogical Impact of Migration on Latinas. Implications for Psychotherapeutic Practice. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 11(4), 489–503.

FEKETE, L. 2018. *Europe's Fault Lines. Racism and the Rise of the Right*. Verso Books.

FEKETE, L. 2004. Anti-Muslim Racism and the European Security State. *Race & Class*, 46(1), 3–29.

FEKETE, L., SIVANANDAN, A. 2009. *A Suitable Enemy: Racism, Migration and Islamophobia in Europe*. Pluto Press.

GEBHARDT, D. 2015. When the State Takes Over: Civic Integration Programmes and the Role of Cities in Immigrant Integration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(5), 742–758.

GLEDHILL, J. 1999. Official Masks and Shadow Powers: Towards an Anthropology of the Dark Side of the State. *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development*, 28(3/4), 199–251.

GREENWOOD, E. 1957. Attributes of the Profession. *Social Work*, 2(3), 45–55.

GUTENBRUNNER, L., WAGNER, U. 2016. Perspective-Taking Techniques in the Mediation of Intergroup Conflict. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 22(4), 298–305.

HARE, I. 2004. Defining Social Work for the 21st Century. *International Social Work*, 47(3), 407–424.

HODSON, R., SULLIVAN, T. A. 2011. *The Social Organization of Work*. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning Custom Publishing.

IFSW. 2014. *Global Definition of Social Work* [online]. International Federation of Social Workers. [17. 12. 2018]. Available from: https://www.ifsw.org/what-is-social-work/global-definition-of-social-work/

KOWAL, E., FRANKLIN, H., PARADIES, Y. 2013. Reflexive Antiracism: A Novel Approach to Diversity Training. *Ethnicities*, 13(3), 316–337.

KUHN, T. S. 1963. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

KYMLICKA, W. 2010. The Rise and Fall of Multiculturalism? New Debates on Inclusion and Accommodation in Diverse Societies. In: VERTOVEC, S., WESSENDORF, S. (Eds.). *The Multiculturalism Backlash; European discourses, Policies and Practices*. New York: Routledge, 32–49.

LIPSKY, M. 2010. *Street–Level Bureaucracy, 30th Anniversary Edition: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Service*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

LOCKWOOD, D. 1964. Social Integration and System Integration. In: ZOLLSCHAN, K., HIRSCH, W. (Eds.). *Explorations in Social Change*. London: Routledge, 244–275.

MAITER, S. 2009. Using an Anti-Racist Framework for Assessment and Intervention in Clinical Practice with Families from Diverse Ethno-Racial Backgrounds. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 37(267).

McKENDRICK, D., FINCH, J. 2017. 'Under Heavy Manners?': Social Work, Radicalisation, Troubled Families and Non-Linear War. *British Journal of Social Work*, 47(3), 308–324.

MICR. 2018. *Cizinci 3. zemí se zaevidovaným povoleným pobytem na území České republiky a cizinci zemí EU + Islandu, Norska, Švýcarska a Lichtenštejnska se zaevidovaným pobytem na území České republiky k 31.1.2018* [online]. Prague: Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic. [17. 12. 2018]. Available from: http://www.mvcr.cz/clanek/cizinci-s-povolenym-pobytem.aspx

MICR. 2017. *Cizinci 3. zemí se zaevidovaným povoleným pobytem na území České republiky a cizinci zemí EU + Islandu, Norska, Švýcarska a Lichtenštejnska se zaevidovaným pobytem na území České republiky k 31.12.2017* [online]. Prague: Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic. [17. 12. 2018]. Available from: http://www.mvcr.cz/clanek/cizinci-s-povolenym-pobytem.aspx

MITCHELL, K. 2001. Transnationalism, Neo-Liberalism, and the Rise of the Shadow State. *Economy and Society,* 30(2), 165–189.

PANTAZIS, CH., PEMBERTON, S. 2009. From the 'Old' to the 'New' Suspect Community: Examining the Impacts of Recent UK Counter-Terrorist Legislation. *The British Journal of Criminology,* 49(5), 646–666.

PAPA, J. M. et al. 2000. Organizing for Social Change Through Cooperative Action. *Communication Theory,* 10(1), 90–123.

PAPADOPOULOS, R. 2002. *Therapeutic Care for Refugees. No Place Like Home.* London: Routledge.

PARSONS, T. 1968. Professions. In: SILLS, D. V. *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences 12.* New York: Macmillan, 536–547.

PAYNE, M. 2015. *Modern Social Work Theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

PENNINX, R. 2009. *Decentralizing Integration Policies: Managing Migration in Cities, Regions and Localities* [online]. London: Policy Network. [17. 12. 2018]. Avaliable from: http://www.integratingcities2012.eu/documents/(2009%20-%20Penninx)%20Decentralising%20integration%20policies.pdf

PENNINX, R., KRAAL, K., MARTINELLO, M. et al. 2004. Introduction: European Cities and Their New Residents. In: PENNINX, R., KRAAL, K., MARTINELLO, M. et al. *Citizenship in European Cities: Immigrants, Local Politics and Integration Policies*. London: Ashgate, 1–16.

POHJOLA, A. 1991. Social Networks – Help or Hindrance to the Migrant? *International Migration,* 29(3), 435–444.

PUGH, J., SULEWSKI, D., MORENO, J. 2017. Adapting Community Mediation for Colombian Forced Migrants in Ecuador. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly,* 34(4), 409–430.

RAGAZZI, F. 2016. Suspect Community or Suspect Category? The Impact of Counter-Terrorism as 'Policed Multiculturalism'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 42(5), 724–741.

ROSSIDES, D. W. 1998. *Professions and Disciplines: Functional and Conflict Perspectives.* Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

SAKS, M. 2010. Analyzing the Professions: The Case for the Neo-Weberian Approach. *Comparative Sociology,* 9(6), 887–915.

SASSEN, S. 1991. *The Global City. New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

SCHILLER, M. 2015. Paradigmatic Pragmatism and the Politics of Diversity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 38(7), 1120–1136.

SCHOLTEN, P., BREUGEL, I. 2018. *Mainstreaming Integration Governance: New Trends in Migrant Integration Policies in Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

SCHOLTEN, P., COLLETT, E., PETROVIC. M. 2017 Mainstreaming Migrant Integration? A Critical Analysis of a New Trend in Integration Governance. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 83(2) 283–302.

SCHOULER-OCAK, M. et al. 2015. EPA Guidance on Cultural Competence Training. *European Psychiatry,* 30(3), 431–440.

SEN, A. 1995. The Political Economy of Targeting. In: VAN DE WALLE, D., NEADS, K. (Eds.). *Public Spending and The Poor.* Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 11–24.

STEIMEL, S. 2017. Negotiating Refugee Empowerment(s) in Resettlement Organizations. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies,* 15(1), 90–107.

SWEENEY, M. A. 2014. Shadow Immigration Enforcement and Its Constitutional Dangers. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology,* 104(2), 227–241.

TATAR, M. 1998. Counselling Immigrants: School Contexts and Emerging Strategies. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling,* 26(3), 337–352.

TOMLINSON, F., EGAN, S. 2002. From Marginalization to (Dis)Empowerment: Organizing Training and Employment Services for Refugees. *Human Relations,* 55(8), 1019–1043.

TRUONG, M., PARADIES, Y., PRIEST, N. 2014. Interventions to Improve Cultural Competency in Healthcare: A Systematic Review of Reviews. *BMC Health Services Research,* 99(14), 1–17.

UITERMARK, J., ROSSI, U., VAN HOUTUM, H. 2005. Reinventing Multiculturalism: Urban Citizenship and the Negotiation of Ethnic Diversity in Amsterdam. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,* 29(3), 622–640.

VALTONEN, K. 2008. *Social Work and Migration. Immigrant and Refugee Settlement and Integration.* London: Routledge.

VERTOVEC, S. 2010. Towards Post-Multiculturalism? Changing Communities, Conditions And Contexts of Diversity. *International Social Science Journal,* 61(199), 83–95.

WASHINGTON, J., PAYLOR, I. 1998. Europe, Social Exclusion, and the Identity of Social Work. *European Journal of Social Work,* (1)3, 327–338.

WEBER, M. 2009. *Metodologie, sociologie a politika.* Praha: OIKOYMENH.

WHITE, B. 2018. *Intercultural Cities: Policy and Practice for a New Era.* Montreal: Palgrave Macmillan.

ZAPATA-BARRERO, R. 2015. Interculturalism: Main Hypothesis, Theories and Strands. In: ZAPATA-BARRERO, R. (Ed.). *Interculturalism in Cities: Concept, Policy and Implementation.* Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar Publishing, 3–19.