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ABSTRACT
Unprecedented ‘Celtic Tiger’ in-flows of economic migrants and asylum-seekers have created an increasingly multicultural Ireland. This transformation has spawned significant academic and policy-making attention to the country’s emerging ‘integration’ agenda. As this agenda develops, neoliberal decentralisations of social service provision are increasingly devolving responsibility for operationalising integration directives to local agencies and service providers. Inadequate national integration policy support and severe under-resourcing require these workers to employ autonomy and discretion (with which they are imbued as ‘street-level bureaucrats’) to develop feasible and pragmatic integration practice.

This study focuses on local service providers ‘delivering integration’ (and other services) to youth (≈ ages 13-25) in Galway City. Though significant research attention has focused on service users, these workers are under-researched in an Irish context and in the migration literature more generally. The objectives of this research are: (1) to illuminate the ways in which local youth service providers imagine ‘integration’, (2) to elaborate the ways in which these imaginings, along with resourcing constraints, circumscribe the boundaries for ‘doing integration’ at the street level, and (3) to examine the ‘spaces of integration’ that are constructed (or not) through everyday service provision practice. Research findings are based on a thematic analysis of in-depth interview data as well as on participant observations of local youth programming and youth service provider knowledge transfer events.

‘Spaces of integration’ (re) produced by the street-level service provider practice illuminated can be characterised as ‘caring spaces’ in view of broader theoretical understandings of ‘care’ and in light of differentiated roles for ‘tolerant hosts’ and ‘needy migrants’ set out in national integration policy. These spaces can be simultaneously inclusive and exclusive and are frequently ephemeral in nature. Their sustainability is challenged by a myriad of factors including under-resourcing; lack of staff training and experience; and insufficient networking. Practice emerging within these ‘spaces of care’ can be imagined as a typology of responses to diversity-related challenges. These “response repertoires” include both assimilative strategies and strategies centring on cultural performance. Various approaches to improving the sustainability and function of local ‘spaces of integration’ are advanced.
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Chapter 1: Introduction
1.1 PREAMBLE

Across the European Union (EU), net in-migration is on the rise. Additionally, internal mobility is also increasing within most European states (Spencer 2005:4). Resultant increases in cultural diversity across most EU States have introduced attendant increases in the number of languages spoken and the number of religions practiced, as well as noticeable new diversity in other cultural practice. Though this increased level of diversity carries with it many advantages for the EU in the form of new contributions to the labour market and research communities, as well as through enhanced opportunities for cultural exchange across a myriad of social venues, diversity also brings with it many challenges. Many EU Member States are now grappling with issues arising from new cultural influences in areas such as education, public service provision and citizen participation. For example, school children in London now speak more than 200 different first languages (ibid).

New socio-cultural realities have elevated discussions of immigration and diversity management to unprecedented importance across many contemporary EU governments. As a result of these discussions, new discourses are emerging that, not only construct immigration as an issue of management and control, but expand to highlight participation, citizenship and equality as critical facets of immigration with which newly diverse nations must contend. Through disparate national debates of these issues, most Member States have arrived at similar conclusions in regard to a recognised need for the successful long-term incorporation of new immigrants in order to ensure a socially cohesive future. The way in which many contemporary EU governments -- including the Netherlands, Sweden, Finland and Denmark -- currently articulate national strategies for the realisation of this goal is by invoking the concept of ‘integration’ (Gray 2006:129). Within these nations, empowerment, participation and a commitment to multiculturalism are viewed as underpinning integration policies and programmes\(^1\) (IWGIRI 1999).

Despite a virtual Member State consensus surrounding integration as the ‘way forward’ for Europe, an equally universal agreement on the best strategies by which to

---

\(^1\) More detailed descriptions of these nations’ key integration policies and ethos(s) are available in the Department of Justice Equality and Law Reform report, Integration: A Two-Way Process (Interdepartmental Working Group on the Integration of Refugees in Ireland (IWGIRI) 1999:36-39).
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achieve it has, thus far, not emerged. Many approaches to integration have been undertaken by different Member States; some that have extensive histories of immigration, and others -- like Ireland -- that have only become nations with net immigration status in very recent decades. The recentness of this status change makes Ireland a particularly interesting case study for exploring the ways in which EU idealisations of ‘integration’ as the solution to diversity challenges become manifest in policy and, more importantly, in everyday practice. The remainder of this chapter will, therefore, highlight Ireland’s recently-arrived position as a destination for migrants, and provide a brief summary of the nation’s policy response to challenges arising from this demographic transition as a context for this research. The concluding portion of this discussion highlights contemporary neoliberal shifts in public service delivery that join with policy to greatly impact the way in which Ireland ‘does integration’.

Before embarking upon this discussion, it is essential to clarify key terminology used in this dissertation. The terms ‘migrant’ and ‘non-migrant’ are used frequently -- along with (occasionally) associated terminology such as ‘non-national’ and ‘immigrant’. It is necessary to acknowledge that these terms are highly contested and have been widely critiqued. These critiques centre on the fact that, when discussing young people, the use of ‘migrant’ as an identifier renders invisible the unique socio-cultural, economic, political, gendered and racialised experiences of those involved in the migration process (Gray 2006). Furthermore, it neglects to acknowledge that young people may in-migrate as dependants of EU migrant workers, work permit holders, returning Irish parents, asylum seekers or unaccompanied minors (Bushin and White 2010).

It is outside the scope of the research questions interrogated herein to engage further with these debates. It is simply necessary to say here that the use of the term ‘migrant’ (and other associated designations) throughout this dissertation to collectively identify people across disparate legal statuses and with highly diverse sets of experiences, (e.g., economic migrants, asylum-seekers and refugees) is the result of a considered decision to use the term that best collectively reflects terminology most commonly used by interviewees participating in this research. In their discussions, these interviewees do not often differentiate between legal statuses and motivational
backgrounds across the youth populations with whom they engage. When
differentiation is made on the part of an interviewee, it is noted in the discussion
around that portion of her/his narrative. This is mainly the case in respondent
discussions surrounding asylum-seekers as a specific population with specialised
needs. In general, however, respondents in this research tend to use the term ‘migrant’
as a ‘generic term’ that they appear to perceive to collectively include individuals
present in Ireland for a myriad of reasons and under several different legal statuses.
The main exception to this can be noted amongst respondents employed in migrant
advocacy roles. In discussions of these individuals’ narratives, differentiations made
by them of individual ‘migrant’ statuses (and associated experiences) are highlighted
accordingly.

1.2 IMMIGRATION AND INTEGRATION: THE IRISH EXPERIENCE
Between 1871 and 1961, the average annual net emigration from Ireland consistently
exceeded the natural increase of the Irish population, which shrank from 4.4 million in
1861 to 2.8 million in 1961 (Ruhs and Quinn 2009). However, beginning in the mid-
1990s -- attracted by unprecedented ‘Celtic Tiger’ prosperity -- return migration of
Irish nationals, combined with new flows of economic migrants and asylum-seekers
from other parts of the world, transformed Ireland from a migration source to a
destination². The timing of this demographic shift made Ireland the last EU Member
State to become a country of net immigration (ibid). Demands for labour across a
wide range of sectors and historically low levels of unemployment served to sustain
Ireland’s popularity as a destination for migrants well into the first decade of the 21st
century. Indeed, in 2007, Ireland had the third highest migration rate across the 27
EU Member States --14.5 migrants per 1,000 inhabitants (ibid). The most marked
period of economic in-migration to Ireland within the post-1990 period came after the
2004 enlargement of the EU when Ireland -- along with the UK and Sweden --
permitted immediate access for new Member State citizens to their labour markets.
Flows peaked in 2006-2007 before beginning to drop off in 2008 with the onset of a
recession late that year (ibid). Asylum applications had already peaked in 2002 (at

² Ireland experienced a brief period of net in-migration during the 1970s, but it was short-lived and did
not have sustained socio-economic impacts on the nation as net inward flows from the 1990s onward
have had (Ruhs and Quinn 2009; Diez 2011).
11,634 applications) before falling off to approximately 3,900 applications in 2008 (ibid).

Despite the fact that Ireland has recently begun to experience increased levels of out-migration due to widespread unemployment and continuing economic recession (Central Statistics Office (CSO) 2010), results of the ‘Celtic Tiger’ immigration boom remain noticeable within a transformed Irish demographic. Largely as a result of high levels of migration flows into Ireland during the end of the 20th century and the beginning of this century, Ireland is now a decidedly multicultural nation with just over 10% of the country’s population listed as “non-Irish” (CSO 2007). The site of this study -- Galway City -- provides a particularly advantageous site for investigations related to this increased level of multiculturalism due to the fact that, amongst all Irish cities, is the most diverse; having 17.45% of its population listed as “non-Irish”\(^3\) (CSO 2007).

Following recent demographic shifts, Ireland has begun to face new socio-economic challenges that impact not only long-time residents, but also many of those individuals who arrived in the pre-recessionary in-migration boom. Current widespread unemployment and subsequent strains on the social welfare system have spawned public debate that has focused particular attention on the needs and rights of Ireland’s most recently-arrived residents, as well as broader discussions regarding their future within Irish society. Though other EU Member-States are also currently experiencing recession-related challenges, their longer respective histories of net immigration provide them with more extensive experience upon which to draw when addressing immigration issues relevant to broader debates regarding socio-economic instabilities. Lacking this experience, Ireland must rely upon hastily emerging, frequently isolated and often contradictory policy responses in the form of statements and directives issued across a wide range of government departments (Gray 2006; Fanning and Munck 2007; Boucher 2008; Cullen 2009).

As a result of Ireland’s relatively late arrival on the international immigration scene, the nation has also experienced a comparative delay (in relation to other EU Member

\(^{3}\) This is in comparison to 17.2% “non-Irish” population in Dublin City proper, 14.5% in Dublin City and suburbs, 12.1% in Limerick City and 11.2% in Cork City (CSO 2007).
States) in the development of related integration measures. When nation-states experience large-scale arrivals of people from diverse national and cultural backgrounds, a need quickly arises for policy that extends beyond immigration issues, (e.g., border control and labour regulation), to matters of societal participation and immigrant incorporation. So, again, given the comparatively longer histories of other EU Member States in experiencing these needs, Ireland is a newcomer to national discussions of integration as well. However, increased cultural diversity within Ireland has necessitated the introduction of an integration agenda which is, and will continue to be, of primary importance to broader national agendas regarding social and economic progress. It is these discussions of Irish integration, then, that provide the context for the investigation undertaken in this research.

Ireland’s body of integration-related policy formulated in the years during and following recent large-scale in-migration is relatively abbreviated and disjointed. A detailed table summarising older policy pieces that form the foundation for this recent policy, as well as summaries of key pieces of contemporary immigration/integration policy itself, can be found in Appendix A. Here, however, it is necessary simply to highlight a few key discourses emerging across these documents in order to contextualise subsequent discussions of local service provider attitudes toward the usefulness of policy guidelines in their daily work. The fact that these policy documents go some way in focussing attention on racism and integration as issues of national concern does not overcome the reality that they provide relatively little in the way of practical guidance for local service providers charged with delivering youth services in line with an ‘integration agenda’.

Rhetoric spanning EU and Irish national-level documents regarding ‘integration’ repeatedly refers to lofty goals regarding the battle against racism and social exclusion, developing a sense of social cohesion, the promotion of ‘tolerance’ in (Irish) society, the promotion of cultural diversity, and the ensuring of equal opportunity for all residents. Several state policy documents further develop this rhetoric into nation-specific goals for the ‘integration’ of migrants. However, these documents seldom identify any pragmatic means for establishing societal structures through which to accomplish these goals -- particularly in regard to youth. For
example, *Migration Nation* (Office for the Minister of Integration 2008) calls for the establishment of an approach between government and nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), as well as civil society bodies, to deepen and enhance opportunities for integration. This approach advocates the establishment of clear public policy that avoids the creation of ‘parallel societies’ for migrants through the employment of integration policy that is embedded within wider state social inclusion measures, strategies and initiatives. This document further outlines that paramount to accomplishment of these goals is the establishment of effective local delivery mechanisms that align services to migrants with those for indigenous communities (*ibid*). However, despite the attention focussed by this piece of policy on the key role of local agencies in the delivery of ‘integration-friendly’ services, the document stops short of articulating specific means by which these services can be developed, delivered and sustained.

*Integration: A Two-Way Process* (IWGIRI 1999) similarly highlights the key role of local service providers in deploying national integration initiatives. However, authors of that document only go so far as calling for “awareness and sensitivity” on the part of service providers toward people of different backgrounds, and direct those personnel to attend training in anti-racism and interculturalism. The extent and form of this training is, however, not defined except in the case of a few specific groups for which state ‘race-relations training’ had already been instituted at the time of the document’s publication, (e.g. trainee gardaí; FÁS staff; social service, probation and welfare officers; and local housing authority officers in the Dublin area) (*ibid*:25). Of these agencies designated for the receipt of integration-related training, few function specifically with youth as their focus. *Integration: A Two-Way Process* does address youth briefly when it calls for the participation of the education sector in the spread of “racial tolerance”, and asks that special efforts be made to develop in Ireland’s youth a “respect for fundamental equality” (*ibid*). Again, however, this document stops short of offering pragmatic guidelines for achieving these goals to educators and service providers delivering informal education (youth work) curricula.

Amidst publication of these highly generalised state directives -- for which practical administrative assistance has largely not been provided to most street-level
organisations -- a key advisory body in the fight against racism and the promotion of a more inclusive intercultural society in Ireland, was disbanded. Despite pleas on the part of personnel from various public service and educational agencies such as hospitals, universities and NGOs to spare the organisation, the National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism (NCCRI) became one of many victims of the budgetary axe in 2008. This year was, coincidentally, the same year in which the National Action Plan Against Racism, 2005-2008 (Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform 2005) also concluded. In addition, the 2008 budget also levelled cuts across such agencies as the Equality Authority, the Combat Poverty Agency and in English-language support programmes for schools across the country. According to government, the functions of the NCCRI were meant to be incorporated into the Office of the Minister for Integration, but all NCCRI staff lost their jobs and the Integration Ministry, itself, has since remained severely under-funded.

With the dissolution of the NCCRI and recessionary cuts in funding for many other integration-related agencies, state policy calling for the spread of racial tolerance and the facilitation of integration were given little material support for their enactment. This lack of administrative support has proven especially problematic within a neoliberal atmosphere of decentralisation and devolving responsibility for social programming to the local level across many contemporary EU governments including that of Ireland. Since the late 1980s, these movements toward decentralisation have elevated the importance of NGOs and other locally-based organisations as agents for the delivery of (formerly centralised) public services designed to facilitate the accomplishment of state social goals (Gideon 1998; Larner 2000; Fyfe 2005; Cullen 2009). Indeed, there has been significant interest in the role of the third sector as a possible, “panacea for the problems facing neo-liberalising states” (Fyfe 2005:537). These local organisations are often argued to be efficient, small-scale and cost-effective agencies through which to deploy state initiatives relating to a myriad of social issues (Frantz 1987; Farrington et al. 1993; Gideon 1998).

Other European Member States have experienced similar shifts in responsibility for their respective integration projects to NGOs and other ‘third sector’ organisations working largely at the local level. Though, in this way, Ireland is akin to these nations
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in regard to certain generalities of the ‘stage’ on which the integration agenda is being played out, a historic lack of cooperation between NGOs across the EU has limited the extent to which ‘integration-responsible’ organisations -- facing similar challenges -- benefit from shared experience, resourcing, networking and the like. With the exception of a few agencies, (e.g., The Churches’ Commission for Migrants in Europe and the European Network Against Racism) that have attempted to stimulate cooperation between NGOs across various countries, supra-national organising and action in this arena are rare. Therefore, existing mechanisms and structures for implementing quite isolated national integration projects continue to be reinforced (Niessen 2002:81).

A trend in Ireland -- following similar cross-national, neoliberal trends -- that increasingly shifts integration responsibility to the local level combines problematically with Irish policy that fails to clearly articulate pragmatic strategies for the ‘delivery of integration’ at the street-level. This ‘integration recipe’ leaves large numbers of local service providers, newly enlisted in state integration initiatives, with little state guidance or support. In light of this shortcoming, these workers are left with few options when/if attempting to adhere to stated national integration goals. They can attempt to ‘read between the lines’ of policy and interpret state goals in ways that are compatible with service delivery practice they are already employing; thereby certifying accomplished compliance with national integration directives. Alternatively, they can interpret state goals to the best of their ability and then implement new programmes and services to attempt the furthering of these goals. Or, they can make themselves aware of stated national policy goals but produce organisation-specific ‘integration’ policy that harmonises with, or is a result of, other organisational goals that are already in place. It is this breadth of choice available to street-level service providers in their attempts to facilitate ‘integration’ through the delivery of their programming that is at the heart of this investigation. The remainder of this chapter will outline the specific objectives of the research and the structure for the remainder of the thesis.
1.3 RESEARCH AIMS

Ireland’s reliance on local schools, religious organisations and voluntary -- or ‘third sector’ -- organisations for the delivery of many increasingly decentralised public services creates an emerging site of study for research into a myriad of social processes being enacted at the street level. However, thus far, little research has been conducted that specifically interrogates integration as one such process -- particularly in an Irish context. This gap in academic investigation is identified by Penninx et al. (2008) in their report for the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) on the state of migration and integration research in Europe. This report highlights a lack of nationally-based studies interrogating the mismatch between integration policy advice and actual policy implementation processes. Further, a lack of research focussing on the role(s) of different local actors in the field of immigration and integration such as local governments, NGOs and individuals is noted (ibid:7). These gaps in research cause most national-level surveys and reporting of integration status to lack a regional and local perspective (ibid). Most certainly, in the Irish context, scant research has interrogated the local service provider role as a specific and significant influence on the trajectory of integration processes -- particularly in reference to young people.

A significant facet of the identified gap in research regarding local actors and their role(s) in interpreting and actualising national integration policy is a deficit in research that focuses particularly on the local spaces (re)created by these processes. In view of Irish national policy constructions of integration as a process within which there are differentiated roles for paternalistic ‘hosts’ and ‘needy’ migrants, integration becomes imbued with ‘caring’ qualities that inform and (re)shape the spaces in which it occurs. These spaces can, therefore, be usefully interrogated as ‘spaces of care’ that may potentially function as part of broader -- if informal -- networks in which other public services and ‘caring’ social policy are enacted. These spaces constitute an important site of geographic enquiry in that the ways in which they are being (re)produced have the capacity to include and/or exclude service users as well as the capacity to influence service provider practice and the sustainability of local programming. In this research, spaces being (re)produced as sites of ‘caring’ integration service provision for local youth are specifically examined.
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Using Galway City as a study site, this research undertakes a three-fold enquiry into service provider practice within local agencies called upon by national policy to participate in youth integration initiatives. An analysis of street-level service provider imaginings of ‘integration’ is contextualised through a discussion of everyday Orientalisms and ‘Othering’ binaries that inform these imaginings. Secondly, the state of resourcing across contemporary Irish youth services is elaborated as a backdrop to the capacity for resourcing youth ‘integration delivery’ specifically. Along with service provider constructions of ‘integration’, this resourcing milieu significantly informs the ‘conditions of work’ for integration service providers at the street level. Thirdly, the nature of spaces that are being (re)constructed vis-à-vis the process of ‘doing integration’ at the street level are interrogated.

In this investigation, attention is focussed on integration service provision practice specifically targeted toward teenagers and youth (up to age twenty-five). Within these discussions, practice relating to migrant youth -- as a particularly marginalised group within broader youth populations -- receives specific attention. The three main avenues of interrogation in this research emerge from the following questions:

I. How do internalised ‘Us’/‘Them’ binaries embedded within Irish national integration policy discourse and broader societal discourses inform street-level youth service provider constructions of ‘integration’?

II. How do these constructions, in tandem with constrained resourcing structures, circumscribe the boundaries for ‘doing integration’ at the street level?

III. How is integration operationalised vis-à-vis service provider practice at the street level, and how do the spaces (re)created by this ‘caring’ form of service delivery take shape and function in Galway City?

These research questions will be examined through the analysis of qualitative data gathered in semi-structured interviews with local youth service providers in Galway City. These service providers represent a range of sectors within youth service provision in order to consider multiple perspectives and a breadth of voices in regard to ‘doing integration’ at the street level. This interview data is analysed in
combination with observational data gathered during participation in service provider training sessions, professional conferences and voluntary service.

1.4 THESIS STRUCTURE
Chapter Two provides the contextual background for this research by reviewing the literature relating to European and Irish conceptualisations of integration, integration-related service provision as a caring behaviour that socially (re)produces space, and street-level bureaucratic behaviour as a mechanism through which policy is (re)produced as practice within these spaces. Chapter Three details the methodology deployed to investigate the research objectives. Chapter Four illuminates various service provider imaginings of ‘integration’ and examines ways in which practical Orientalisms shape these constructions. Chapter 5 examines resourcing within local youth service provision. In elaborating service provider conceptualisations of ‘integration’ and resourcing constraints; together, Chapters 4 and 5 establish critical street-level “conditions of work” (Lipsky 2010) that significantly inform service provider integration practice in Galway City. Chapter Six interrogates this highly individualised and discretionary street-level practice in order to elaborate the local provision of ‘integration’. Chapter Seven draws together the research findings, puts forward recommendations for practical methods of enhancing and increasing the sustainability of spaces for youth integration at the local level and suggests scope for future research.
Chapter 2: Conceptual Foundations
Chapter 2: Conceptual Foundations

2.1 INTRODUCTION
This chapter addresses literatures focusing on street-level bureaucracy, ‘Othering’ and spaces of care as they coalesce to form the investigative framework for an interrogation of ‘spaces of integration’ as they are (re)produced by the practice of youth service providers in Galway City. These spaces -- and the practice of service providers within them -- are, to date, under-examined in the academic literature and a framework for their systematic illumination has not previously emerged. Though many disciplinary literatures address integration as a critical facet of migration and immigrant incorporation, and as a dynamic social process, geographic analyses of the phenomenon as a catalyst for the production of street-level ‘spaces of integration’ are lacking. Further, investigations interrogating these spaces as sites of ‘care’ -- and the service provider practice emerging therein -- are also absent from geographies of health and other academic explorations. These gaps in the literature are highlighted in the forthcoming discussion in order to position this research as a contributor to the formation of critical links between bodies of work interrogating key concepts in the investigation of integration.

In view of these gaps in the extant literature, this research will contribute to better understandings of integration in a local context during an era of increased academic, governmental and public attention to the complex outcomes resulting from global mobility and increasingly pluralistic societies. Within this demographic milieu, ongoing devolutions of responsibility for many types of caring service provision from the State to the local level are occurring which add further relevance to this street-level investigation. Contextualising these dramatic societal changes in Ireland is a failure for a clear and cohesive body of integration policy to emerge. This policy shortfall has far-reaching impacts on service providers across such diverse sectors as education, youth work, local government and sport in their everyday approaches to diversity-related challenges in their work with youth. Subsequently, these street-level workers engage in a myriad of informalised, everyday operationalisations of ‘integration’ according to a plethora of imaginings of the concept. It is this practice and the spaces it (re)produces that constitute the main focus of this research.
2.2 STREET-LEVEL BUREAUCRACY

Since being brought to the fore of social research by Michael Lipsky’s (2010)\textsuperscript{4} Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services, examinations of the influential everyday practice of public service workers has garnered the analytical interest of academics across a range of disciplines including sociology, organisational behaviour and political science. Through these multi-disciplinary endeavours, street-level processes have come to form a recognised area of inquiry; with Lipsky’s conceptualisations forming the basis of an investigative framework that continues to be highly applicable to contemporary research across many topics. To date, however, researchers in geography have drawn upon Lipsky’s work to a much lesser degree than academics in other fields. In light of the aims of this research, and in the context of contemporary neo-liberal shifts in social service provision from State to local scales, Lipsky’s ideas are highly relevant to examinations of everyday service provider practice and how that practice (re)produces spaces of integration at the local level. Therefore, the adaptation of Lipsky’s ideas to this geographic investigation is germane and useful for the illumination of social processes that are, always and at once, intrinsically spatial.

Since publication, Lipsky’s assertions have been subject to frequent critique and his theorisations adapted to social research across a wide range of disciplines (Hudson 1997; Fineman 1998; Evans and Harris 2004; Walker and Gilson 2004; Honig 2006; Hagelund 2009). In order to apply them to my research, it is necessary to unpack Lipsky’s conceptualisations in detail to provide a framework upon which subsequent empirical discussions will build. Lipsky (2010:3) asserts that local public service workers occupy a critical position in society, even though they are often regarded as ‘low-level employees’. In many cases, these workers come to constitute the services delivered by government in many countries around the world (ibid). Moreover, the individual decisions and actions of these workers become, over time, agency policy, and can determine access to social goods and services (ibid). Lipsky (ibid) labels these workers who interact directly with citizens in the course of their jobs and who

\textsuperscript{4} Michael Lipsky first published Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services in 1980. However, in 2010, a 30\textsuperscript{th} anniversary edition of the book was published that contains expanded discussion in the form of a revised preface and an added chapter. This expanded 2010 edition was referenced in this research, therefore, all in-text citations will reflect the use of this edition rather than the, perhaps, better-known 1980 edition.
have substantial local discretion in the execution of their work street-level bureaucrats, (e.g., police officers, social workers, teachers and health workers). Extensive literatures have emerged surrounding topics such as policy implementation and organisational behaviour concerning workers from these fields. However, this research focuses on an under-investigated category of street-level bureaucrat providing an increasingly important (but also under-researched) category of service -- local youth integration service providers. Many of Lipsky’s conceptions of street-level bureaucratic behaviour are highly applicable to these workers and provide a useful framework through which to examine their everyday practice.

2.2.1 STREET-LEVEL BUREAUCRATS AS DE FACTO POLICY-MAKERS
The area of Lipsky’s (2010) analysis of street-level worker behaviour which is, perhaps, most vital to this research centres on the idea of street-level bureaucrats as de facto policy-makers. Lipsky states that most street-level workers experience a high degree of autonomy from organisational authority and a high degree of discretion in decisions about citizens with whom they interact (ibid:13). These characteristics translate into a significant capacity to make policy at the local level through a process Lipsky calls “policy-as-produced” (ibid). In this process, the individual actions of street-level workers, over time, add up to agency behaviour. The discretion and autonomy with which the types of street-level workers that Lipsky interrogates are imbued are also identifiable amongst local youth workers delivering ‘integration services’. Therefore, it is useful to examine these capacities more closely as they relate to these roles.

Lipsky (ibid:13) asserts that, unlike lower-level workers in many organisations, street-level bureaucrats have considerable discretion in determining what services their agency will provide to local citizens, what amount of those services each individual will receive, and what form those services will take. This does not mean that street-level bureaucrats are unrestrained actors, however. Rules and regulations from above, in addition to occupational norms, community norms and decisions of administrators do structure the policy choices of street-level workers (ibid:14). Nevertheless, by definition as professionals, these workers experience a certain degree of discretion based purely on this status alone, (i.e., professionals such as law enforcement officers,
nurses and teachers working in any environment are accorded discretionary judgement in their field. In this sense, they are deferred to in their area of specialisation and are relatively free from scrutiny by those in other fields or by their clients (ibid). Vis-à-vis the exercise of this professional expertise, these workers contribute to shaping the contours of policy implementation (May and Winter 2007).

However, according to Lipsky, the difference between street-level bureaucracies and other types of organisations lies in the fact that, in street-level bureaucracies, public service employees who do not hold a professional status often still exercise considerable degrees of discretion in their daily work, (e.g., a lower-level clerk in a welfare office still exercises some control over access to client benefits) (ibid).

In his discussions of street-level bureaucrats, Lipsky (ibid:14-15) goes on to highlight that though discretionary behaviour can become problematic to agencies in various ways, the fact remains that certain characteristics of street-level jobs make it difficult, if not impossible, to severely reduce this discretion. Street-level jobs frequently involve tasks for which elaborate rules, guidelines or instructions cannot adequately circumscribe behavioural alternatives appropriate for each situation that arises (ibid:15). Tasks within these positions are often performed in complex work environments that are “too complicated to reduce to programmatic formats”, and involve encountering situations that require responses to the ‘human dimension’. These tasks are, therefore, not easily performed by referencing pre-set action scripts. Indeed, public service provision often requires sensitive observation and judgement -- even on the part of ‘non-professional’ workers -- which could not be effectively executed within the bounds of strictly defined action parameters (ibid). In situations requiring this type of independent and reactive judgement to unique human interactions, Brehm and Gates (1997:202) assert that street-level workers act as ‘principled agents’ as they fulfil their roles in ways that they deem appropriate to the given circumstances. Lipsky summarises this dimension of street level bureaucracies when he states that “to the extent that street-level tasks remain complex and human intervention is considered necessary for effective service, discretion will remain characteristic of many public service jobs” (ibid:16).
According to Lipsky, the second component of street-level bureaucracies that enables “policy-as-produced” to emerge is the presence of relative autonomy from organisational authority within local agencies. Lipsky’s model posits that street-level workers will not always share the objectives of their superiors and have the autonomy to choose not to work toward stated agency goals in all cases (ibid:16). In fact, an extensive literature bears out that managerial factors have muted influence over the actions of street-level workers (Brehm and Gates 1997; Langbein and Jorstad 2004; Ricucci et al. 2004; Ricucci 2005; May and Winter 2007). Ultimately, then, given the assumption that street-level workers often embrace differing views than their superiors regarding agency objectives, Lipsky asserts that a certain amount of street-level non-compliance can be expected. In such situations, Lipsky and other researchers (Maynard-Moody and Musheno 2000; Sandfort 2000) conclude, therefore, that discrepancies between policy declarations and actual policy implemented are to be expected.

It is not a primary objective of this research to determine the degree to which street-level integration practice in Galway City does or does not conform to national integration policy mandates, as this project is not a policy implementation study and the validity of attempts to measure ‘integration’ are widely debated. However, where notable examples of non-compliance with State integration policy emerge within this research, discussion will be devoted accordingly. What is important to consider in this conceptual discussion is that the street-level model elaborates service provider discretion and autonomy that allows these workers to vary their everyday ‘integration practice’ with regard to state mandates and initiatives. This variation within and between service providers and agencies allows for an equally variable (re)production of local ‘spaces of integration’ which are the focus of this research. Therefore, in this conceptual discussion, it is important, simply, to establish awareness of this capacity by local service providers and agencies to determine individualised programmatic paths toward ‘integration’; bounded only very broadly by nebulous state guidelines regarding the same.
2.3 YOUTH SERVICE PROVIDERS AS STREET-LEVEL BUREAUCRATS

Lipsky’s conceptions of street-level bureaucracies and how workers operate within them provide a useful framework through which to examine the under-researched category of workers with which this research is concerned -- youth integration service providers. Perhaps, the reason for the neglect of this group of workers in the academic literature stems from the fact that they are employed across a disparate group of organisations that, as yet, have not constructed themselves -- and have not been constructed in the academic literature -- as a functioning network for the provision of ‘integration services’. The street-level bureaucracy model furnishes an effective means of collectively interrogating this group of workers -- across agencies and organisations -- in order to illuminate their everyday practice; thus providing insights into locally produced imaginings of, and attitudes toward, integration.

There has, to date, been scant academic investigation, through the use of the street-level bureaucracy model, of individuals charged with operationalising integration policy. However, in her examination of education service providers in Norway, Anniken Hagelund (2009) does broadly construct service providers working in diverse communities as a specialised form of ‘street-level bureaucrat’. In her research, Hagelund (ibid:80) posits that the management of diversity is a critical street-level dimension of work, and that valuable investigative ground exists in the examination of everyday practices aimed at “handling diversity”. Aiming to further illuminate such practice, this research centres on street-level workers in Ireland who now find themselves charged with developing integration strategies within their work in an increasingly diverse society. Refugees, migrants and their children are amongst the clientele with which these workers interact on a regular basis (ibid). Within this work, dilemmas arise from certain ambivalences that the State has built into ‘integration’ policy designed to manage this diversity. On the one hand, many pieces of national policy are concerned with immigrant incorporation into the majority society; while on the other hand, they also claim to support the maintenance of cultural diversity in order to respect the cultural identities of all residents (Grillo 2002). Hagelund (2009:80) focuses on these sorts of ambivalences and the ways in which they shape street-level practice within service provision.
Within the two broad agendas of incorporation and diversity encapsulated by much contemporary EU integration policy discourse -- as well as that of Ireland -- ‘integration’ is often equated with *sameness* (Hagelund 2009:81). While the rhetoric of diversity is seemingly embraced by policymakers, there still appear to be strong assimilationist expectations for newcomers. Whilst offering equal rights to immigrants and maintaining spaces for cultural diversity, current policy directives in many EU Member States encourage gaps to form on the ground between ‘integration’ ideals and a multicultural reality (*ibid*). These gaps are where shortcomings in policy can be, “observed and measured as discrimination, marginalisation and inequality” (*ibid*). In light of these gaps, it is necessary, for the purposes of this research, to unpack the notion of ‘integration’ as it is constructed in contemporary policy -- particularly in the Irish context. In doing so, the foundations will be laid for the interrogation of this policy and its shortcomings as a contextual contributor to street-level service provider struggles with “diversity dilemmas” (Hagelund 2009).

2.4 INTEGRATION AS “CONCEPTUAL SHORTHAND”

Like that of many EU governments, contemporary Irish integration policy has emerged during an era of rapidly increasing global migration. Under these historical and social circumstances, a plethora of conceptual terminology has been used to explain and characterise immigrant experiences. Absorption, acculturation, accommodation, inclusion, participation, cohesion-building, enfranchisement, toleration, anti-discrimination and other related terms have been proposed as superior lenses through which to examine the process by which immigrants transition into a new society (Favell 2001). In recent years, however, the concept of ‘integration’ has seemingly come to represent the most broadly accepted vision or end-goal for society as a whole in regard to processes of immigrant incorporation. It seems to invoke a wider conceptual consensus when compared to other competing terms and concepts (*ibid*). Favell (*ibid*) states that, in the post-1960s era, integration has become a “sensible middle ground” between xenophobic nationalism and radical anti-system discourses. As such, thus far, integration has proven fairly impervious to becoming ‘unfashionable’ (*ibid*).
Emerging as modern and unifying “conceptual shorthand” for interrogations of the immigrant experience, ‘integration’ has not been problematised to as great a degree as other related terminology such as assimilation (ibid). Indeed, assimilation, as originally theorised in the early 20th century, has been particularly heavily critiqued due to its constructions of a uni-directional process that expects different ethnic groups to meld into the majority culture by shedding their own ethno-cultural traditions and practices (Gordon 1964). Though it held sway within the academic literature for several decades, from the 1970s, this envisaging of immigrant incorporation began to be viewed as highly problematic, as it required immigrants to change their behaviour in order to achieve a degree of ‘sameness’ with majority society members (Nagel and Staeheli 2005:489). By virtue of this and other criticisms, assimilation theory came to be characterised as ethnocentric and patronising to minority peoples who wish to maintain their cultural and ethnic identities (Alba and Nee 2003). Backlashes against the middle-class, Protestant, white normative standard elevated by the classic assimilation model, thus, began to move other models of immigrant incorporation, (e.g., multiculturalism) to the fore (Brubaker 2001). Within these more structural and conflict-oriented models, notions of a homogenous society were rejected in favour of an emphasis on on-going processes of reciprocal exchange and adaptation on the part of both immigrants and majority groups (Hooker 2008:3).

Through the 1980s, though newer models of immigrant incorporation began to highlight pluralist perspectives, ethnic persistence and the desirability of a multi-ethnic society, multiculturalism as a central theme remained vague and, therefore, widely debated. Eventually, these debates led to a re-visitation of the classic assimilation model within academic circles. Differing from original Chicago School theorisations of the 1920s, these late 20th century re-considerations of the theory suggested reformulations that reflected more agnostic views of, and ambivalences toward, the direction, degree, modality and desirability of migrant assimilation toward the majority culture (Brubaker 2001:540). Subsequently, new theorisations of the ‘old assimilation model’ have emerged that focus on commonalities and a renewed concern with civic integration (ibid:542). However, despite these more contemporary reconceptualisations of ‘assimilation’, ghosts of the theory’s past have not allowed the
term itself to escape, in any widespread way, negative undertones previously associated with it. This is particularly true outside of the academic community. Fields such as education, social work and other human service professions have been enduringly impacted by the ‘assimilation as a dirty word’ mentality that emerged in the post-Civil Rights Era (Jacoby 2004; Durance and Godet 2007; Kerrin 2005). More recent (re)theorisations of assimilation within the academic literature have seemingly failed to reach these audiences as widely as did 1970s-1980s critiques of the concept.

The afore-discussed trajectory of assimilation as a much-contested conceptualisation of immigrant incorporation -- and the widespread impacts of that progression -- have helped to elevate ‘integration’ to a preferred conceptual status. Favell (2001) posits that the wide acceptance of ‘integration’ in recent decades has to do with the term’s built-in vagueness and its abstract -- yet positive sounding -- quality. It seems to suggest a “comfortingly technical” view of modern society heading towards a progressive outcome (ibid). Favell (ibid) further argues that its polar opposite -- disintegration -- is so unpalatable, that society is almost forced to accept ‘integration’ as a necessity. Hagelund (2002:408) similarly asserts that, rhetorically, ‘integration’ is such a forceful notion simply because its conceptual opposites are so socially unacceptable. ‘Incohesion’, ‘disenfranchisement’ or ‘intolerance’ do not seem to evoke quite the same level of societal abhorrence as ‘disintegration’ might (Favell 2001). Therefore, ‘integration’ is constructed as, “the only route forward in the face of unambiguously undesirable alternatives” (Hagelund 2002:408).

Despite characterisations of ‘integration’ as a positive-sounding, ‘one-size-fits-all’ term, Hooker (2008:3) argues that contemporary emphasis on ‘integration’ as a conceptual goal marks a potentially problematic phase in the development of theories of immigrant incorporation. Hooker (ibid) maintains that the concept of integration may prove theoretically elusive and raise questions of different meanings for different audiences. Adding further potential for confusion -- despite arguments by proponents for integration theory as an alternative to assimilation theory -- some contemporary scholars still equate ‘integration’ with assimilation (ibid:4). This association exists despite earlier academic attempts to distance the two concepts by formulating
meanings of integration in terms of what it is not (i.e., not assimilation, not segregation) (Hagelund 2002:406).

Phalet and Swyngedouw (2003) add an additional dimension to concerns regarding integration as the newly-dominant conceptual framework within which to examine immigrant experiences, when they point out that the political success of ‘integration’ -- as argued by Favell (2001) -- is not matched by its analytical and empirical merits in social science research. They contend that, ‘integration’ combines analytical concepts with idealised projections of society that invoke very different emotional and attitudinal reactions in different groups and contexts (ibid). Li (2003:316) concurs with this concern over the potentially problematic nature of ‘integration’ as a universal concept by which to characterise immigrant experiences when he states that the term is, “used liberally by policy-makers, immigration critics, and academics without vigorous theoretical explication”. Within these under-interrogated interpretations of the concept, assessments of immigrant ‘success’ or ‘failure’ are often based on narrow understandings and rigid expectations that treat ‘integration’ as the degree to which immigrants meld with normative standards of native-born society members, (i.e., assimilate) (ibid).

Li’s arguments concerning integration theory’s expectations for migrant aspiration to ‘host society’ norms brings into question new considerations of ‘old assimilationism’. Li (ibid:324) posits that discourse surrounding integration theory unwittingly accepts an inherent conformity premise that, “equates the extent of immigrants’ integration with the degree of compliance with the average host standard”. Therefore, conformity is held up as the desirable outcome of ‘successful’ integration, and immigrants who choose to continue to adhere to their ethnic, linguistic and cultural ways are segregated from the mainstream and depicted as detrimental to the well-being of society (ibid:327). Ultimately then, integration discourses have the potential to (negatively) underscore relationships between ‘host society’ members and newcomers, as well as to enhance the power and influence of the former to set the normative terms and expectations for immigrant change (ibid:329). Echoing Li’s arguments regarding nuances of ‘old assimilationism’ found embedded in contemporary ‘integration’ discourses; Phalet and Swyngedouw (2003) contend that
the multidimensional concept of integration actually quite clearly builds upon Gordonian ‘old assimilation’. Other contemporary scholars (Alba and Nee 1997; Faist 2000) concur that both assimilation and integration theory share functional expectations for immigrant trajectories.

Despite identified relationships between assimilation and integration, many contemporary theorists maintain that there are still important differences between the two. Hooker (2008:4) states that, “unlike assimilation theory, integration theory emphasises a mutual process of adaptation and inclusion on the part of both newcomers and the receiving society.” However, the Gordonian-type conceptualisation of assimilation to which Hooker (2008) refers is argued by others to under-appreciate contemporary theorisations of assimilation that predict bi-directional processes (Portes and Zhou, 1993; Alba and Nee 1997; Brubaker 2001). Ultimately, it would seem that researchers concerned with issues of immigrant incorporation will continue to argue what is constituted by ‘assimilation’ and ‘integration’, whether they share theoretical foundations and functionalities, or whether they are, perhaps, one in the same thing. These academic debates are likely, “going to be unresolved ones”, and the questions as to what is meant by integration in any given case provide no easy answers (Fanning and Munck 2006:2). However, when interrogating issues of contemporary immigrant incorporation it is this very theoretical nebulousness that provides focus for ongoing investigation across many disciplines. Specifically in this research, it constitutes an intrinsic and critical backdrop to the ‘integration work’ that street-level youth service providers are charged with doing.

2.5 EU INTEGRATION POLICY: A LIMITED GUIDE FOR MEMBER STATES

Despite the theoretical indecisiveness underlying debates and discourses of integration, researchers and policy analysts widely agree that ‘integration’ (however imagined) has become central to the EU’s agenda (Favell 2001; Spencer 2005; Gray 2006; Boucher 2008). With net migration in Europe increasing consistently and internal mobility enhanced by the 2004 enlargement of the EU, much policy attention has been turned toward issues of immigrant integration arising from these demographic trends (Spencer 2005). In order to specifically interrogate Irish integration policy development and integration strategies, it is useful to briefly discuss
the broader EU policy foundations which Member State integration policy is suggested to follow. However, it is important to note that Ireland has chosen -- more actively than some other EU countries -- to deviate from these suggestions. Nevertheless, as EU-level policy exists as one possible guideline for nationalised and/or localised integration practice, it is prudent to highlight it briefly here.

The primary EU document upon which much Member State policy draws in defining the nature and scope of ‘integration’ is the European Common Basic Principles (CBP); adopted in late 2004. This lynchpin policy piece characterises integration as, “a multidimensional process of mutual accommodation”, and calls upon EU Member societies to remove all barriers to such integration while respecting the rights and obligations of migrants (Spencer 2005:24). Ireland’s contemporary integration policy draws selectively from this policy piece. However, the CBP is not legally binding to any Member State, and Ireland -- along with the UK -- have particular ‘opting out’ facilities when it comes to these sorts of EU instruments. In fact, Ireland has decided not to adopt at least 53 different EU measures in the field of immigration and asylum (Smyth 2008). Boucher (2008) highlights that, given Ireland’s particular capacity to deviate from CBP guidelines, it is not surprising to find that the nation’s integration policy is nationally based and distinctive; with convergences toward the policies of other EU Member States being a facet of Irish choice rather than obligation.

In light of Ireland’s decision to develop more nationally-oriented integration policies that do not specifically adhere to the CBP, an extended discussion of the EU document will not be included here. However, it is worthy of note that EU Member States that do not have the ‘opting out’ capabilities of Ireland and the UK (when it comes to certain integration-related measures) have demonstrated little policy ‘convergence of thought’ regarding the meaning of ‘integration’ despite greater coalescence around the CBP. Indeed, Favell (2001) assesses that contemporary Member State integration policy continues to encompass a wide range of positions.

5 The UK, Ireland and Denmark have opt-outs from EU immigration, asylum and civil law set out in a Protocol to the Treaty of Amsterdam which took effect 1 May 1999 (Peers 2004).

6 For a more detailed treatment of the integration guidelines spelled out in the CBP, see Spencer (2005). For comparative discussions regarding variations in Member State adaptations of this policy piece in their own national integration policies, see Favell (1998); Joppke (1999); Koopmans and Statham (2000) and Carrera (2006).
from more assimilatory practices through to more open-minded multicultural ones. Spencer (2005:26) similarly asserts that as a result of increasingly nationalistic determinations of integration policy approach, many “chaotic experimental models” have emerged wherein unique interactions between factors in individual host societies and the characteristics of their particular migrants have come to shape increasingly divergent national understandings of ‘integration’.

As a result of notable national variations exhibited in regard to a ‘best practice’ approach to integration, scholars and policy analysts have questioned the utility of the CBP as a guiding document, and interrogated the material effects of the politicised discourses embedded therein. In his critique, Spencer (2005:24) notes that the CBP is less comprehensive than earlier policy statements on integration from the European Commission, and that the document implicitly characterises integration as a uni-directional process. Warranting further concern, temporary or irregular migrants are left un-addressed by the CBP since it is targeted at only “legally-residing third-country nationals”. The document also contains negatively-toned references, (e.g., “law-abiding migrants” and “migrant youth delinquency”), that could potentially interfere with the positive vision of integration that the CBP is meant to reinforce (ibid).

In view of questions regarding the efficacy of the CBP as a guiding document, and given that it is non-binding to Member States, Ireland -- like many other EU Member States -- has chosen to develop its integration policies less in accordance with this document than in accordance with its national agendas and within a unique historical, cultural and political context (Spencer 2005). Further, Ireland’s integration policies have also been informed by the experiences of non-European nations with longer histories of net in-migration, and by the specificity of the nation’s national experiences of migration overall (Gray 2006:118). It is, therefore, necessary to interrogate Ireland’s chosen path toward ‘integration’ as a distinctive policy platform that contextualises street-level integration work. The following section will discuss Irish integration policy, then, as a nationalistically-derived body of directives emerging within particular demographic and societal conditions.
2.6 IRISH INTEGRATION POLICY: A NATIONALISTIC PATH

Despite focused attention on integration policy at the European level since the 1980s, in Ireland, it has only more recently become a subject of public and political discussion (Gray 2006; Boucher 2008). In his comprehensive analysis of Irish integration policy, Boucher (2008) states that, until about 2002, the Irish government did not perceive a need for a coherent integration strategy because national attention to immigration was, for the most part, focussed only on legal economic migrants who were constructed simply as a source of much-needed temporary labour. These workers were expected to leave the state when the state decided they were no longer needed. With immigrants imagined largely in this way, there was no national need to link immigration to integration policy or to institute and resource state-led integration strategies. Therefore, ad hoc measures to meet any infrequently arising integration issues were seen to suffice (ibid). When it became apparent -- through critiques by academics, policy watchdogs and the media -- that such ad hoc measures were not resulting in a coherent strategy through which to address urgent integration challenges that actually were arising, the Irish government began to engage in more focused integration debates.

By 2007, when it had become apparent that policy measures emanating from a variety of State offices was producing a quagmire of conflicting and redundant ‘integration’ policy, it was decided that the Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration (OPMI) --formerly the Office of the Minister of State for Integration -- should be established. This office was set up in June of that year to, “develop, drive and co-ordinate policy in relation to the integration of legally resident immigrants across Government Departments so that [our] immigrants are fully integrated into Irish society” (OPMI 2011). State operations relating more specifically to immigration, (e.g., visa requirements and restrictions, asylum, citizenship and repatriation) remain headquartered under the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, (under which the Immigration and Naturalisation Service (INS) and the Reception and Integration Agency (RIA) currently operate). In addition, the RIA (2011), on its web site, cites a select list of NGOs in Ireland that would also appear to have some implied role in operationalising State integration policy. It is not stated, however, which
agencies might offer help for particular issues, or to what degree. This list of NGOs can be referenced in Appendix B.

Key policy documents emanating from the Department of Justice and Equality, the Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration and other Irish State agencies in regard to integration and immigration can be referenced in Appendix A. A detailed discussion of this body of policy is not central to the objectives of this research, and these documents have been thoroughly surveyed and critiqued elsewhere (Burstein 2006; Gray 2006; Watt 2006; Fanning 2007; Boucher 2008). It is important, in view of this research, simply to establish that these critiques are overwhelmingly negative in nature and widely assert that Ireland’s contemporary ‘integration’ policy has not been produced and resourced as a cohesive framework for achieving clearly-defined multicultural goals (European Anti-Poverty Network (EAPN) 2007). Rather it is a patchwork of, “reactive and piece-meal policy statements that have resulted from immediate responses to problems surrounding immigration” (Boucher 2008). The implications of this policy shortfall for street-level delivery of integration services to youth are many. Therefore, an examination of the complex discourses embedded in this ad hoc collection of policy is critical to the objectives of this research.

2.6.1 THE DIVISIVE EFFECTS OF IRISH ‘INTEGRATION’ POLICY

Critiques of Irish integration policy widely conclude that much of this body of legislation is designed to serve national interests of border control, internal regulation, and preservation of ‘Irish’ national identity and culture. These discourses diverge quite notably from liberal EU integration discourses that espouse a need for equality, anti-discrimination and cultural diversity (Boucher 2008). A similar sort of ‘liberal dilemma’ is identified by Hagelund (2002:408) in her discussion of the “integration solution” in the Norwegian context. Hagelund notes that the optimal balance between rules and conventions for managing diversity on the one hand and the right to maintain one’s culture on the other is a difficult one for states to achieve. Ireland’s fragmented ‘integration policy’ approach, to date, demonstrates a case in point. In Irish attempts to achieve this sort of ‘optimal balance’ between the management of diversity from a nationalistic viewpoint, and the need for equality and cultural preservation, Gray (2006:118) asserts that what has resulted is a set of practices that
actually serve to produce and reproduce boundaries of inclusion and exclusion rather than to encourage integration.

Gray’s (2006) analysis of Irish integration policy -- as well as that of other academics -- characterises the legislation collectively as a vehicle for the active problematisation of immigrants. Gray (ibid:121-122) argues that constructions of immigrants in Irish policy as a distinct population make it possible to group together people with, “very different social, economic, political, cultural, gendered and racialised statuses and experiences into one problematic population in need of a coherent policy response”. Immigrants are repeatedly defined by policy, surveyed and accounted for in order that integration can be legitimised, organised and delivered (ibid:122). In this way, the category of ‘immigrant’, and immigration as a phenomenon, are constituted as a population and a process in need of governance (ibid). Further, specific groups of immigrants, such as refugees, are described by policy as having ‘special needs’. Therefore, Irish citizens are asked, in policy documents, to adopt a mindful and ‘tolerant’ disposition towards them (ibid:130).

Calls for the development of a ‘tolerant’ society within which immigrants can integrate are a form of nationalistic practice in which those who are ‘tolerant’ assume the power to imagine the nation as ‘Theirs’ (Hage1998:79). Through their power to continually reproduce a system of ‘tolerant’ nationals, and migrants in need of integration, Gray (ibid:133) asserts that divisive Irish integration discourses “masquerade as progressive discourses of inclusion”. Vis-à-vis the division of Irish society into ‘hosts’ and ‘migrants’, Gray (ibid) argues that immigrants are legitimised as a ‘matter out of place’. Further, by designating migrants as a distinct population that are, “documented, surveyed, subject to needs analyses, and targeted for service provision”, ‘integration’ policies serve to reproduce migrant/non-migrant hierarchies of difference. Titchkosky (2003:525) concurs when she states that ‘integration’ policies, by their nature, identify certain groups as vulnerable, marginalised and in need of social support. Fanning and Mutwarasibo (2007:452) discuss this stratification of nationals and non-nationals as an effective means of gradating or stratifying Ireland’s citizenry based on social membership rights between various categories of people, (e.g., citizens, refugees, asylum-seekers, “illegal” workers).
Boucher (2008) highlights this effect as well when he states that, by adopting integration policies that identify migrants as a distinct and needy population, Ireland has become a ‘civic stratifier’, rather than a ‘civic integrator’. In analysing the material effects of this ‘civic stratification’, Gray (2006) concludes that, through the identification and classification of migrants within Irish society, immigrants are unquestionably regarded as in need of integrating by ‘hosts’ who are invited to be understanding, tolerant and mindful of this need. Migrants are thereby always identified as ‘un-integrated’, and the invitation for hosts to be tolerant of them, “reinstates and disguises, rather than changes, power relations, and reconstitutes those to be integrated as outsiders” (ibid:131).

The effects of creating differentiated roles for the ‘tolerant host’ and the ‘needy migrant’ through integration policy discourse are widespread and often detrimental. If immigrants wish to graduate from this ‘needy’ status, it is implied by policy that they must foster their own self-sufficiency, be independent and commit to contributing to Irish society so that they may be integrated (Gray 2006:130). In this way, immigrants are imagined to be active in choosing and advocating their way into citizenship in Ireland (ibid). This assignment of responsibility for integration to immigrants is problematic, as it can lead to the legitimisation of a laissez-faire approach to integration by the State (Boucher 2008). If individual immigrants are meant to take responsibility for their own integration, the State’s role is reduced to merely facilitating equality of access, addressing racism, and adopting some form of anti-discrimination measures (Fanning 2007b).

Boucher (2008) highlights this laissez-faire approach within Irish integration policy when he states that the government has succeeded in ‘off-loading’ much of the responsibility for integration onto immigrants and their families as well as to ‘third-sector’ community organisations and NGOs. In this scenario, immigrant communities are enlisted into governmental programmes to govern problems, while the State gives an impression of retreat from governance (O’Malley 1998). Boucher (2008) argues that this retreat of the Irish State from performing an active role in immigrant integration has the strong potential to lead to a socially exclusive future for Ireland; rather than a socially cohesive one. Adapting a laissez-faire approach in the short-
term will, Boucher (ibid) asserts, reinforce and reproduce existing hierarchies of wealth, status and power in Irish society. Ultimately, as a result, immigrants will likely be forced to ‘choose’ to integrate into Irish society by assimilating to Irish national culture and social practices in favour of maintaining their own cultural identities (ibid).

As the State retreats from the integration arena and immigrants are assigned more and more responsibility for their own integration, the role of Irish ‘host-society’ members also appears to progressively shrink. Indeed, Gray (2006) notes that, within much of current Irish integration policy, the role of Irish citizens is limited to the adoption of a mindful and tolerant disposition toward immigrants. Given that ‘tolerance’ is set up as a responsibility for ‘host society’ members, it is implied that there are some (noticeable, but not clearly defined) ways in which their way of life or societal norms have been, or will be, disrupted -- otherwise, there would be no necessity for ‘tolerance’. Moreover, Gray (2006:131) sees this assignment of ‘tolerance’ as a ‘host’ role to be problematic because tolerance sets limits or boundaries on what routes to integration are available to immigrants. ‘Tolerance’(in this usage) is defined, not just as acceptance, but acceptance within certain limits which then become pre-ordained requirements for integration (ibid). Hagelund (2002:405) echoes Gray’s concerns when she states that, in this way, ‘integration’ becomes (at least partly) formulated according to vaguely defined limits on cultural expression.

Within conceptualisations of ‘integration’ wherein the Irish national citizenry is invited to exercise its ‘tolerant’ nature, Gray (2006:135) asserts that, in effect, what is being offered to the newest members of Irish society is the “promise of integration”. ‘Tolerant hosts’ are encourage not to exercise the power (over immigrants) vested in them by virtue of being national citizens (ibid). Rather, ‘hosts’ are encouraged to facilitate immigrant passages toward an elusive end-state wherein the “promise of integration” lurks if the migrants achieve some vaguely-defined level of sameness to ‘host society’ members whilst expressing native cultures only within (equally ill-defined) limits (ibid). In other words, integration is constructed as a ‘promise’ -- vis-à-vis legitimisations of the roles of ‘tolerant’ host and ‘needy’ migrant within policy -- because migrants, in this imagining, are present within the national space as
potentially ‘un-integratable’. In this view, integration may never be *achieved* but, instead, is held out as a *promise* to migrants that reminds them of their status as a “matter out of place” (Gray 2006:135). Therefore, integration is imbued with a processual character that, by definition, locates it somewhere in the future -- a future wherein one might ‘belong’ if particular conditions are met (*ibid*).

### 2.7 INTEGRATION AND PRACTICAL ORIENTALISM

The discourse of ‘tolerant host’ and ‘needy migrant’ invokes a very specific geographing in which the ‘host’ group has the power to imagine the nation as ‘Ours’ and not ‘Theirs’7 (Hage 1998:79). Such binary constructions of society can be understood through an examination of Said’s (1978) discussion of Orientalism8. Beginning in the late 1970s, scholars illuminated social constructions of the ‘Orient’ and ‘Occident’ that produce imagined binaries to differentiate one from the other. The idea of binaries builds on the earlier work of psychiatrist Frantz Fanon (1952), but Edward Said’s (1978) Foucauldian-inspired theorizations introduce the term ‘Orientalism’ to the scholarly literature and represent a more nuanced version of Fanon’s binaries which Said calls ‘Othering’. Said (1978) asserts that the process of ‘Othering’ is embedded in colonial discourses that have influential material effects on those being represented as ‘Oriental’ or ‘Other’. Through these representations, the ‘Orient’ is *created* as an imagined and socially constructed entity within the context of colonialism and Western dominance (*ibid*). Therefore, the relationship between the ‘Occident’ and the ‘Orient’ can be understood as a system of power that not only describes and rules, but also ‘produces’ the Orient (*ibid*). In other words, Orientalism produces the effect that it names (Gregory 2004).

Since the time of Said’s early writings, the processes that (re)produce ‘Othering’ binaries have been the focus of much scholarly attention across many disciplines. Within this body of work, some scholars have come to criticise Said’s focus on textual and representational aspects of an over-arching regime of knowledge that serve to substantiate Western superiority over the ‘Orient’ (Billig 1995; Yegenoglu 1998; Haldrup *et al.* 2006; Warraq 2007). These criticisms have increasingly inspired scholarly examinations of more ‘everyday’ ways in which binaries are produced,

---

7 See also Anderson (1991).
8 See also Gregory (1994) and Billig (1995).
reproduced and negotiated through banal and non-representational practice (Richardson 1990; Billig 1995; Haldrup et al. 2006; Varisco 2007). Theorists interrogating these banal practices assert that Said’s discursive system of Orientalism is dependent on a daily reproduction. In other words, these scholars see Orientalism as being continually performed, practiced and (re)negotiated in daily life (Haldrup et al. 2006:175). The everyday consumption and (re)negotiation of Orientalism, then, reproduces a system of power and dominance that, over time, establishes itself as natural, self-evident or ‘taken-for-granted’ within a global moral order (ibid).

By extending Said’s concept of Orientalism to the banal means by which it is (re)produced, hegemonic discourses are translated to the ‘everyday’ so that they enter the habitual spaces of ordinary experience (ibid:177). Drawing on Billig’s (1995) ideas of ‘banal nationalism’, social theorists have expanded upon this idea of ‘everyday’; or ‘practical Orientalism’. Haldrup et al. (2006:175) identify ways in which members of established nations reproduce national identity in ways so ordinary that it may escape attention altogether, (e.g., using homeland-making words and phrases such as ‘we’, ‘this’ country, ‘here’, etc.) (ibid). These uses of language cause people to think in ‘Us’/‘Them’ dichotomies that, in practice, designate in one’s mind a familiar space which is ‘Ours’, and an unfamiliar space beyond which is ‘Theirs’. In doing so, immigrants from ‘out there’ are produced and reproduced as the ‘Other’ so regularly that it escapes attention (ibid). Material practices such as the banning of ‘Their’ headscarves, the displaying of ‘Our’ national flag, etc., further serve to remind people, “who ‘We’ are and where ‘We’ are, but also who ‘They’ are and where ‘They’ belong” (ibid).

Through the application of practical Orientalist theory to contemporary social phenomena, ‘internal Orientalisms’ at work in many Western societies have been illuminated following recent immigration flows and the emergence of non-Western diasporas in these countries (Haldrup and Koefoed 2009:40). Haldrup et al. (2006:176) assert that hegemonic grammar that has come into use as a result of these demographic shifts is articulated and reproduced in many different little ways so that it becomes a natural part of everydayness. ‘Foreigners’ are discussed, essentialised and generalized as the ‘internal Other’ and stereotyped as threatening or disruptive.
As such, ‘They’ have the potential to negate ‘Our’ enjoyment of the authentic culture (*ibid*). In this way, ideas of practical Orientalism resonate directly with Gray’s (2006) discussions of the ‘tolerant host’ who is asked to *tolerate* infringements upon the enjoyment of a particular way of being within ‘Our’ national borders.

In attempts to circumvent implied infringements on the ‘host’ culture, (i.e., ‘Our’ way of life), recent Irish national policy directives encourage the social construction of spaces wherein ‘tolerant hosts’ can facilitate the ‘integration’ of the ‘Other’. This encouragement takes material form through previously-discussed neo-liberal revolutions of integration responsibility to the local scale; largely through the involvement of ‘third sector’ organisations. However, national institutions such as education have also been enlisted in these endeavours. Through policy mandates, then, these organisations become active participants in the deployment of integration initiatives. As currently defined by the State, ‘integration’ is to be maintained and progressed *vis-à-vis* street-level agents constructing spaces within local programming and service provision that facilitates a processual journey along which ‘They’ are encouraged to become more like ‘Us’. In doing so, it is thought that newcomers will come to exist tolerably within nation-state boundaries; not by being as they are, but by becoming as they ought to be (Said 1978:67).

Said (1978:58-59) illuminates the underlying goals of ‘integration’ imagined in this way in his discussion of lenses through which territory beyond what is ‘Ours’ is experienced. Said asserts that these lenses shape encounters between ‘Us’ and ‘Them’ so that, over time, something foreign becomes less distant and more familiar. In this way one stops judging things as either completely novel or as completely well-known, and some new median category emerges (*ibid*). The productive outcome of the creation of this new category is to control or mute the influence of newcomers so that they become less threatening to the status quo. Over time, the effect of this newly-constructed median category of familiarity imposing itself on everyday encounters is to reduce the pressure of accommodating the newcomers (*ibid*). In Said’s vernacular, essentially, then, current ‘integration’ policy characterises immigrants to Ireland as a new and different category of society member, (i.e., ‘the needy migrant’) that exists within nation-state borders reserved for ‘Irish’ society.
members. However, whilst they exist as an identifiably different category, ‘They’ are simultaneously being schematically incorporated (vis-à-vis integration) in such a way that their influence is muted and Ireland’s newest societal members become constructed as being for Ireland (ibid:71).

Within such a dualistic discourse, then, ‘tolerant hosts’ employed at the local level by agencies co-opted into facilitating national integration initiatives are charged with helping ‘needy migrants’ on their journey toward ‘integration’. The spaces socially constructed for/by this purpose constitute the focus of my research. In interrogating the nature of these spaces at the street level, it is necessary to go beyond detailing their physical locations and characteristics to examine the behaviours that shape them, their complex functionality and their potential for sustainability. In the construction of an investigative framework that effectively elucidates the interplay between these spaces, and the way in which street-level integration service provision is enacted within them, literatures spanning several disciplines and sub-disciplines become relevant. The remainder of this conceptual chapter will incorporate these interdisciplinary literatures in a discussion of ‘spaces of care’ that, through street-level ‘policy-as-produced’, often come to be equated with ‘spaces of integration’.

2.8 THE STREET-LEVEL INTEGRATION SERVICE PROVIDER: AN UNDER-EXAMINED ROLE

As discussed in Section 2.3, youth integration service providers working at the local level often come to function as ‘street-level bureaucrats’ vis-à-vis the high degree of discretion and autonomy that they experience in their everyday work roles (Lipsky 2010). Because of the discretion and autonomy imbued in these workers, they have the capacity to significantly influence the nature and scope of local integration service delivery. Despite this influential function, these workers -- collectively constructed across disparate agencies and sectors as ‘integration service providers’ -- remain largely unexamined in the academic literature. Reference to the importance of the integration role these individuals play is, however, made in scholarly research. Indeed, in elucidating the “promise of integration” implied in Irish national policy, Gray (2006) highlights the importance of relationships between immigrants and local actors such as teachers, religious leaders, community workers, and local government workers. The negotiation of these relationships directs and informs the trajectory of
integration, and eclipses the influence of nebulous and *laissez-faire* national integration policy on the fulfilment of the ‘promise’ (Boucher 2008).

Though she does not address the delivery of ‘integration services’ as such, sociologist Annekin Hagelund’s (2009) examination of street-level public welfare service delivery in Norway provides entrée into investigations of the important relationships between immigrants and local service providers that Gray (2006) and Boucher (2008) highlight. In her investigation, Hagelund (2009) employs Lipsky’s (2010) model of street-level bureaucracy to interrogate the challenges faced by street-level workers in their everyday encounters with immigrants -- which she labels “diversity dilemmas”.

Given that the management of diversity has risen to extreme importance across many Member State agendas, Hagelund (2009) asserts that questions will inevitably arise concerning what aspects of diversity will be deemed undesirable (and should be made the object of corrective technologies), and what aspects are desirable to the extent that society should accommodate them. In her research, Hagelund (*ibid*) situates street-level service providers as workers who continually confront these ambivalences with diversity within their daily agendas. Therefore, Hagelund labels them “diversity workers” (*ibid*:83). These individuals spend considerable amounts of time in their work interacting with people of culturally, ethnically and religiously diverse backgrounds, and are employed by institutions or agencies with an area of responsibility which has multicultural, diversity or integration-oriented dimensions (*ibid*).

Employing Lipsky’s (2010) street-level bureaucracy assumptions of discretion and autonomy, Hagelund (2009:83) unpacks the “diversity worker” role through a typology of behaviour responses to “diversity dilemmas”. Because, as Lipsky (2010) highlights, street-level workers are consistently under-resourced by virtue of a lack of centrally-sanctioned policy that is not overly voluminous, unclear or contradictory, they discretionarily and autonomously *produce* policy through everyday decision-making which, over time, becomes agency behaviour -- or “policy-as-produced”.

Drawing upon Wetherell and Potter’s (1992) “interpretive repertoires”, Hagelund (2009:83) labels these collective individual actions “response repertoires” and identifies five major categories of such response. The five categories identified by
Hagelund are as follows: (1) practical strategies, (2) pedagogical strategies, (3) authoritative strategies, (4) delegation strategies and (5) non-interventionist strategies. Present within each of the five categories of response is a differentiated way of constructing “diversity dilemmas” as well as a strategy for resolving them (*ibid*:84). Ultimately, all the categories represent patterns in the ways that “diversity workers” talk about and perform their work (*ibid*:88).

In her discussion of the five “response repertoire” categories, Hagelund asserts that street-level workers may subscribe to more than one type throughout the course of their work. They may flexibly draw upon all of them at different times and may even mix several different types in any given situation. This is because these individuals work within specific institutional settings which may facilitate the choice of one strategy over another, but not completely determine it (*ibid*:85). So, rather than focusing on personal attitudes of “diversity workers”, Hagelund’s approach focuses on the analysis of discourses and practices that are more directly observable for the researcher. Variations in these discourses are assessed in relation to the type of “diversity dilemma” and the institution within which it is being encountered (*ibid*:85-86). In this way, street-level “diversity workers” are treated as creative, reflective and frequently inconsistent actors within diverse bureaucracies that do not subscribe to any one ideological position or move in any one particular direction (*ibid*).

2.9 STREET-LEVEL INTEGRATION AND ‘SPACES OF CARE’
Hagelund’s elaboration of “response repertoires” provides a useful analytical tool for the examination of street-level behaviours which, in the absence of adequate national policy direction, produce policy of a more pragmatic sort. This ‘policy-as-produced’ enables service providers to confront everyday “diversity dilemmas” in ways that accommodate the broader goals of their particular agency or institution whilst also allowing them, in the words of Hagelund (*ibid*:83), to conduct the business of “getting things done”. In the context of this research, the ‘business’ of providing integration services, and the practices embedded therein, socially construct ‘spaces of integration’ that constitute the focus of my examinations. Due to the implied designation within Irish integration policy of a paternalistic role for the “tolerant host”, (i.e., to see to the ‘needy migrant’ in the interest of social cohesion), these spaces arguably take on a character that allows them to be analysed as ‘spaces of care’. The remainder of this
section will, therefore, address the literature concerning ‘spaces of care’ in light of its applicability to investigations of ‘spaces of integration’.

Until recently, the explicitly spatial nature of care-giving has been under-researched and poorly conceptualized; with most geographical studies in this area narrowly focussing on geographical inequalities in the availability of formal supports to carers and their dependents within de-institutionalised settings (Brown 1997; Milligan 2000, 2001; Robson 2000). However, contemporary investigations within geographies of health and welfare, as well as across disciplines such as health care, psychology and social work, have begun to recognise this gap in the literature. The result has been the production of new bodies of research addressing ‘care’ in much broader conceptual terms and analysing caring behaviour using increasingly spatially-grounded approaches. Included within this emerging literature is a growing body of work relating to the sites in which support and care take place (Andrews and Phillips 2002; Kearns and Moon 2002; Parr 2002, 2003; Brown 2003; Conradson 2003; Parr and Philo 2003; Andrews 2004; Milligan 2005; Smyth 2005; Carey et al. 2009). In conceptualisations proposed by these scholars, ‘spaces of care’ are extended beyond the physical dimension to encompass socio-spatial fields disclosed through practices of care that take place between individuals (Kearns and Gesler 2002; Conradson 2003).

Not only have contemporary conceptualisations of the ‘spaces of care’ extended notions of site, but they have also broadened definitions of what it means to care. ‘Care’, in these imaginings, is about movement toward another person in a way that has the potential to facilitate or promote their well-being. It may or may not involve physical care-taking tasks (Conradson 2003:508). Constructed in this way, a myriad of everyday, practical articulations of interest in the well-being of others constitute ‘care’. Thus, the facilitation by ‘hosts’ of ‘migrant’ journeys toward ‘integration’ through the everyday practice of street-level service delivery can be constructed as ‘caring’ behaviour. This behaviour takes place across a wide variety of socio-spatial fields which, then, can be imagined as ‘spaces of care’.
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Though much research has focussed on obvious sites of care provision such as hospitals, hospices and mental health facilities (Philo 1997; Kearns and Joseph 2000; Parr 2000; Pinfold 2000; Allen 2001; Brown 2003; Parr 2003), based on recent reconceptualisations of ‘caring behaviour’, scholars have expanded their inquiries to sites of caring that are correspondingly much more broadly imagined. The homespace has received significant academic attention as part of this expansion of focus (Milligan 2000; Williams 2002; Brown 2003; Milligan 2003; Dyck et al. 2005; Lawson 2007; Aronson and Neysmith 2009; England 2010; England and Dyck 2011); but so too have less visible spaces of care such as community drop-in centres, rural retreats, soup kitchens and soup runs to the homeless (Parr 1999; Kearns and Barnett 2003; Parr and Philo 2003; Andrews 2004; Gesler et al. 2004; Conradson 2005; Johnsen et al. 2005; Darling 2011). However, one type of caring space that has, thus far, not received specific attention in these newly imagined geographies are the spaces constructed vis-à-vis caring behaviour embedded in the provision of integration services.

Despite a lack of specific attention in the literature to sites of caring integration practice, many of the findings resulting from recent research in more broadly imagined spaces of care are significant when interrogating sites where integration practice occurs. For example, Milligan et al. (2007:136) conclude that much of the work around care has tended to treat groups as too homogenous, and the implications of diversity within and between social groups for our understandings of who cares, why and how remain under-researched. Milligan et al., (ibid) go on to point out the significance of this deficit in the literature for understandings of minoritised cultural groups and the failure of service provision to adequately recognise what constitutes appropriate forms of care for them.

In addition to gaps in the literature concerning ‘spaces of integration care’ from a site-oriented standpoint, further gaps exist regarding devolutions of integration responsibility (as a caring practice) to the local level. The ‘downloading’ of longer or more traditionally-recognised forms of caring service provision have been illuminated in a growing body of research (Milligan 2001; Cloke et al. 2005; Milligan and Fyfe 2005; Edwards and Woods 2006; Skinner and Rosenberg 2006; Crack et al. 2007;
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Kelly 2007; Carey et al. 2009). This research addresses shifts toward community-based care as a result of State down-loading of responsibility to ‘third sector’ organisations and to families. However, similar trends in the devolution of ‘caring integration services’ to the local level remain unexamined through a geographic lens.

Stemming from the recent burgeoning of work in geographies of care, the potential for geographic examinations of ‘spaces of integration’ is enhanced by the acquisition of applicable empirical findings and also from scholarly recommendations regarding directions of future research, (which may bring more geographic focus to integration service provision as a form of care). However, perhaps the most significant benefit derived from work examining other ‘non-traditional’ spaces of care is that ‘spaces of integration’ can become validly included as an important dimension within what Conradson (2003b:453) refers to as a “variegated picture of places” that can be formulated as either caring or care-less. Investigations of these places reveal how care is woven into particular social spaces and communities -- at times supporting individuals and facilitating their well-being; at times breaking down and leaving significant gaps (ibid). In examining these gaps, our understanding of the interweaving of care within everyday human geographies is enhanced (ibid).

In the context of this research, examinations of ‘spaces of integration’ as a specific type of caring space can be further contextualised within a more nuanced area of the new geographies of care literature focusing on therapeutic networks. Smyth (2005) asserts that, unlike recently-investigated notions of therapeutic spaces (Gesler 1992; Kearns 1993; Kearns and Gesler 1998; Geores 1998; Palka 1999), therapeutic networks represent a less formalised subject of study. These networks of support and care often exist outside (or in parallel to) more formal institutions of care (Smyth 2005:492). The work of Johnsen et al. (2005) is representative of the interrogation of such networks, as transitory spaces of care provided for homeless people through a soup run are examined. Smyth (2005:493) posits that illuminating these types of informal networks may enable geographers to think in new ways about the provision of care. Since many forms of care -- like integration services -- are increasingly being provided outside of institutional settings and by more informal community networks composed of a wide range of agencies (where multiple sources of support may exist),
the potential for therapeutic networks to develop increases (*ibid*). The formation of these networks has the capacity to impact both those seeking care and those providing it; adding to the complex relationship between caring and place (*ibid*).

Emerging from examinations of therapeutic networks as one form of therapeutic or caring environment, recent research has illuminated the capacity for spaces within these networks to regulate and normalise certain kinds of behaviour and to include as well as exclude (Smyth 2005:494). This notion constitutes an interesting nexus between literature emerging from contemporary geographies of care and geographic theory focussing on spaces of inclusion and exclusion. Indeed, much recent research emerging from reconceptualised geographies of care focuses on historically excluded groups such as the elderly, the disabled, children, the impoverished, those living in rural areas, the mentally ill and women. However, the exclusion of these groups has not, until recently, been interrogated through investigations of the nature of the therapeutic networks available for their care (in all its imaginings).

Practices of inclusion and exclusion have been central to much social research across various disciplines. However, through the frame of therapeutic networks these concepts are directly applicable to investigations of community networks of care that figure prominently in the process of ‘integration’ advocated by many contemporary neoliberal states. In the Irish context, Gray (2006:133) asserts that, through policy discourse, the development of street-level networks of loosely connected organisations and institutions is highlighted as a route by which migrant communities can come to ‘bridge’ with mainstream Irish society. Attention to these networks represents new opportunities for illuminating interactions between ‘host’ and ‘migrant’ and the dividing line(s) between those who enable the act of ‘bridging’ and those who are defined as ‘un-integrated’ (*ibid*).

Darling (2011) focuses on these interactions between individuals in ‘host’ and ‘migrant’ roles as he interrogates caring, generosity and hospitality in an asylum drop-in centre setting. Like Gray (2006), Darling (*ibid*:413) finds that acts of caring and hospitality have embedded within them role expectations based upon citizenship, nationality and established notions of who gives and who receives. This causes caring
interactions to be asymmetric, as ‘caring hosts’ (perhaps, temporarily) transform their dominance over ‘needy migrants’ into generosity that, then, reproduces the inequality and dependence already embedded within these roles (ibid:412). In other words, the performance of care creates and sustains the right of some individuals and groups to actively give time, space, attention, etc. to vulnerable others who must passively wait to receive it (ibid). Darling *does* highlight the possibility for these roles to be temporarily reversed or to become ‘invisible’ within caring sites wherein effort is made toward greater egalitarianism (ibid:413). However, even where this occurs, both carers and the cared-for are constantly aware that ‘hosts’ are capable, at any time, of reclaiming their role as ‘carers’; or even of being uncaring, ungenerous or hostile (ibid:415). Thus, the “politics of compassion” (ibid:414) is not so much about making ‘tolerant hosts’ less powerful, as it is about inviting them not to exercise their power to be ‘uncharitable’ (Hage 1998:95).

In light of the capacity for caring networks to highlight -- and possibly reinforce -- social divisions between already-marginalised individuals and ‘mainstream society’ members, the importance of investigating more nuanced processes of exclusion within these networks has been noted in recent research (Parr 2000; Philo 2000; Conradson 2003; Parr *et al.* 2004; Johnsen *et al.* 2005). This scholarship illuminates ways in which ‘spaces of care’ within therapeutic networks can be simultaneously inclusive to some while being exclusive to others. Further, these inclusive and exclusive effects can be disparately felt by the same individual at different times (Parr *et al.* 2004:408). By virtue of their dualistic nature, then, these spaces allow for the articulation of difference in an environment intended to facilitate the expression of care and distribution of resources (Johnsen *et al.* 2005:328).

Recent research focussing on exclusionary processes within ‘spaces of care’ builds solidly on broader geographic enquiry that interrogates these complex spatial processes as they produce dualisms extending beyond simple binaries of same/other (Sibley 1995; Cresswell 1996; Madanipour 1998). This body of research further highlights that who is felt to belong and not to belong in a space produces and reproduces that space in particular ways (Sibley 1995:3). Sibley (*ibid*) notes the particular importance of illuminating these processes of spatial (re)production as they
occur in everyday ways so that they are taken for granted as part of the routine of daily life. He asserts that, within these everyday acts lie the answers to the questions: who are places for; whom do they exclude; and how are these prohibitions maintained (*ibid*)? These questions come to bear significantly on interrogations of caring spaces of integration service provision, in that street-level “diversity workers” have a significant capacity to influence the answers to them in their daily work.

Geographic theorisations of the simultaneously inclusive and exclusive nature of socially constructed spaces has been interrogated in the context of marginalised groups such as the mentally ill (Parr 1997; Kitchin 1998; Craig and Timms 2000), the homeless (Johnsen *et al.* 2005; Beazley 2008) and the rural elderly (Fortuijn 1999; Milbourne 2004; Parr *et al.* 2004). However, a literature focussing on the ways in which migrant youth -- and those charged with facilitating their integration -- function within spaces of inclusion and exclusion present within broader spaces of care has not yet developed. A growing body of research within children’s geographies and also within migration research has focussed on youth-specific experiences of exclusion (Matthews and Limb 2001; Cunningham and Dillon 2003; Vanderbeck and Dunkley 2004; Ní Laoire *et al.* 2008), but this research has not, thus far, coalesced to any large degree with recently reconceptualised theorisations of care and caring spaces. This gap in the geographic literature (coupled with the absence of focus on spaces of integration in the therapeutic networks literature), constitutes rich research ground for valuable cross-disciplinary investigations of spatial processes of exclusion operating within sites of caring service provision. But, perhaps, an even more glaring gap in this cross-disciplinary body of literature, in light of my research aims, is the lack of focus on service providers. Examining their role(s) as *carers* in therapeutic networks will provide essential insights into the way in which they operate as co-constructors of, and actors within, inclusive and exclusive spaces of youth integration in Galway City.

### 2.10 CHAPTER CONCLUSIONS

Local youth integration service providers can be constructed as street-level “diversity workers” (Hagelund 2009) employed by a disparate collection of agencies and institutions that constitute an informal network of care. Imbued with discretion and
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autonomy, and restricted by inadequate resourcing and policy guidance (Lipsky 2010), these workers are charged with implementing State initiatives meant to facilitate ‘needy migrants’ (Gray 2006) along their journey toward a nebulously-defined state of sameness wherein they will achieve ‘integration’. However, as a result of neo-liberal ‘down-loadings’ of responsibility to the local level, interpretations of State integration policy become manifest in highly varying and individualised programming decisions (Boucher 2008). Collectively, and over time, this decision-making (and resultant practice) come to constitute agency behaviour -- or “policy-as-produced” (Lipsky 2010).

Through the practice of ‘doing integration’ at the street-level, spaces are socially constructed which are designed to be inclusive to both young ‘host society’ members and to ‘migrant’ youth. Within these spaces, “diversity workers” attempt to implement caring practice in a myriad of ways; responding to arising “diversity dilemmas” through the employment of broadly typological responses (Hagelund 2009). These responses help to (re)shape the spaces in which they occur. The nature of these spaces (as they are continually (re)produced) comes to be simultaneously inclusive and exclusive, in that individuals experience them differently; and the same individual can experience them differently at different times (Sibley 1995; Conradson 2003; Parr et al. 2004; Johnsen et al. 2005). Thus, young people -- as well as the workers providing integration services within these spaces -- are impacted by the complex relationships between caring and space. These impacts, in turn, shape the development of ongoing street-level practice intended for the further facilitation of youth ‘integration’. This conceptualisation provides an investigative frame for analysing the ‘spaces of youth integration’ being (re)produced in Galway City.
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3.1 INTRODUCTION
This chapter elaborates the methodology deployed in this research. The case study approach used is discussed with regard to specific contextual conditions within which the research was conducted. The incorporation of this approach into the research design is discussed as the most advantageous path toward the illumination of: (1) constructions of ‘integration’ by street-level workers delivering youth services in Galway City; (2) the ways in which these constructions, in addition to resourcing constraints, shape everyday practice emerging amongst these workers; and (3) ‘spaces of integration’ (re)produced through this practice. Also elaborated in this methodological discussion are: (1) the qualitative interview technique used within this case study to gather data from an expert respondent pool; (2) participant observation opportunities undertaken for data gathering purposes; and (3) secondary data sources consulted. Additionally, a discussion of thematic analysis as an analytic tool for the processing of qualitative interview data is included. In particular, the identification, coding and cataloguing of interview data according to both a priori themes and themes emerging over the course of the research is explained. The iterative cycles of data gathering, coding and analysis necessary for the deployment of this analytic approach are given specific attention in this discussion. Researcher positionality is also addressed.

3.2 THE CASE STUDY APPROACH
In order to explore the everyday operationalisation of ‘integration’ by youth service providers at the street level, this research incorporates a case study approach. The case study as a research strategy has long been employed across many disciplines, and continues to be recognised as a means of contributing to knowledge in situations wherein there is a desire to understand complex social phenomena whilst retaining a holistic view of ‘real-life’ events and processes (Eisenhardt 1989; Stoecker 1991; Abrahamson 1992; Hamel et al.1993; Punch 1998; Yin 2003; Hartley 2004). The case study approach is widely used in such investigations because of its intrinsic flexibility and the illumination it affords in regard to everyday practices and their meanings (Robson 2002). Specifically, in view of the aims of this research, what is sought is the fuller illumination of integration as a social phenomenon that is highly politicised and problematically complex in scope and that has become an everyday
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facet of street-level youth service delivery in contemporary Ireland. A case study approach affords the most promising avenue toward revealing the everyday articulations of this phenomenon within a specific local context.

Because this research investigates ‘integration’ as a broad phenomenon being operationalised in very specific, everyday ways at the street level, it is useful to highlight the appropriateness of the case study approach for answering ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions related to such social processes (Yin 2003; Hartley 2004). In investigating these types of questions, the case study allows the fullest possible understanding of the selected case in a ‘real-life context’ (Yin 2003:13). This research investigates Galway City as a unique context for ‘doing integration’ -- deemed necessary and/or desirable per national and EU policy -- amongst local youth. Through the employment of a case study approach, the contextual influences on this process, and the interactions embedded therein, are able to be explicitly highlighted. In this way, the construction of street-level meanings of ‘integration’ within youth service delivery -- the ‘how’ and ‘why’ -- is better understood.

It is prudent, at this stage of the methodological discussion, to highlight awareness on the part of this researcher that criticisms of the case study approach have been raised by scholars across various disciplines. Questions of rigour and objectivity are voiced by some who maintain that a case study approach does not produce results that are satisfactorily able to be generalised to larger populations, and that the method can consume large amounts of resources in producing these results (Campbell and Stanley 1966\(^9\); Dogan and Pelassy 1990). However, proponents of the method argue that these criticisms stem from misconceptions of the case study approach, and fail to appreciate the detailed understanding afforded by case studies of a particular context in which processes operate (Yin 1989; Hamel 1993; Myers 2000; Yin 2003; Flyvbjerg 2004). It is possible to generalise from these observed processes to similar contexts in which they may also be expected to occur based on the in-depth understanding gained regarding the particular context in which the original research was conducted (Hartley 2004). Further, it is important to note that generalisability of

---

\(^9\) Campbell (1975) later reconsidered many of the criticisms he and Stanley levelled regarding the case study method in their 1966 paper.
results does not always constitute the primary goal of meaningful, qualitative research.

Taking into consideration the advantages inherent in the use of the case study as a comprehensive research strategy, researchers focussed on phenomenological studies -- such as research interrogating integration -- highlight further design features and data collection tactics that make the case study a particularly appropriate choice for use in this type of research (Stoecker 1991). When investigating a phenomenon, what is sought is a deeper understanding of the ‘lived’ experience of study participants in relation to that phenomenon. This understanding incorporates the meanings which participants ascribe to, and subsequent judgements made about, everyday situations in which the phenomenon influences their actions and relationships (Schutz 1970; Russell and Gregory 2003). A phenomenological approach is taken in this research in order to gain an understanding of the lived experiences of youth service providers involved in the interpretation and operationalisation of ‘integration’ at the street level. This approach will allow for deeper understandings of street-level integration practice and the ‘spaces of care’ it (re)produces. This practice circumscribes a complex set of individualised meanings associated with ‘integration’ across a diverse group of youth service workers. The desire to illuminate the integration roles of these individuals predicates the specific research design, data collection techniques and data analysis methods chosen to do so. These choices and their respective advantages will be outlined in the remainder of this discussion.

3.2.1 THE SINGLE CASE STUDY
This research uses a single case design. It is important, therefore, to highlight specific advantages in the use of the single case study (as compared to multiple cases). Within the family of case study approaches, the single case study affords a specific opportunity for the investigation of a phenomenon that is suspected to occur more uniquely or extremely in one particular setting or among one particular population (Yin 2003:42). What is of interest in a single case study, then, is the abstracting out of highly contextualised aspects of reality and properties of interest in order to investigate the relations between or among them (Edelson 1988; Abbott 1992; Barzelay 1993). In this way, single case studies serve an important research function.
They allow for case-specific findings -- that may conflict with a priori theoretical understandings -- to emerge so that thinking can be “unfrozen” and new lines of inquiry can develop (Hartley 2004:325).

Another advantage of the single case study is that it is an approach particularly amenable to the employment of a tentative theoretical framework (based, initially, on issues identified in the extant literature). When a research framework is allowed to evolve throughout the course of the investigation, the issues involved and the theory(s) which help to explain them may shift as concepts are examined against systematically collected data (ibid). This scenario unfolded very plainly during the course of this research. The tentative theoretical framework which organised the initial route to enquiry underwent multiple refinements through iterative cycles of data collection and analysis; emerging as a more finely nuanced and ‘research aim-appropriate’ framework. Particularly, the employment of conceptualisations regarding ‘spaces of care’ as a useful lens through which to examine street-level integration practice and processes resulted from allowing the initial investigative framework to evolve in accordance with emerging data. Approaches apart from the single case study would not have been as amenable to this sort of fluidity and flexibility in regard to theoretical guidance. Ultimately, the results of this research are better understood through a finalised theoretical framework resulting from sensitivity to meanings of the data as they unfolded.

The likelihood of shifting theoretical frameworks during the course of a single case study does not mean, however, that researchers -- as they have sometimes been accused by critics -- are “finding what they want to find” (Eisenhardt 1989). As Yin (2003) explains, it is, in fact, a method akin to detective work, in that evidence is sifted in order to build inferences about what has happened, why, and in what circumstances. This then leads to a systematic piecing together of this evidence in order to inductively generate or add to theories of broader interest (Hartley 2004:324). Therefore, beginning with, perhaps, only a rudimentary theoretical framework, a researcher employing the case study approach develops and refines this framework through the course of the study as s/he informs and makes sense of the data. This, then, builds a case for the plausibility of the resulting completed theoretical
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framework, because all evidence leading to the building of it has been examined systematically for conformance to (or divergence from) the theory (*ibid*).

As mentioned previously, though valued, this sort of theory-building need not always be the goal of case study research. Qualitative researchers often begin with only general exploratory questions and preliminary conceptual frameworks, rather than attempting to fit the data (yet uncollected) to a pre-existing set of assumptions or to a developed body of theory (Russell and Gregory 2003:37). This approach encourages the avoidance of focusing on particular -- and potentially misleading -- aspects of the data to be analysed (*ibid*). Indeed, interesting work may not always find a theoretical niche. Ambert *et al.* (1995:888) argue that the researcher’s goal may be to report new data or to raise new research questions, rather than to formulate new theory -- and it may not always be possible or necessary to do so. The employment of a single case study approach in the investigation of integration as a concept interpreted and operationalised at the street level, and the interrogation of the spaces this process (re)produces, both contributes to theory building in key conceptual areas as well as raising questions that point to scope for further research in this and other study contexts. This dual result of employing the single case study approach is a positive outcome of the research in that theoretical knowledge is advanced whilst avenues for future empirical investigation are more clearly defined.

3.3 RESEARCH SETTING

The use of a single case study was employed in this research in order to comprehensively illuminate and better understand the everyday practice emerging amongst youth service providers whilst ‘doing integration’ at the street level. Galway City constitutes a case study site with potential to yield particularly rich results in this under-explored area. This is due, in large part, to the fact that the city possesses unique demographic characteristics that set it apart from other second-tier cities in Ireland. Galway City is a young and rapidly-growing city of 72,414 (CSO 2007). Within this population, 17.45% are “non-Irish” according to the 2006 census. This is in comparison to a national figure of just over 10% (*ibid*). This disproportionately multinational character is highly relevant to discussions of integration at the local level, and presents a unique context for those discussions when compared to Irish
cities with less diverse compositions. Yin (2003:13) highlights the importance of conducting case study research in distinctive research settings -- like Galway City -- that are imbued with, “a valuable set of contextual conditions that are highly pertinent to the phenomenon of study.” In doing so, research results will illuminate more fully, “this case…in all its peculiarity” by revealing locally-produced knowledges and processes within an exceptional context (Stake 2000:437-8).

Having arrived at the choice of Galway City as a rich study site, the remainder of this methodological discussion is devoted to an elaboration of the way in which a population of ‘key informants’ within the city was identified and selected for this research and the methods by which data was collected from these participants. Further, a brief discussion of participant observation venues utilised in the research and the purpose and type of data collected from them is included. Lastly, the analytical approach employed in the processing of qualitative interview data gathered in this research will be detailed within a discussion of the thematic analysis technique.

3.4 RESEARCH POPULATION

In order to explore the research questions being interrogated in this study, a non-probabilistic, purposeful ‘sample’ was assembled.10 In this type of sample, participants are selected according to predetermined criteria relevant to the research objectives (Guest et al. 2006:61). The use of purposeful samples for the exploration of phenomenological topics -- like integration -- is widely supported in the academic literature. Russell and Gregory (2003:36) state that the logic and power of such samples lies in selecting, “information-rich cases (participants or settings) for in-depth study to illuminate the questions of interest.” In particular, when investigating a phenomenon that is narrow in focus and about which a relatively small number of ‘experts’ are conversant within the study site, it is prudent to select potentially ‘data-rich’ people as participants. For a more detailed discussion of key informants as

10 The qualitative methodological literature oftentimes uses the word ‘sample’ interchangeably with ‘population’. Though this research does not employ a ‘sample’ in the statistical or representative sense, the word is used, on occasion, in this dissertation to refer to the purposefully selected research population because it is clumsy to remove the word ‘sample’ from all referenced discussions of ‘populations’.

Within Galway City, a relatively small number of youth service providers across a range of sectors are conversant in the ‘delivery’ of youth integration. An exception to this statement would be (theoretically) those service providers employed in secondary education. However, in this research, it was deemed critical to include a breadth of service provider voices across disparate youth service agencies and sectors. Therefore, including only a small number of secondary school teachers in the research population was a conscious design decision that allowed for more balanced voice to emerge from workers in other types of youth service agencies. This research design choice has certain implications for the analysis of the research data collected from the selected participants. There are aspects of the analysis that apply more directly to the education sector and other aspects that apply more directly to the youth work sector. Where this sort of differentiation occurs, it is highlighted for the benefit of the reader. However, there are many facets of the analysis that cross the bounds of both youth service sectors. In areas of the discussion where analysis is differentiated with regard to youth service sector, it is viewed by this researcher to be a strength of the research design. Such differentiation allows for local variations in the operationalisation of integration at the street level to emerge more strongly than may have been the case if a more homogenous research population (with respect to youth work sector) had been selected. This design feature, therefore, enhances the illumination of the research questions being interrogated in this project.

The afore-described cross-sector research population was assembled using a (modified) ‘snowballing’ method\(^\text{11}\). This approach was determined to be the most expedient and reliable means by which to assemble this ‘data-rich’ group of participants (Figure 3.1). Yin (2003:90) posits that, in using a ‘snowballing’ technique for purposefully selecting a research population of ‘key informants’, each carefully selected ‘expert’ participant can provide insight into the particular phenomenon being investigated and can also initiate access to other individuals who

\(^{11}\) The procedure used is referred to as a ‘modified snowball’ technique because some referrals to (potential) new respondents were furnished by individuals outside of the respondent pool, (e.g., university colleagues and other professional contacts).
may also be valuable participants. In view of this advantage, in employing the ‘snowballing’ technique, each newly–selected participant was asked to ‘elect’ subsequent potential participants based on personal knowledge of those individuals’ respective expertise regarding youth integration. The initial participant for the research was selected and approached based upon a reference from a colleague at the National University of Ireland, Galway. In order to include as much breadth as possible in the respondent pool across various youth service provision sectors, the sample was augmented (mid-stream) by a few respondents recruited via ‘cold calls’ to agencies not yet represented by individuals referred through other research respondents. Contact information for these ‘cold calls’ was derived from agency web sites.
Figure 3.1: Interview respondent selection process, Nov. 2007-Aug. 2010
As illustrated in Figure 3.1, as a factor of the small number of organisations (across a variety of sectors) undertaking youth-specific integration work within Galway city, peer referral of potential new ‘key informants’ quickly became circular in the early stages of the ‘snowballing’ process. In other words, when asked if they knew other ‘expert’ individuals who might be willing to participate, multiple service provider respondents elected individuals already within the research population, or they elected individuals already recommended to the researcher by other study participants. Hence, the ‘snowball’ formed in the early stages of the research grew somewhat unevenly following the interviewing of some easily identified experts. However, as fieldwork continued, additional participants were identified by utilising new contacts made at simultaneously on-going participant observation venues/events and also by re-approaching extant study participants to enquire about potential key informants who may have ‘sprung to mind’ in the interim following the initial enquiry. During periods when the ‘snowball’s’ growth was temporarily halted, opportunity was taken to conduct first analyses of interview transcripts and to perform subsequent iterative refinements of the thematic template. Throughout the entirety of this necessarily extended participant selection process, a premium was set on diversity of respondents with respect to job description, work sector, gender and national/ethnic origin. This diversity was believed to be critical to ensuring the most comprehensive exploration possible of the range of ways in which integration is interpreted and operationalised across a relatively limited number of youth service agencies and agency types, (given the city’s small size).\footnote{See King (2004:17) for an extended discussion of the merits of small, but diverse, samples.}

During stages of the ‘snowballing’ process when sample growth was temporarily stalled, questions of optimum population size were considered. Academic findings regarding sample size in qualitative studies were consulted as a guide to determining this optimum for the research questions being interrogated here. Indeed, Kuper et al. (2008:687) posit that qualitative inquiries -- like this study -- that are based in experience and concerned with the construction of meaning, should use the research questions to guide the sampling process. In other words, the ‘sample’ should be broad enough to capture the many facets of the phenomenon, but should not aspire to achieve statistical representativeness; as this is not necessarily a requirement in
studies wherein the objective is to understand a social process (Mays 1995; Kuper et al. 2008). Further, research findings suggests that the evolutionary nature of qualitative research design requires that investigators do not pre-set a sample size, lest important data be overlooked or data saturation occurs sooner than expected. Thus, in a qualitative study, selection criteria as well as the number of participants are expected to develop over the course of iterative analysis, and the adequacy of a sample’s size is ultimately judged by how comprehensively and completely the research questions are answered (Marshall 1996:523; Russell and Gregory 2003:37).

Even though sample size and constitution are expected to -- and acceptably -- change over the duration of a qualitative study, questions still arise in methodology literatures regarding good practice in the final determination of optimum sample size. These sources were consulted in order to assure this researcher that the sample size ultimately arrived upon in this study sits well within accepted academic standards for qualitative, single case study research designs. Marshall (1996:523) states that, in practice, the number of required subjects for this type of research design usually becomes obvious as the study progresses. He posits that it is difficult to accurately predict what this number will be at the outset of the research due to the iterative nature of data collection and analysis (ibid). In this research, the study population size was, indeed, undetermined at the inception of the research design -- for reasons highlighted by Marshall. Ultimately, though, data was collected from a purposefully selected population of 25 service providers. As indicated by good practice recommendations in the methodological literature, the study population was ‘capped’ when saturation, or “informational redundancy”, was reached (ibid).

Because sample saturation in a qualitative study is relevant to discussions of rigour and reliability, it is worthwhile to elaborate on the decision regarding optimum sample size and associated determinations of data saturation. As discussed previously, qualitative studies normally proceed without predetermined sample size, and sampling stops at an endpoint called ‘saturation’. Researchers consider samples to be saturated when data collection with new participants is no longer eliciting trends or themes not
already raised by previous participants\textsuperscript{13}. At this point, the researcher can stop adding new individuals to the sample (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Ambert \textit{et al}.1995; Kuper \textit{et al}. 2008). In the specific context of thematic-type analyses -- as incorporated in this study -- Guest \textit{et al}. (2006:65) state that saturation is the point in data collection and analysis when new information produces little or no change to the [analytic] ‘codebook’. Russell and Gregory (2003:37) similarly state that iterations between data collection and data interpretation in a thematic analysis should continue only until the analysis is well-developed. This development has occurred at the point when further observations yield either redundant information, or minimal new information, with which to elaborate the conceptual framework or in-depth descriptions of the phenomenon under study (\textit{ibid}). Other methodological discussions (Ambert \textit{et al}. 1995; Elder and Miller 1995; Marshall 1996; Guest \textit{et al}. 2006) similarly highlight ‘saturation’ as the critical determinant of optimum sample size; identifying information overlap or redundancy as the accepted criterion for the cessation of data collection and sample expansion.

Guest \textit{et al}. (2006) empirically address the matter of optimal sample size and data saturation in their methodological study focussing on qualitative interview-based data and a thematic analysis approach. Based on this research, Guest \textit{et al}. (\textit{ibid}) posit that twelve interviews normally allows for the full range of discovery in regard to themes (\textit{ibid}:66), and that the majority of codes appearing to be important in early interviews remains so throughout successive interviews with little change (\textit{ibid}:73). Further, high-frequency codes in early stages of analysis tend to retain their prevalence over the course of subsequent data collection (\textit{ibid}). Guest \textit{et al}. (\textit{ibid}) explain that these seemingly small sampling parameters are directly linked to participant homogeneity. In a purposeful sample, participants are, by definition, chosen according to some common criteria. Logically then, the more similar participants are to one another with respect to experience relevant to the research question(s), the more likely data saturation will be reached sooner than in a non-purposeful sample. Romney \textit{et al}. (1986:326) reach similar conclusions when they state that small samples can provide accurate and complete information within a particular context as long as participants

\textsuperscript{13}In order for this to occur, logically, analysis of the data must be performed concurrently with data collection. This iterative process will be elaborated further in Section 3.5 addressing thematic analysis.
possess expertise about the phenomenon of inquiry. In fact, as few as four individuals can return extremely accurate information in a sampling scenario of this sort (*ibid*).

The use of such smaller sample sizes affords benefits in that a deep, case-oriented analysis can be undertaken (Sandelowski 1995). Studies with larger samples must incorporate a more narrow focus and are, therefore, unable to examine as broad of a range of participant experience (Russell and Gregory 2003:37). It is for this reason that a balance between in-depth, meaningful, data-rich analysis and broad enough representation within a sample to allow for thematic saturation is critical to qualitative research design. In this research, aforementioned good practice recommendations, (e.g., Romney *et al.* 1986; Guest *et al.* 2006), guided the determination that the sample population was appropriately large when informational redundancy began to occur -- indicating that data saturation had been reached. Additionally, (1) the specific research questions being investigated, (2) the small number of ‘expert’ informants identifiable within the study site (3) the in-depth nature of the data collected, (4) the homogeneity of study participants (with regard to their ‘expertise’), and (5) the complex analytical method deployed were carefully considered in determining the appropriateness of the population size ultimately reached. Table 3.1 elaborates this research population.\(^4\)

**Table 3.1: Study population composition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Advocacy Worker</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Mainstream’ Youth Worker</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Special Interest’ Youth Worker</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School Teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Worker</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Organisation Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Integration Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Advocacy Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) A more detailed profile of individual respondents included in this research population can be found in Appendix C.
Concurrent with the iterative selection of this sample population, data was collected via ongoing, in-depth, semi-structured qualitative interviews as well as through participant observations conducted at a range of local integration-oriented events. Further, observations made whilst serving in a volunteer capacity in a local youth service programme augmented and helped to further triangulate the interview data. Lastly, secondary data sources in the form of EU and national-level integration, education and youth work policy documents; departmental white papers; ‘watch-dog’ agency reports; and mass media reports were consulted during this phase of the research. The collection techniques used to gather data from primary sources are elaborated in the following section.

3.5 DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES

Upon the identification of an initial ‘key informant’, the next stage of the research design involved determining the most appropriate method by which to collect data from this (and subsequent) research respondent(s). This decision was weighed in light of the research objectives. Every data collection method is imbued with certain inherent strengths and weaknesses, and several methods were considered carefully for this study. For example, survey methods were considered and dismissed due to the fact that though -- like qualitative interviews -- surveys can address phenomenon and context, they limit the number of variables being investigated in order to fall within the limits of a certain number of questions. Unstructured or semi-structured interviews do not suffer as much from this limitation (Yin 2003:13). After weighing the respective advantages and limitations of the various methods considered, the semi-structured interview and participant observation were ultimately selected as the methods likely to yield the most meaningful discovery relative to the objectives of this research.

Significant academic research supports the use of qualitative interviews as a means for collecting data in phenomenological studies. Glassner and Loughlin (1987:37) call the qualitative interview approach a “methodology for listening” in that researchers come to see the world from the perspective of their subjects (ibid). In pursuit of this perspective, most qualitative interviews are of the open-ended variety in which respondents are asked about facts as well as their opinions on events and
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issues under investigation (Yin 2003:90). These interviews usually take the form of guided conversations rather than structured queries (Rubin and Rubin 1995). Vis-à-vis this unstructured approach, interviewing, “provides a way of generating empirical data about the social world by asking people to talk about their lives” (Silverman 2004:140). Ultimately, the researcher aims to gain access to the “life-world” of the interviewee with respect to interpretation of the meaning of the phenomenon under investigation (Kvale 1983:174).

The interview approach to data collection allows for more flexibility than most other methods available to the qualitative researcher. It is ideally suited to examining topics within which different levels of meaning need to be explored (King 2004:21). In this study, the meanings that service providers ascribe to ‘integration’ are central to understanding how that concept is operationalised under their direction or care. Therefore, the qualitative interview is highly suited to the investigation of the research questions herein. Further, the interview is an approach to data collection to which most participants quite readily adapt. This is due, largely, to widespread popular familiarity with interviewing and the fact that most people like talking about their work -- but rarely have the opportunity to do so with ‘outsiders’ (ibid). Indeed, Atkinson and Silverman (1997) support interviewing as an advantageous methodological choice in data collection given that we live in an ‘interview society’, in which interviews have come to be an accepted way of making sense of our lives.

In order to benefit most greatly from the advantages inherent in the qualitative interview as a method of data collection, elements of positionality and reflexivity on the part of the interviewer within the process should be recognised. Acknowledging that the researcher/interviewer is a ‘positioned subject’ who consciously thinks about what and where s/he is, and what and how s/he does things, brings strength to qualitative work because it allows for conscious deliberation of what researchers do and how they interpret and relate to subjects (Baxter and Eyles 1997:505). It is, therefore, important to highlight researcher positionality and reflexivity within the context of this research in order to acknowledge the role they play in the production of knowledge(s) that occurs within the qualitative interviews conducted.
3.5.1 POSITIONALITY, REFLEXIVITY AND THE PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE

Attention in the qualitative methodological literature has become increasingly focused on the activeness of interviews (Mishler 1986; Alasuutari 1995; Gubrium and Holstein 1997; Kuper et al. 2008). Perspectives highlighted in these discussions hold that meaning is socially constructed, and that knowledge is created from the actions undertaken to obtain it (Garfinkel 1967; Cicourel 1974). Therefore, treating interviewing as a social encounter in which knowledge is actively constructed recognises the interview to be a site of, or occasion for, producing reportable knowledge, rather than simply being a neutral conduit of information. In recognising interviews as sites of knowledge production, qualitative researchers also readily admit that interviewers are “deeply and unavoidably implicated in creating meanings” in conjunction with the interviewee (Silverman 2004:141). Meaning is not merely elicited by questioning, nor transported through replies; it is actively assembled through the interview process (*ibid*).

When qualitative interviews are viewed as sites of knowledge production, interviewees take on a much more significant role than just that of repositories of knowledge. As ‘constructors’ of knowledge in association with interviewers, they do meaning-making work through a collaborative process that results in the production of ‘stories’ (Holstein and Staples 1992; Alasuutari 1995; Revill and Seymour 2001). Evolving from this process is a discourse that not only describes, but socially constructs, the external social world and people’s internal reactions to it (Eyles 1988:2; King 2004:13). When viewed in this light, the relationship between the researcher and the interviewee in the interview setting is a part of the research process; not a distraction from it (*ibid*:11). Indeed, the interviewee is a participant in the research who -- along with the interviewer -- actively shapes the course of the interview, the nature of the research process and the knowledge produced through it (*ibid*:20). This view of the qualitative interview -- and the roles embedded therein -- reflects what Schwartz and Jacobs (1979) refer to as, “the reality reconstruction business” in which interpretive geographers engage. The aim is to develop representations and constructions to describe the representations and constructions that take place within the social world (Baxter and Eyles 1997:506).
In view of the active role that interviewers play in constructing knowledge through a collaborative process with the interviewee, it is important to also recognise that interviewers fulfil this collaborative role as positioned subjects who possess particular experiences, motivations, biases and perspectives. Indeed, all qualitative researchers are positioned relative to their age, gender, race, social status and lived experiences (Milligan 2001:105). This positionality enables or inhibits particular kinds of insights and contributes to the creation of meaning through the interview process as much as does that of the interviewee (ibid). It is important to recognise these influences, but also to highlight that they need not be viewed as problematic. Positionality needs to be disclosed for the benefit of the reader, but can be usefully employed within the research process as a means of narrowing the gap between the experiences of actors and audiences (Pearson 1993: xviii). In pursuit of this disclosure, and positive acknowledgement of the role played by researcher experience, it is important to highlight several aspects of this researcher’s positionality.

As a mature researcher, I embarked upon this study having experienced a variety of work and voluntary roles that relate to broad themes of multiculturalism and integration. Therefore, I am placed, to a degree, in a position that allowed for some prior insight into, and involvement with, the issues under investigation in this research. Additionally, as an American, I grew up in a society already heavily impacted by cultural diversity and issues associated with that status, (i.e., racism, segregation, language-learning debates, etc.). Coming into this researcher role, then, I was equipped with certain a priori experiences and perspectives regarding integration that shaped the way in which I collaborated with interviewees to give meaning to lived experiences of integration in Ireland -- a country that has not, until very recently, experienced the major societal impacts associated with a shift from a mono-cultural society to a multicultural one. Additionally, as a female, and as a former secondary school teacher in receipt of formal training in practice and strategy related to racism, discrimination and multicultural/gender-fair curricula, I possess certain perspectives that contribute to constructions of meaning (along with those of interviewees); particularly in relation to education. Lastly, as an individual who has long maintained an interest in learning about other cultures and socialising with individuals of diverse
cultural backgrounds, I am positioned to explore integration as a social force or experiment, in part, through the lived experiences of those individuals as well as through my own.

3.5.2 DEPLOYMENT OF THE QUALITATIVE INTERVIEW TECHNIQUE

Upon determination that the qualitative interview technique possessed unique advantages for the interrogation of the particular research questions under investigation in this research, the method was deployed in a systematic, but flexible, manner. For the benefit of the reader, this deployment is elaborated here. Most of the interviews were conducted at respondents’ places of work. However, in some cases, it was necessary to conduct interviews in public meeting places due to privacy and/or noise concerns. One interview was conducted (and recorded) by phone, at the respondent’s request, due to scheduling difficulties. The interviews were semi-structured; allowing for significant respondent choice in emphasising areas more personal to her/his experience or that s/he believed to be more critical to researcher understanding of integration at the street level. Most interviews were of 1-1.5 hour’s duration and were recorded (with respondent permission) for later transcription. These recordings were preceded, for the benefit of the interviewee, by an unrecorded overview of the research project, statement of purpose for the interview, and an explanation regarding usage of the interview data. In this explanation, the interviewee was assured that her/his identity would remain confidential. These overview statements were followed by an unrecorded opportunity for the interviewee to clarify any questions s/he might have regarding these issues.

Upon establishing the interview purpose and format with the interviewee, respondents were guided in a discussion of their lived experiences of ‘doing integration’ at the street level by a pre-determined, but ‘loose’, interview guide. This guide evolved, and became somewhat specialised, throughout successive iterations of interview data collection, coding and analysis conducted throughout the fieldwork stage of the research. These changes in the interview instrument were based mainly upon the particular youth service provision role(s) of each respondent, (i.e., questions asked of a classroom teacher would not necessarily be relevant to the experiences of a youth club leader). However, certain questions were retained in the interview guide.
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throughout the entire data collection phase because they allowed for the analysis of interview data to be somewhat ‘parallel’ in terms of broad topic areas, and they ensured the ascertainment of key pieces of information from each interviewee, (e.g., occupation, job roles, etc.).

At the conclusion of the interview, respondents were encouraged to elaborate any topics they felt had been overlooked by the researcher in regard to their experiences with integration. Sometimes these ‘postscripts’ yielded illuminating results that may have otherwise been missed by the researcher. Other times, respondents chose to forego the opportunity to elaborate and voluntarily closed the interview. Following the recorded session, respondents were again given the opportunity to clarify any questions about the interview process or use of the interview data that they may have had. Interviewees were furnished with researcher contact details in the event that they wanted to provide further information or wanted to clarify questions/concerns about their participation in the project.

Following the interviews, respondent audio recordings were saved, transcribed and assigned a respondent number. These respondent numbers were later used in the writing of research results to ensure interviewee anonymity. Following the conclusion of this dissertation and the attendant examination process, the audio recordings will be destroyed to protect respondent confidentiality. The thematic method by which interview transcripts were analysed is detailed in Section 3.6.

3.5.3 PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION DATA COLLECTION

Qualitative interview data collected from ‘key informant’ youth service providers in Galway City was augmented in this study by data collected via participant observation. Observations were conducted at various venues and events related to local and national integration projects, programmes and services -- specifically focussing on initiatives for youth. Events attended for the purpose of these observations included stakeholder meetings and anti-racism and interculturalism training workshops targeted toward youth service providers. A sampling of these events is detailed in Appendix D. At these events, it was possible to observe, as well as to actively participate in, discussions of integration as a social phenomenon being
operationalised across a multiplicity of local youth organisations and service agencies. In addition to attending these sorts of professional development events, attendance at various professional conferences (attended by other researchers similarly engaged in integration research) provided opportunity to observe the production of contemporary academic discourse regarding integration.

In addition to engagement as a participant in many ‘large-group’ type events focussing on integration, active engagement while conducting this research was also accomplished via a voluntary opportunity with a local integration-oriented youth programme. This voluntary service constituted an invaluable opportunity for the observation of service provider integration practice in a ‘real world’ context; allowing for the further contextualisation of qualitative interview data. Observations made whilst serving in this voluntary capacity were included in the research with the consent of the programme director. No interviews were conducted with programme participants as they were under the age of legal consent and/or were determined to be of ‘vulnerable’ status by the programme director. The programme director is, however, included in the respondent population for this research.

The enhanced contextualisation of interview data achieved vis-à-vis the aforementioned participant observations and active engagements allowed for a triangulation of interviewee storyings of the street-level ‘delivery of integration’ and of discussions by professionals across various work sectors and academic disciplines of integration as a contemporary challenge. Further, attendance at these events allowed for the cultivation of professional contacts that proved useful in the identification of additional interviewees for the research. Lastly, perspectives elaborated by stakeholders at these events enhanced researcher analysis of the data and allowed for research findings to be positioned within a broader integration discourse. The final section of this chapter discussion will elaborate the method by which data gathered during participant observations, as well as that collected through qualitative interviews, was analysed.

---

15 In order to maintain the anonymity of the programme’s director and its participants, the programme name is not stated.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.6 DATA ANALYSIS
In a qualitative research design, attention to rigour in the data collection phase must be accompanied by equally stringent attention to the same during the systematic sifting through of the vast amounts of rich data likely to result. It is necessary for qualitative researchers to transparently describe the techniques used in this data analysis so that readers can be assured they are receiving the results of respondent narratives -- with as little fracturing as possible -- and not merely the results for which the researcher was looking. In this study, the technique chosen for this systematic processing of collected interview data is thematic analysis. The following discussion provides rationale for this design choice and elaborates the deployment of the analytical approach.

Thematic analysis can be briefly described as a search for themes that emerge from data as being important to the description of the phenomenon under investigation (Daly et al. 1997). It is form of pattern recognition within the data -- through careful reading and re-reading -- so that emerging themes become the categories framing the analysis (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane 2006). In this research -- as is typical of studies investigating social processes through qualitative interviews -- a large amount of data was collected. The framework used for the analysis of this data needed to be flexible enough to ensure that it could be read, interpreted and presented in a way that does not truncate meaningful stories within it. However, this flexibility needed to be balanced with a systematic organisation of the data in order to ensure rigour in the analytical process. Thematic analysis is a technique that successfully allows for both of these goals to be met. In light of these advantages, a thematic approach was determined to be highly suited to the analysis of the type of data collected in this research.

Other commonly employed analytical approaches like grounded theory and interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA) were considered for this research. However, these methods tend to be more prescriptive in nature in that they specify strict procedures for data gathering and analysis that allow for less flexibility than thematic analysis (King 2004b:257). This study benefited from the greater flexibility afforded by a thematic approach due to the evolving nature of the study population and the interview guide. The resulting emergent data set was able to be analysed in-
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depth through iterative cycles without \textit{a priori} restrictions. Indeed, perhaps the greatest advantage in using a thematic approach is that iterative cycles of data collection and analysis are incorporated into the research design. Through the performance of these repeated cycles, meaning is retained which could be lost if each interview text were to be analysed independent of previously identified themes and other analysed texts. As themes emerge, through rigorous analysis of the experiences communicated by respondents and how they fit with those of other respondents, coherence of ideas, experiences and ‘life-worlds’ can also emerge (Leininger 1985:60).

Given the iterative nature of data collection and analysis when employing a thematic approach, by necessity, data analysis begins while data is still being collected; making the process cyclical and evolutionary rather than linear (Ambert \textit{et al.} 1995:884). Therefore, preliminary findings actively influence subsequent data gathering and analysis (Ambert \textit{et al.} 1995:884). In this way, reliability of results and transparency of research design are further enhanced. In addition to allowing for the refinement of a meaningful thematic template -- which is used in interpreting and discussing research results -- the iterative cycles involved in a thematic approach also allow for the more timely identification of the important data saturation point discussed in Section 3.4. In the performance of these iterative cycles of data collection and analysis in this research, as new themes stopped emerging, new respondents ceased to be added and the focus shifted solely to the interpretation of the rich data set. The process through which this interpretation was conducted is important to elaborate, since, “there are no standard procedures for analysing interview texts” (Baxter and Eyles 1997:506). This elaboration, and a discussion of the development of the final thematic template used in the interpretation of results, is contained in Section 3.6.1.

3.6.1 GENERATING THE THEMATIC TEMPLATE

The first stage of the analytical process used in this research was to develop a list of a few \textit{a priori} themes, (e.g., education, racism, integration strategies) expected by the researcher to emerge from respondent narratives based upon a (previous) review of the extant integration literature and based upon questions chosen for the preliminary interview guide. This was done to provide an initial sense of direction and a means of
organising data emerging from early interviews, (i.e. before the thematic template had matured). However, a limited number of these *a priori* codes were established in order to avoid ‘blinkering’ the analysis. Indeed, most of the themes found in the final thematic template subsequently emerged through iterative analysis cycles previously described.

The second phase of the analysis consisted of reading the interview transcripts in order to identify sections of text that were relevant to the research questions being interrogated. These sections were then coded according to an established theme(s) from the template or according to a new theme(s) represented by the passage. This information was catalogued in an Excel spreadsheet. An excerpt of this spreadsheet is shown in Figure 3.2. Interview passages were assigned a passage number (chronologically as they occurred in the interview) in this cataloguing process. These passage numbers were later used, in combination with respondent numbers, to cite quotations from interviews within the dissertation text, (e.g., 12:2 translates to the second passage catalogued and thematically coded from Interviewee Number Twelve’s transcript).

---

16 Emerging themes that lay outside the scope of the research objectives were also identified, noted and organised for later consideration and/or discussion.
FIGURE 3.2: Sample of spreadsheet cataloguing of respondent number, interview passage number and applicable thematic codes

Through the cataloguing process, themes were systematically linked to specific data points, (i.e., respondent statements) in order to provide verification of a given theme within the text(s). As themes emerged, they were continually incorporated into the evolving thematic template to further organise ongoing analysis regarding relationships between themes. As the thematic template matured, some themes were combined (where redundant or overlapping) in order to streamline the template. Ultimately the template was organised into three ‘master themes’ with multiple ‘sub-themes’ in order to more clearly highlight broader relationships between individual themes (Figure 3.3).
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3.7 CHAPTER CONCLUSIONS

The methods employed in this research were selected to afford the greatest understanding of integration as a street-level phenomenon. This chapter has described the process by which these methods were deployed; identifying the research design, the selection of a research population, and the effectiveness of (modified) snowballing as a technique for assembling this population. The use of participant observation data to augment data collected from interview respondents has also been highlighted. The thematic analysis technique employed has been elaborated as a means of linking data to the conceptual framework underpinning this research. The following three chapters present, in detail, the results emerging from both interviews and participant observations. This presentation is organised by a framework elucidating the
“conditions of work” (Lipsky 2010) within which service providers enact street-level integration practice in Galway City.
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4.1 INTRODUCTION
In his theorisations of street-level bureaucracy, Lipsky (2010) stresses the importance of the “conditions of work” under which service providers operate in shaping the ways in which these individuals choose -- or are able -- to carry out their everyday practice. Lipsky (ibid:27) also asserts that the working environment conditions the way that street-level workers perceive problems and frame solutions to them. In the context of this research, the “conditions of work” in street-level agencies are important to examine when interrogating questions regarding service provider constructions of integration-related challenges, the practice enacted to meet these challenges, and the spaces (re)produced by that practice. Toward this investigation, this chapter illuminates several coalescing themes that significantly inform street-level working conditions within the context of integration service provision in Galway City. These themes emerge from interviewee discussions of: (1) the way(s) in which ‘integration’ and the various actors engaged in it are constructed at the street level, (2) the ways in which everyday “diversity dilemmas” are framed by service providers as a result of these constructions, and (3) the influence that conflicting and nebulous Irish national ‘integration policy’ has (or does not have) on these conceptual understandings. Insights from participant observations are also incorporated. Particular focus in this chapter is devoted to an interrogation of practical Orientalisms embedded within imaginings of ‘integration’ (and those engaged in it) and the way in which these banal systems of thought operate at the street level.

4.2 ‘DIVERSITY WORKERS’ AND IRISH INTEGRATION POLICY
Within a more culturally pluralistic Ireland, diversity -- whether imagined positively or negatively -- has become a post on the national policy agenda. Due to State decentralisation of responsibility across many areas of social policy implementation, a focus on diversity has also become a ‘necessary dimension of ordinary work’ for youth service providers employed by a range of local agencies (Hagelund 2009:80). Thus, though engaging in work that may span quite different types of youth service delivery from education to recreational activity, for the aims of this research, these workers can be constructed as ‘diversity workers’ in that they all spend considerable amounts of time interacting with youth of diverse cultural, ethnic and religious backgrounds (ibid:83). In order to frame the empirical discussions that follow, it is
useful to specifically apply Hagelund’s imagining of ‘diversity workers’ to the individuals composing the research population in this study.

When considering the multiple employment sectors represented by the respondents in this research, differences can, undoubtedly, be noted, (e.g., variations in work environment, non-integration related role responsibilities, compensation, etc.). However, for the purposes of interrogating the questions of interest in this research, what can be found in common across these worker roles is of greater importance than the differences. For example, teachers operate within certain working conditions that may privilege them in comparison to youth workers or NGO workers, in terms of particular resourcing structures or relationships with the wider community, but they are, nonetheless, engaged in integration challenges similar to those of other types of youth service providers. And though youth workers may not be as restricted in their work by State curricula guidelines as are teachers, they, nonetheless, encounter everyday diversity challenges within roles that similarly place them in a position of care and responsibility in regard to young people. So, despite varying employment classifications, the differences inherent therein are peripheral to the questions under investigation here. What is common to all of the individuals participating in this research is that they are employed by agencies and institutions with an area of responsibility toward multiculturalism and diversity or an integration oriented dimension (Hagelund 2009:83). It is the reactions to this responsibility -- in the form of everyday integration practice -- which are of interest in this investigation. In the following discussions of the empirical results emerging from this research, findings with specific sensitivity to worker role/employment sector will be discussed in that light. However, collectively, the empirical discussions will illuminate more similarities than differences amongst the workers within this research population in regard to integration and diversity-related challenges.

Regardless of job title or employment sector, when looking to national integration policy for guidance in the performance of their roles as ‘diversity workers’, all street-level youth service providers in Ireland find themselves engaging with a myriad of documents -- generated across a range of agencies from education to justice -- that
often espouse very disparate ‘integration’ goals\textsuperscript{17}. Boucher (2008) refers to this assortment of documents as a, “collection of policy statements and piece-meal, reactive policy responses to immediate problems arising from immigration and integration”. Other scholarly policy critiques similarly conclude that the current body of Irish integration policy can be characterised as chronically undeveloped (Fanning and Munck 2007); focusing primarily on integration as a “managed approach to migration” rather than as an enhancement of involvement by migrants and their families in social, educational, cultural and political life (Gray 2006:132). Watchdog groups such as the Irish Human Rights Commission (2011) also critique the inadequate Irish policy response to issues concerning migrant incorporation; stating that Ireland lacks a clear human rights policy, provides no human rights education or training for civil and public servants, and harbours problematic gaps in the protection of cultural rights within the Irish constitution.

In his model of street-level bureaucracy, Lipsky (2010) posits that the sort of unclear, \textit{ad hoc} or incohesive policy guidelines that local Irish youth service providers must interpret is not unexpected given that these individuals are employed in the delivery of services at the local level. Lipsky states that street-level personnel usually work in conditions wherein -- despite the existence of policy at upper levels -- policy-related goal expectations for the agencies in which they work tend to be ambiguously defined, vague or conflicting (\textit{ibid}). This ambiguity, combined with the autonomy and discretion with which these workers are generally imbued at the street level, result in conditions wherein policy from above tends to be less influential in the everyday work of these individuals than for workers in other types of organisations (\textit{ibid}). That is not to say that policy and directives from above never come to play in street-level practice. However, the ‘human dimension’ of much street-level work requires managers from above to allow professional discretion and local resourcing constraints to shape local practice in many cases; often, thereby, supplanting the influence of policy (\textit{ibid}).

\textsuperscript{17} An overview of key policy documents relating to integration, immigration and youth service delivery can be found in Appendix A.
In their everyday work, then, local youth service providers in Ireland must deal with emerging ‘diversity dilemmas’ that are encountered whilst engaging with a much-changed national demographic, and they must do so with unclear integration ‘good practice’ guidance from national policy. Discussions of this policy shortfall frequently emerge in the narratives of service provider respondents in this research. One respondent, working for a migrant advocacy organisation, assesses Irish integration policy as having, ‘no strong, driving force at the national level in terms of the government or the general policy environment’ (7:15). Another respondent, also working in a migrant advocacy capacity, similarly concludes that Irish policy-makers are, ‘not aware -- or if they are aware, they just are not bothered -- with the [integration] issue’ (13:52). A service provider working for a national-level integration NGO similarly cites deficits in Irish integration policy:

Definitely, on a national level, there is a lot still to improve, especially because Ireland hasn’t experienced immigration for a long time. ...I really hope that Ireland learns from other countries’ experience. ...I guess Ireland could do a bit better on this (18:8).

Teacher respondents interviewed are similarly critical of Irish national integration policy progress from an education standpoint. One teacher critiques the Irish national response to integration issues, as she highlights a lack of State willingness to identify and engage with the need for integration as a contemporary social reality:

It seems as if all the [integration] issues...by the government...are being ignored. It’s almost as if, “When we get there, we’ll be fine.”, instead of making policy. Until people start looking at the policies, they’re ignoring the problem. ...It’s a lack of acceptance. ...If you pretend it’s not there, then you’re not acknowledging that it is (11:25).

Another teacher respondent echoes these criticisms when he concludes that the government policy response to matters of integration, to date, has possessed, ‘no vision whatsoever’, and that the, ‘whole [policy] setup is as short-sighted as you can get’ (17:15). This same respondent goes on to assert that:

Regardless of cutbacks, [the government] are embarrassing, to say the least...with the lack of foresight in it [the approach to integration policy] from Day One. ...They’re not that intelligent. You know? The government saw this [demographic change] coming since ’94 or ’95, and they’ve still done nothing on it.
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Embarrassing, is how flat-footed they are on the whole thing (17:17).

A teacher respondent at another school similarly assesses national integration policy as having, ‘a kind of vision missing’ in regard to the needs of migrants in Ireland (11:56). She states that Irish policy-makers, ‘need to cop on, back off and start conversing, instead of kind of deciding, “We have the right perspective.”, or, “We KNOW the way.”’ [emphasis added] (11:58).

These negative appraisals of ‘management’s’ views and policy actions are predicted within the street-level bureaucracy model. Lipsky (2010:16) asserts that ‘lower-level’ participants in organisations often do not share the perspectives of their superiors and, hence, in some respects, cannot be thought to be necessarily working toward stated agency goals. This street-level phenomenon is clearly evident in discussions of national integration policy by many respondents in this research. Within statements chastising the government for being ‘unaware’ and ‘lacking vision’ whilst thinking that they have the ‘right perspective’ and ‘know the way’ is an implication that, perhaps, street-level workers have a better perspective or a ‘different way’ that may be more in tune with realities of integration service provision at the local level. In fact, several service provider respondents in this research go beyond the level of implication, to actually identifying specific ways in which national policy-makers have been negligent in their duty toward migrants; demonstrating a lack of awareness regarding their needs and, subsequently, misrepresenting or wilfully neglecting those needs.

4.2.1 ‘INTEGRATION POLICY’ AS ‘IMMIGRATION POLICY’

One way in which many respondents believe that national policy-makers are performing a disservice to migrants in Ireland is by imagining ‘integration’ as a matter of immigration management. These service providers believe that, in doing so; policy-makers legally enshrine the unfair treatment and/or neglect of many of the migrant youth and their families with whom they work. Indeed, policy-makers such
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as (former) Tánaiste\textsuperscript{18}, Michael McDowell, clearly highlight the politicised connections between immigration and integration policy which these respondents identify. In a 2007 speech at a conference on integration, Mr. McDowell acknowledges the “critical links between the immigration, visa, asylum and integration areas”, and asserts that activities in all these areas “affect the other” (2007). In fact, he states that, “Changes to our immigration laws are changes to the integration landscape.”, and that policies concerning, “citizenship, family reunification, determination of legal status linked to rights of access to services – all are factors in building successful integration policies” (ibid).

In their discussions, several respondents lament these policy constructions equating ‘immigration’ with ‘integration’, because they believe that, inherent in them, is a notion that labour migrants are ‘good migrants’ in that they are (or were) beneficial to the economy\textsuperscript{19}. Meanwhile, these service providers fear that refugees and asylum-seekers are conversely being constructed as ‘problematic’ in light of economics. Due to these constructions, many respondents -- echoing policy critics (Gray 2006; Fanning \textit{et al.} 2007; Fanning and Munck 2007; Boucher 2008; Ruhs and Quinn 2009; Irish Human Rights Commission 2011) -- assert that ‘integration’ initiatives are being wrongfully enacted through policy as a form of immigration management and, thus, unfairly target or neglect asylum-seekers and refugees in various ways. A respondent working for a national-level integration NGO questions the future of ‘integration’ in Ireland in light of this policy outlook and the changes to Irish immigration law that it has engendered:

\begin{quote}
\textit{The laws are changing as well, and show people [migrants], “We only need you as labour. We don’t really want you as human beings.” You know, like, where’s the integration? Where is the common ground for receiving people if you just ask them to come for a certain time, and then you ask them to leave again once they’re not in a job? So, there you can see the Irish approach to integration} (18:10).
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{18} The Tánaiste, or, more formally, \textit{An Tánaiste}, is the deputy prime minister of Ireland. The Taoiseach (prime minister) nominates a member of the government to the position of Tánaiste.

\textsuperscript{19} The fieldwork for this research was conducted in the early stages of the current economic recession. The depth and scale to which this recession would later develop was, of course, not fully realised at this stage. Therefore, comments regarding the desirability of ‘economic migrants’ (as viewed by the Irish government) should be placed within this temporal context.
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In view of this policy outlook, respondents working in migrant advocacy organisations express concern for the policy-protection of migrants in Ireland not viewed by the State as ‘beneficial’ to the economy, (i.e., asylum-seekers and refugees):

The main policy of the government is deterrent [sic]. That’s their focus. They make it as hard as they can for as long as they can, and they hope [asylum-seeking] people go home. And it is working as a deterrent. I think people are giving up, but I think if you’ve got someone who chooses to go back to a war-torn country, as opposed to endure this [asylum system] anymore, I think that is horrendous. …I think that is the [policy] objective. And that everything that’s put in place now is to make it more difficult to get in, and to make it as miserable as possible while you’re here. And I think that that’s causing a whole other set of social problems. And in addition to being wrong for what it is…it’s very short-sighted (20:39).

For the first couple of years of this century …the national policy response was, I think, a fervent hope that all these people would go away. …At official level, there was a recognition that we needed [labour] migrants. They served our economy, so we put up with them. But refugees and asylum seekers were different. …I think they [policy-makers] thought and hoped that those people would go away. And then they realized, no, they’re not. And, “OK, right. So we have to make things as difficult as possible for them here.” …I’ve heard the Reception and Integration Agency, which is an agency of the Department of Justice, say, “You know, it’s really great! Our policy is working! There are much fewer people coming! Deterrence is great!” They’ve said that publicly. So, I think, that was the response (7:19).

Another respondent raises related concerns for asylum-seekers under current Irish ‘integration’ policy due to State attempts to unilaterally equate ‘migrants’ with ‘labour’:

Certainly, in terms of refuge and asylum issues …the [Irish] leadership is really important. And either it’s been very
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Negative, like the Citizenship Referendum\textsuperscript{20}, or in the kind of inaction on really important refugee legislation that we’ve had. ...It’s just awful to hear this human rights issue being subsumed by the needs of a TINY economy! (laughs) [emphasis added] And of course the big danger is that; as soon as that economy starts to wane...as it is...that, then suddenly, those arguments just don’t hold any water. In fact, they go into reverse thrust very fast. And the human rights element of it just becomes even less and less important (6:23).

National policy differentiating labour migrants as ‘good migrants’ from refugees and asylum-seekers as ‘undesirable migrants’ is critiqued by Gray (2006). She states that Irish ‘integration policy’ pays little or no attention to its dividing practices, and that the racialised workings of the global labour market and economic policies by which nation-states (like Ireland) position themselves in relation to globalising capitalism remain outside the integration policy frame (\textit{ibid}). Boucher (2008) concludes, in a similar vein, that Irish ‘integration policy’ is about a managed approach to immigration that relies primarily on white, European and predominantly Catholic migrants for needed temporary or low-skilled labour. Boucher (\textit{ibid}) asserts that individuals from these groups, (e.g. Polish and Lithuanian nationals) are thought by the State to be the ‘type’ of migrant who will more likely integrate in both the short and long terms to the Irish nation -- maintaining social cohesion. In this way, Ireland hopes to avoid the “mistakes of other countries” that have operated policies to attract low-skilled, temporary workers, only to find that they (and their descendents) become the socially excluded ethnic minorities of the future (\textit{ibid}).

In the State construction of ‘good’ economic migrants, then, there is an inherent practice of extending opportunities for integration to some, whilst withholding it from others. When examined through the investigative framework for this research, it can

\textsuperscript{20} Until 2004, it was enshrined in Article Two of the Irish Constitution that the nation of one’s birth determined one’s citizenship. In 2004, however, a referendum was passed that removed the constitutional provision of territorial birthright citizenship for the children of non-citizens (Mancini and Finlay 2008:575). Post-dating the comments of Respondent 6 in this research, this referendum was called into question \textit{vis-à-vis} a European Court of Justice (ECJ) ruling in the Zambrano Case (C 34/09). In this case, it was ruled that an EU member state may not refuse the non-EU parents of a dependent child who is a citizen of, and resident in, an EU member state the right to live and work in that state. At the time of this writing, the Department of Justice and Equality in Ireland is examining a number of cases of non-EU/non-EEA parents of Irish citizen minor children which may meet the criteria specified in the Zambrano judgement. If they meet the Zambrano criteria, the parents may be granted permission to live and work in Ireland (Citizen’s Information Board 2011).
be argued that current Irish national ‘integration policy’, rather than creating ‘spaces of integration care’ for migrants across all categories, can be seen to create spaces of ‘integration care-less-ness’ for some groups. Indeed, policy-makers construct only certain categories of migrants as entitled to ‘integration care’; effectively rendering asylum-seekers and refugees -- who may have already been resident in the country for many years -- undeserving of ‘caring services or entitlements’ that may help to incorporate them more fully into the social fabric of the nation. It is only when -- or if -- they become legally resident in the country and are employed in occupations contributing to the nation’s economic growth that they are deemed to be worthy of the State’s ‘care’ and policy protection. Until such time, they remain, both figuratively and literally, in ‘care-less’ spaces (e.g., asylum direct provision centres) to await highly politicised decisions that will determine their fate. These decisions are viewed increasingly by policy-makers as economic rather than as of a human rights nature.

4.2.2 NATIONAL POLICY CONSTRUCTIONS OF ‘INTEGRATION’: A FAILURE TO PERMEATE STREET LEVEL

Given that the bulk of Irish national ‘integration policy’ is viewed by many respondents in this research as a State attempt to control migration and award access to those groups imagined as more economically ‘useful’ and less problematic to social cohesion, there is little policy remaining that respondents believe usefully addresses integration in the context of their everyday, caring ‘diversity worker’ roles. Indeed, whilst attempting to meet the challenges ordinarily encountered within the scope of their street-level work with all youth, as well as encountering new challenges in the form of ‘diversity dilemmas’, most respondents in this research report feeling woefully unaided by national policy. Specifically, many respondents assert that they must perform their professional role expectations under the (alleged) guidance of a policy milieu that is, not only inadequate and stratifying, but also contains built-in ambivalences. Respondent discussions of these ambivalences sharply illuminate some central issues associated with the delivery of local youth integration services. One such issue centres on service provider acceptance (or lack thereof) of policy-derived imaginings of the scope and nature of ‘integration’.
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When local service providers in this research discuss national policy constructions of ‘integration’, many highlight that a confusing multiplicity of imaginings for the concept are espoused and that contradictory goals are set out by policy-makers for its achievement. One teacher respondent communicates her frustration with this lack of clarity as she attempts to discern Department of Education ‘integration policy’ from other policy statements by the Department that impact her as an educator:

_We now have got this new multicultural society, and the government...what really annoys me at the moment...is the Department of Education have confused teachers about the difference between inclusion...they talk about the “inclusive school”, but they talk about it in conjunction with disabilities and culture, which are very different issues. You know? So you pick up a manual, and one minute you’re talking or reading about Aspergers and autism...and the next minute you’re reading about having a culture day. Which, to me, is quite insulting. They’re two very separate issues, but they’re being kind of bundled in together by the Department of Education (11:20)._

In discussing migrant children and their intercultural education needs in conjunction with the educational needs of differently-abled young people, national-level ‘integration policy’, again, fails to provide ‘integration care’ that specifically addresses an already marginalised population. Instead, migrant youth are further marginalised by constructing them as having ‘special needs’; thereby (re)producing ‘able-bodied Irishness’ as the norm. Though these policy characterisations may effectively position migrant youth as a category needing ‘care’, they do so in a way that is detrimental to the recognition of migrant youth equality. Along with Respondent 11, other respondents in this research highlight these policy ambivalences and ambiguities. An interviewee working within a national migrant advocacy organisation asserts that, to avoid this lack of clarity, national policy should not ‘bundle together’ a range of social issues. Rather, she states that, ‘_there should be a national integration strategy...a quite clear one... that is really implemented at regional and local levels_’ (18:25).

Despite such recommendations by individual service providers as well as by migrant advocacy organisations, human rights watchdogs and other advocacy groups, policy
that clearly defines and addresses migrant integration has, thus far, not been outlined by the Irish government. The ‘piece-meal’ approach highlighted by policy critics (Gray 2006; Fanning and Munck 2007; Boucher 2008) has, instead, produced a patchwork of isolated policy documents and directives which, many respondents in this research assert, are largely being ignored by street-level youth service providers. This failure for an unclear and ambivalent body of national ‘integration policy’ to be ‘taken on board’ by many street-level workers is attributed by respondents to a variety of causes. These include poor communication from above, inadequate training, and a preference for individualised agency approaches to integration that can be more readily communicated and implemented at the street level.

Lipsky (2010) predicts the aforementioned relationships between street-level realities and ‘management’s’ policy-making efforts in his model. He asserts that, exercising discretion and autonomy, street-level workers often choose to follow agency-specific procedures and policies, rather than those of management, because they better suit the vagaries of individualised service provision. In other words, street-level workers are interested in performing their work in a way that is consistent with their own preferences (ibid:19), and also avoids adherence to systematised solutions to everyday dilemmas when individualised approaches are better suited (ibid:23). Further, street-level workers may feel inadequately equipped to implement management-recommended solutions due to lack of training and/or lack of clear guidelines by which to do so (ibid:27).

In this research, service provider discussions of some of the root causes for national integration policy’s failure to be adopted in wholesale fashion at the street level in a youth service context highlight respondent perceptions that this policy is often generated for reasons that depart from their own imaginings of ‘integration’ and that it is poorly communicated from above. As Lipsky (2010) predicts, these disconnects between the national and the local make the operationalisation of ‘management’s’ vision of ‘integration’ an exercise likely to result in confusion for street-level workers. Further, with no clearly stated goalposts by which to measure achievement, even more frustration is likely to be introduced (ibid:28). Confusion over, and frustration with, policy from above engenders, according to Lipsky (ibid:19), a propensity amongst
street-level workers to, then, implement their own (or their agency’s) more individually-tailored approaches to the operationalisation of a complex concept like integration. A teacher respondent in this research provides an example of this sort of local departure from national policy. She highlights the failure of national integration policy to be widely implemented within her local school despite her perception that policy-makers expect implementation to occur by mere virtue of publication:

*I think the Department of Education has to realize that…this whole idea of putting it [integration policy] all down on paper and handing it out to us, and we all blindly follow like sheep, is completely…a complete bunch of rubbish* (11:49).

This teacher justifies her (and/or her school’s) disregard of national integration policy; asserting that it is little more than a manifestation of EU obligation and an attempt to expunge the State from culpability should EU human rights directives be audited:

*A lot of it [integration policy] goes down to what they [the government] are obliged to do... EU regulations... So if they’re ever called up, they can say, “Well, we have the document. It’s not our fault it wasn’t implemented.”...And there just doesn’t seem to be anybody there [in policy-making] who’s clued in. I think what happens in education is, you have too many theorists and not enough realists* (11:57).

In addition to street-level disagreements with national policy-makers’ intentions or expectations, respondents in this research also cite inadequate training in the implementation of policy as a reason for national integration policy’s failure to be ‘taken on board’ locally. A teacher respondent highlights this relationship as he discusses an instance wherein a new Department of Education integration policy directive was introduced to the staff at his school through an in-service training. When the new policy was introduced, he asserts, it was inadequately discussed and training necessary for the school-based operationalisation of it was not provided:

*We did an in-service on basically integration and teaching English as a second language and so on. This was the first meeting we had on this [English-language competency] assessment pack, and I said, “Can we just go through the assessment pack?” And she [the trainer] said, “No, we’re told not to go through it.” I said, “Well, will we have an extra course for it?” And she said, “Probably not.” I said, “Well, then why are we having this meeting if we’re not allowed to talk about the most obvious thing in the room?” So...I think, again, a lot of it [‘integration policy’ from the Department of*
Education is a waste of time, really. Yeah, it's all hot air (17:42).

Similar failures to communicate national-level integration policy initiatives at the street level emerge from participant observation data in this research as well. Whilst attending a conference focusing on interculturalism in Irish education, a spokesperson for the Department of Education and Skills addressed attendees regarding the Department’s newly published *Intercultural Education Strategy, 2010-2015*. Prefacing her main comments, this spokesperson held up a copy of the document to the audience and asked for a show of hands from people who were familiar with it. After receiving a reasonable verification of familiarity, the Education staffer commented that she was ‘relieved’ to see this reaction because the strategy was rather ‘hidden’ on the Department web site. She then stated that if anyone needed help locating it, to please contact the Department and they could be directed. This manner of introducing a key piece of national integration policy exemplifies a broader pattern of inadequate State communication and discussion of such initiatives that several respondents in this research highlight.

In addition to reasons relating to poor communication, discussions of national integration policy’s failure to be significantly espoused at the street level are also tied, by service providers, to reasons of intrinsic disagreement in ethos. In the narratives of several respondents, rationale is provided for policy’s failure to permeate or significantly influence street-level practice based on perceived differences in the State’s view of ‘integration’ versus the views of street-level ‘diversity workers’. For example, one respondent working for a migrant advocacy organisation explains her agency’s lack of adherence to certain national policies on the basis of their disagreement with State imaginings of ‘integration’ that underpin them.

*A document called “Integration: A Two-Way Process”...What they [policy-makers] maintain there is that integration starts, for the people we work with [asylum-seekers], the day you get*

---

21 The conference in question was The Conference on Interculturalism in Irish Education and took place at The University of Limerick in February, 2011. The speaker cited from this conference will remain unidentified in order to protect anonymity. Though my purpose in attending the (participant observation) event at which this person spoke was clearly stated to event organisers, I feel it is prudent to reference the speaker’s comments in this way. In other words, though event organisers knew of my motivations for being present, this specific speaker may not have. All subsequent references to participant observation data attributed to anonymous sources will be handled similarly in the text.
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your refugee status

We fundamentally disagree with that. That’s absolutely rubbish. We think that people need to be integrated from Day One. So we’re completely against that [policy perspective] (7:7).

This respondent’s comments reflect a view of integration as a service or process wherein the State has a ‘duty of care’. Though asylum-seekers, as a specific category of migrant, are forced by the State to live in hostel accommodation and are not allowed to seek employment or otherwise live an independent lifestyle, this worker believes they are still entitled to caring integration services. The fact that State policy constructs them as ‘un-integratable’, until such time that they (potentially) receive refugee status, does not mesh with this worker’s (and her agency’s) imaginings of ‘integration’. She clearly believes that, under the conditions that current national ‘integration policy’ stipulates, when (some) asylum-seekers are eventually granted Irish residency as refugees, they will be lacking in some way(s) due to a failure by the State to have provided them with integration services prior to that status change. If asylum direct provision centres were, on the other hand, imagined as ‘spaces of integration care’, asylum-seekers would be able to receive integration services that would, in this respondent’s view, help them to better prepare for life as a legally resident refugee and member of Irish society.

Other respondents in this research similarly highlight philosophical disagreements between the ways they and their local agencies imagine ‘integration’ versus the way(s) it is constructed in Irish national policy. A teacher articulates a rejection of policy-derived definition(s) of ‘integration’ on the grounds that the State, in her view, does not adequately understand the term and cannot agree on a singular definition for it. By virtue of this State confusion, this respondent believes that expectations for street-level compliance with national ‘integration policy’ are illegitimised:

The last paper [regarding integration] that I read...the government even had all the terminology wrong. They actually

---

22 In the document to which this respondent refers, the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform does state that integration policy must take account of the over 100 nationalities represented in the Irish asylum process (IWGIRI 1999:42). However, throughout the rest of the document, only refugees are addressed in discussions of access to services such as health care and education as well as when addressing participation in employment and the political process.
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didn’t differentiate between multicultural…interculturalism, and between… But, you know, there are four different types of integration. One actually is “Them” and “Us”, and another one is assimilation… They used all those terms interchangeably. They didn’t differentiate between any of them. I was actually quite disgusted. You know, reading the paper, you wouldn’t actually really understand what their [State] goals are at all. Because, on the one hand, there was the kind of “Them” and “Us” situation, and on the other hand then, there was, “Oh, we’re all in this together.” …kind of High School Musical type stuff. (laughs) So, I don’t think the government understand, themselves, what they want. So it’s very hard for schools to actually decide policy when the policymakers aren’t in keeping

Another respondent working for a migrant advocacy organisation similarly assesses policy-provided definitions of ‘integration’ as inadequate; therefore, providing rationale for wariness on the part of street-level service providers:

What do we understand about multiculturalism or interculturalism or any of these terms? We’re not at all clear. So, I’m a bit sceptical about ‘integration’, I have to say.

These respondents’ statements clearly reflect Lipsky’s (2010:16) theorisation that street-level workers will often disagree with ‘management’s’ policy views. As exhibited by service provider narratives emerging from this research, where this occurs, workers may rationalise disregard for said policies on the grounds that the perspectives enshrined therein are not legitimate. In view of such determinations, these workers will frequently, then, display a degree of non-compliance, as their interests -- or those of their local clients -- are seen to differ from the interests of those at higher levels (ibid). In the cases of several respondents in this research, the interests of their respective agencies doing integration work in Galway City are articulated as being different than the economic and political interests of policy-makers in Dublin. For this reason, these respondents feel legitimised in their refusal to accept national policy-derived imaginings of integration and State articulations of the scope for achieving it.

4.3 ‘INTEGRATION’: A MULTIPlicity OF STREET-LEVEL DEFINITIONS

Central to the arguments of service providers who assert that State imaginings of ‘integration’ do not mesh with those held by their local agencies are issues of definition.
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Rather than attempting to comply with multiple (and often contradictory) definitions of ‘integration’ set out in national policy, many local service providers are, instead, determining the meaning of ‘integration’ at agency -- or even individual -- level. These sorts of street-level interpretations are possible due to the local autonomy that many street-level organisations and workers experience (Lipsky 2010). A teacher respondent highlights this sort of autonomy in the context of her school, as she discusses the operationalisation of integration and the tendency to make policy decisions relating to this (and other) process(es) locally:

_Really, the Department of Education have very little to do with schools on a day-to-day basis. ...You know, really, what you’re talking about in a school ...is management...what the management of the school is like. That really defines ...even...like, people will say to me, “Well, your school is only your manager. The Department of Education is really your boss.” But it doesn’t work...you know...on paper, that’s what it’s about, but in practice, it’s completely different. And it’s the same with interculturalism (11:47)._  

A respondent working for a migrant advocacy organisation similarly describes street-level autonomy in matters relating to integration as she recounts an instance wherein this sort of local agency was even recommended by policy-makers in Dublin:

_ I was listening to a radio discussion yesterday about the Hijab, and the controversy that had blown up in Ireland last year about the wearing of the Hijab. ...The schools went to the Minister for Integration and begged him for guidance on what to do when people come to school and want to wear a Hijab. The Minister set up a working group, and the working group deliberated and consulted with white, Irish people and unions and so on. They came back and said, “We’ll leave it all up to the individual schools in dealing with that. There’s no national guideline.” That will just show you how weak integration can be (7:8)._  

A respondent working as a national liaison to local youth organisations similarly observes a high degree of street-level autonomy from national integration directives whilst working with youth organisations across the country:

_In their [street-level service providers’] day-to-day work ...I don’t think any of them draw on [integration] policy. I think, in ALL cases, it comes down to practice first, and then people that do good practice will eventually do the policy [emphasis added]. I don’t think the policy ever drives the practice on that [street] level. ...The person isn’t coming from the angle of, “There’s a policy there, therefore, I will do intercultural_
A respondent working for a national-level integration agency expresses concern regarding the implications of street-level agencies deriving individualised interpretations of ‘integration’ and the best practice for achieving it:

_There are schools where nothing [related to integration strategy] is happening. And even just taking in students from new communities could be a challenge for them, and they wouldn’t be interested [in integration] at all. So, it’s down to the personality of the principal, which is really a shame, because the Department of Education has intercultural strategies, and it’s really time for this to come out and be implemented in all the schools, and not be down to preferences of individuals (18:16)._ 

Because many service providers _are_ choosing to reject national policy as a legitimate source of guidance in defining the nature and scope of ‘integration’, a complex and diverse set of individualised, street-level definitions of the concept are beginning to emerge. Reflecting this trend, the number of different definitions for, and characterisations of, ‘integration’ provided by respondents in this research is equal to the number of respondents interviewed. In view of the multiple and nebulous State imaginings of ‘integration’ to which most local service providers in Ireland are exposed, the often similarly imprecise and/or contradictory nature of these respondent-generated conceptions of ‘integration’ is not unexpected. Indeed, Lipsky (2010:40) asserts that varying street-level conceptualisations regarding policy goals from above _will_ emerge due to street-level workers and agencies exercising discretion in tailoring policies to their specific preferences, resourcing structures and client needs. In the context of this research, a closer examination of this myriad of street-level interpretations of ‘integration’ is warranted in order to lay the groundwork for subsequent interrogations of the practice enacted to achieve it.

Despite speaking on all manner of issues related to the concept of ‘integration’ for durations of up to two hours, during the course of interviews conducted in this research, most service provider respondents fail to confidently articulate a succinct definition of ‘integration’ or to construct cohesive theorisations as to its nature and scope. Whilst some respondents display self-awareness regarding this shortfall, others ‘dance around’ it
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in such a way that it is difficult to determine whether they realise they are doing so. Therefore, in some cases, insight regarding service provider conceptualisations of ‘integration’ is gained as much by virtue of what respondents do not or cannot express, as it is by what they do. One respondent’s discussion exemplifies this pattern of revelation as she discusses, first, her frustration with policy-makers’ conflicting and confusing attempts to define ‘integration’, followed by an assessment of her agency’s failure to (thus far) replace these ‘inadequate’ State attempts with a more concise definition:

_We don’t agree with how it [‘integration’] is being used by State organizations, and we have a real fear that it’s being used in such an imprecise and meaningless context…that it’s so little understood. It can mean something to you…it can mean something over there…and nobody defines it. Everyone says, “Oh, we’re all for integration!” …So, we have a concern because it can mean anything. Somebody recently described it to me as…like a perfume. Suddenly EVERYBODY’S wearing “Integration” [emphasis added]. Wow! But nobody has a grasp of it. You know? It’s fleeting. It’s ephemeral. Nobody pins it down…least of all, our beloved [former] Minister for Integration. I don’t think he has a clue. So, we’re working…we would see integration…having to pick the values or ethos that we would like to see such an approach include would be…a focus on equality, anti-racism, respect for human rights, etc. We’re still struggling with kind of coming up with a better approach to it. But we know that we want to be in an integration approach, but it’s just…we’ve more work to do on that._ (7:7)

In order to further interrogate street-level determinations of a definition for ‘integration’, at some stage in the interview, interviewees are asked to clarify their own working definition of ‘integration’, or to provide the definition of ‘integration’ which their employing agency espouses. In most cases, the asking of this question generates a palpable degree of discomfort on the part of respondents. A mixture of nervous laughter and/or intensified body language often accompanies ‘stalling’ phrases used whilst respondents seek to formulate an answer. Given the politicised nature of the term ‘integration’ and the highly-charged discourses surrounding it, it is possible that respondents are searching for a way to articulate their answer so as not to say the ‘wrong thing’, (i.e., something that sounds culturally insensitive or politically uninformed). In light of the fact that most respondents in this research are employed in roles wherein they have become -- by choice or by default -- “diversity workers” (Hagelund 2009), it is
possible that they feel pressed to generate the ‘correct’ answer to a question so central to issues impacting their ethnic minority/migrant clients.

Some respondents are seemingly so unnerved by the ‘definition question’ that they -- directly or indirectly -- refuse response. One respondent simply laughs and says, ‘I find it very hard to define, so I won’t even embarrass myself!’ (6:15); whilst another states, ‘I don’t have an actual formal definition. It’s a word that bedevils us, you know?’ (7:6). A third respondent takes a more indirect approach; turning the question back to the interviewer through the use of a common response to ‘sticky’ questions, as he replies, ‘That’s a good question!’ (14:18). Despite these occasional refusals to define ‘integration’, most interviewees do attempt to comply with this interviewer request. However, even amongst those offering a definition, a degree of trepidation is revealed by the way in which many interviewees introduce their responses with ‘hedging’ phrases (Figure 4.1). These introductory phrases frequently contain a degree of personalisation that signals to the interviewer that the response about to be given is not necessarily based upon understandings of integration derived from policy documents, agency training, etc. Rather, responses are framed in such a way as to ensure that the interviewer accepts them as individual interpretations of ‘integration’; thus affording a certain degree of immunity from being found ‘incorrect’ according to some documented or ‘official’ source(s).
Figure 4.1: Phrases used by respondents to preface definitions of ‘integration’

Once past these sorts of personalising introductory phrases, respondents set about the business of defining ‘integration’ in ways that are similarly wide-ranging to those emerging from national policy. Some of these individualised definitions show signs of influence by policy-generated conceptualisations of integration, whilst others do not.

Definitions provided by service providers working in migrant advocacy roles collectively exhibit the most noticeable influence of State policy in terms of general scope and tone. This is not surprising since, presumably, workers who are advocating for migrants would need to be more familiar with national policy rhetoric; as the success of their lobbying efforts is highly dependent upon knowledge of the policy they are attempting to influence. This would be less likely to be the case in the work of service providers within more ‘mainstream’ organisations like schools and youth clubs. Further, workers employed by migrant advocacy organisations are engaged in roles that are, perhaps, more narrowly focussed than those of workers in more ‘mainstream’ agencies. In other words, schools, youth clubs and other ‘mainstream’ agencies have wider demographic remits and aim to engage service users in non-integration specific programming as well as that which is integration-focused. Therefore, workers in these organisations may display familiarity...
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with national policy that is broader and/or less integration-specific than that displayed by advocacy-type workers.

The following interview passages exemplify the aforementioned role-related variations amongst workers in regard to their conversance with national integration policy. A respondent who serves as an ethnic community organisation director and participant in the Galway City Intercultural Forum -- and who is a migrant -- provides a definition of ‘integration’ that invokes language used in several recent national policy documents:

Integration... I would say it’s a two-way process. You cannot just expect people to be open to you and to accept you in their environment without you giving something back as well (13:16).

Another respondent, engaged in the delivery of development and anti-racism education, formulates a similarly policy-influenced definition:

I see it [integration] as a quite two-way process. ...I think that it would have to be some kind of two-way process where societies are constantly...just in flow and in changing and absorbing new influences and, in turn, influencing people... that we’re constantly absorbing them and changing and being changed (6:15).

Yet another respondent working in a migrant advocacy capacity -- and who is also a migrant -- provides a similarly policy-influenced definition that, again, invokes a ‘two-way process’:

I believe integration... sometimes, you can’t just maybe throw away your culture and take up Irish culture. It’s a kind of two-way process...being able to...for your culture, or maybe your way of life... to be accepted here in Ireland, and being able to understand the way of life of the Irish people (8:5).

The thrust of all three of these definitions can be specifically traced to a key piece of integration policy published by the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform (DJELR): Integration: A Two-Way Process23 (Interdepartmental Working Group on

23 Several migrant advocacy groups were consulted in the writing of this policy document, including The Refugee Agency; the National Consultative Committee on Racism and Integration (NCCRI); Access Ireland’s Refugees’ Social Integration Project; The Association of Refugees and Asylum-Seekers in Ireland; The Jesuit Refugee Service and the Vincentian Refugee Centre (IWGIRI 1999: Appendix 4). None of the respondents participating in this research are employed by these specific agencies. Therefore, their familiarity with the document cannot be attributed to directly working in consultation with policy-makers in its creation.
the Integration of Refugees in Ireland (IWGIRI 1999). In this document, integration is defined as, “the ability to participate to the extent that a person needs and wishes in all of the major components of society without having to relinquish his or her own cultural identity” (IWGIRI 1999:9). Familiarity with the contents of this policy piece would likely be beneficial, if not necessary, to the advocacy work performed by these three respondents, so it is not surprising that some of its verbiage appears in their responses.

When respondents not employed by organisations with a primarily migrant advocacy function are asked to define ‘integration’, these more ‘mainstream’ service providers embark upon less ‘policy-esque’ explanations of the concept. In other words, their definitions/discussions do not, in most cases, explicitly invoke national integration policy verbiage. Instead, this group of service providers frequently define ‘integration’ in more descriptive terms; discussing ways in which the phenomenon is made manifest or evident to an observer. For example, a secondary teacher respondent engages in a multi-faceted discussion of integration in which she alternates between, (1) assessing the concept as a positive phenomenon, (2) highlighting awareness with in her teaching practice of cultures outside of Ireland, and (3) citing ways in which she attempts to introduce a focus on integration into her classroom.

Integration... about migration... and more cultural diversity coming to Ireland...for example ...the impact on Ireland by migration and overpopulation and things like that. You do look at case studies from other countries...some African countries...and the situations there. So, the students are made aware of different cultures... We always would look at it or teach it in a way that it’s a positive thing, obviously, for people to integrate. ...Issues like migration, saying that it’s a positive thing for Ireland...that Ireland’s becoming more tolerant and, you know, it’s good to have more cultural diversity. ....Describe integration...I suppose, different people getting to know each other...different cultures...people coming over...different cultures and learning different languages maybe...foreign students learning the English language... language would be a big thing for integration, I suppose. I suppose that would be it, really... just making friends with people from different cultures (12:18).

Toward the end of this discussion, the respondent does speak in more ‘definitional’ terms; loosely equating integration with English-language learning and ‘making friends’.
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However, nowhere in this extended passage does this respondent cite national integration policy emanating from the Department of Education or other State sources. Similarly, a ‘mainstream’ youth club leader defines integration, not by citing national policy, but by equating it with other concepts like equality and participation:

*The concept and the interpretation of the word ‘integration’ itself ... I suppose ... as far as I am concerned ... but also as an organization as well ... there is not ... or can’t be ... this kind of special treatment for one and special treatment for another. As far as we're concerned ... it's coming in as equals, and that they [migrants] have the right to express themselves and to be a part of ... to engage and participate in the programmes in their own way ... that they actually would express themselves ... coming from their own experiences* (14:18).

Another respondent who delivers ‘mainstream’ community recreation programming to local youth also conceptualises integration by equating it with community and cooperation:

*Integration...well...I suppose... it would be to get people from various backgrounds to work together to give an equal input in the process and achieve something that is the product of the whole group...not the individuals or sub-groups...coming from a variety of backgrounds, but becoming one group* (23:20).

Though ‘mainstream’ service provider respondents in this research collectively approach the definition of ‘integration’ from a less policy-based standpoint than do their migrant advocacy counterparts, the former are not unique in their tendency to equate integration with, perhaps, more ‘comfortable’ or knowable concepts and ideas that have been longer in the Irish national vernacular and/or are more familiar in everyday experience. For example, when asked to define ‘integration’, a service provider respondent working in a migrant advocacy role chooses -- like Respondent 12 -- to equate it with something else -- in this case, equality and community:

*I suppose, integration would be equality... where everyone has equal access to services and is pretty much the same and is treated equally. ...So that your neighbour is your neighbour. ... Not, people are isolated. People mix and join in together. So, it’s kind of like a community becomes...everyone who lives in an area becomes a community* (20:23).
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Another respondent working in a migrant advocacy capacity provides a discussion of integration that is also contextualised by comparisons to community and equality; as well as to peaceful co-existence:

*My interpretation of it [integration] is...if there is understanding, in a society, of the existence of different cultures... If we are able to appreciate that [he] is different and has got a culture that he can show me, and I can accept it, and see mine and accept it, and then live as one community, you know? That is how I look at integration and how it has to work. I don’t look at it that there is a superior culture out there that these other cultures...maybe I should call them ‘small cultures’...that they have to be dissolved, or should be swallowed by the bigger culture, you know? What needs to happen is, yes, there is a big ethnic group in the society, but that ethnic group has to accept that other ethnic groups are ethnic groups, just like they are. ...So, integration should be coexistence of different cultures...and then, while doing so, providing a way of equal access to the services that exist in the community* (10:14).

In equating integration with other more familiar social concepts, (e.g., equality, participation, cooperation, community), many service providers seem better able to articulate their perceptions of a phenomenon with which they are clearly *not* as comfortable or conversant. In these comparative discussions, though none of the respondents explicitly equate ‘integration’ with ‘assimilation’, when some of the narratives are examined more closely, an underlying assimilationist perspective can be discerned. For example, some respondent definitions of ‘integration’ equate the concept with notions of ‘community’; wherein people are envisioned as ‘becoming one’ despite diverse backgrounds. Herein, ‘integration’ is constructed as suppressing difference in order to achieve a positive sense of ‘community’. These notions of integration, as a positive means for migrants to ‘become one with mainstream society’ are in stark contrast to imaginings of the concept by several respondents working in migrant advocacy roles. In fact, some respondents working in this sector voice concern that ‘integration’ constructed in this way idealises the subversion or abandonment of cultural identity for the sake of social cohesion:

*I think integration is always spoken of as what ‘They’ must do to fit in with ‘Us’. It’s talking about ‘Them’. ...Like... the Labour Party...their spokesman said...when asked about the Hijab, he said, “Well, they’ve got to fit in with Our ways!” You know? So what does it mean, then? What does*
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‘integration’ mean? Does it mean assimilation? Or what does it mean (7:9)?

Other migrant advocacy workers echo similar concerns regarding a ‘one-way’ process that ‘down-plays’ cultural difference for the sake of achieving ‘integration’:

*I know that quite often… I get the impression that… one group is meant to somehow integrate with the other… ideally, by becoming invisible* (laughs) (6:15).

*Depending on who’s using it [the word ‘integration’], they have very different interpretations of what it means. I think that the danger for some people is that it’s very much about a one-way street… about people [migrants] learning how to live the way the host community want them to live* (20:23).

The concerns regarding ‘one-way’, assimilationist constructions of ‘integration’ voiced by these migrant advocacy workers are echoed in recent critiques of Irish integration policy. For example, in their response to a report by the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), the National Economic and Social Council (NESC) (2006) in Ireland asserts that ‘integration’, as currently constructed by Irish policy-makers, focuses more on maintaining social cohesion and social order by requiring migrants to adapt to existing ‘Irish society’, rather than the government or Irish society adapting to the societal changes that arise from immigration and cultural diversity. Recent scholarly critiques similarly argue that current ‘integration strategy’ in Ireland is likely to mean that immigrants will be pressured to ‘choose’ to integrate into Irish society by assimilating to Irish national culture and social practices (Boucher 2008).

The expectation for assimilationist trajectories on the part of migrants is predicated upon an underlying assumption that ‘They’ are different to ‘Us’, or ‘Their’ ways are different to ‘Ours’ -- otherwise, the process of ‘integration’ would not be necessary. This construction of migrants as topologically and characteristically different to members of the ‘host society’ is the genesis of a myriad of associated stratifications that shape interactions between members of these groups. Of key interest, in view of the aims of this research, are the ways in which social interactions -- embedded, particularly, in service delivery targeted toward the ‘integration’ of migrant youth -- are shaped by imaginings of ‘Us’ and ‘Them’. The remainder of this chapter discussion specifically examines these ‘Us’/’Them’ constructions within the context of street-level youth service
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provision in order to interrogate their impact on service provider integration strategy and everyday practice. Included in this discussion is an examination of the problematic dilemma these service providers encounter when faced with the need/desire to recognise cultural difference amongst their young service users whilst simultaneously being influenced by broader societal and State calls for social cohesion and ‘integration’ that often, effectively, run counter to the recognition of those differences.

4.4 PRACTICAL ORIENTALISM: STREET-LEVEL CONSTRUCTIONS OF INTEGRATION AND MIGRANT YOUTH

Irish policy conceptualisations of ‘integration’ create clearly differentiated roles for individuals who are expected to integrate into the ‘host society’ versus those who are asked to facilitate (or ‘tolerate’) this process. These differentiated roles implicitly create power for the ‘host group’ to imagine the nation as ‘Ours’ (Hage 1998:79). The ‘Us’/’Them’ constructions that emerge within this imagined ‘Irish nation’ can be understood as ‘practical Orientalisms’ that are (re)produced and negotiated through everyday interactions between group members in such a way that they become, over time, ‘taken-for-granted’ (Anderson 1991; Haldrup et al. 2006:175). Through these banal processes, ‘They’ are essentialised and generalised, thereby creating new categories of familiarity so that the Other is no longer completely foreign (Said 1978). In this way, We come to ‘know’ what They are like; employing a myriad of stratifying binaries and stereotypes to reinforce notions of who They are and where They belong (Haldrup et al. 2006).

As imagined geographies emerge, the Other come to be viewed through newly created lenses which (re)construct and represent newcomers in ways that (re)produce stratifications between ‘Us’ and ‘Them’ (Haldrup et al. 2006). Said refers to these stratifications as ‘Othering’ and asserts that the process of creating them has influential material effects on those individuals and groups being represented. Everyday constructions of the ‘Other’ increasingly and persistently come to shape negotiations of encounters and relationships between members of different cultural groups in such a way that constructed binaries between ‘Us’ and ‘Them’ become internalised and begin to go unnoticed. Over a period of time, then, as ‘outsiders’ become sufficiently incorporated into newly imagined categories of existence, what is
‘known’ about ‘Them’ can begin to take on a stereotypical character. These stereotypes then contribute to the (re)production of Othering that colours future interactions between ‘Us’ and ‘Them’ in cycles that become more internalised and go more unnoticed with each iteration (Haldrup et al. 2006).

The internalised ‘Us’/’Them’ dichotomies highlighted in Orientalist theory emerge prevalently within the narratives of many of the service providers participating in this research. Table 4.1 provides examples of such binaries found embedded in language used by these service providers in their storyings of street-level integration work.

24 Though the research population assembled in this study contains individuals of both migrant and ‘Irish’ background, the individuals represented in Table 4.1 would all be classified as ‘White Irish’ in Ireland’s national census.
Table 4.1: Embedded Orientalist Binaries in Service Provider Constructions of Migrant Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Role</th>
<th>Service Provider Constructions of Migrant Youth &amp; ‘Non-Irish’ Cultures</th>
<th>Implied Binary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local youth club leader</td>
<td>Plenty of foreign people have come in and live in this area too (21:27).</td>
<td>Migrants are outsiders who are not members of the imagined homeland or nation of Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Name of neighbourhood] is kind of more sort of …settled people, Travellers, and then some non-Irish (21:39).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International youth organisation local project director</td>
<td>In [name of school], there would be more non-nationals (2:14).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant youth project director</td>
<td>Most of them [migrants] harbour a hope to return home (4:22).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International youth organisation local project director</td>
<td>From what I’ve seen, they [migrant families] have been pretty welcoming to embrace Irish culture (2:8).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school teachers</td>
<td>Polish and Africans and so on wouldn’t feel a very strong connection to struggling Irish history (17:29).</td>
<td>(I) ‘Irish’ culture -- which is singular and separate from ‘foreign’ culture(s) -- is inaccessible to ‘non-Irish’ people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the classroom, things are pretty OK, but it does depend on the language, and the competency of language and the willingness of the student to pick up English in the school. There’s one girl in particular in First Year that really has very little English that came from Poland. She’s not interacting with the group. Her religious belief system as well doesn’t help. So she really stands out (11:3).</td>
<td>(II) ‘Their’ languages and religions are important cultural markers that influence the capacity to ‘integrate’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Youth Project Director</td>
<td>It’s important for them to feel looked after (4:17).</td>
<td>‘Irish’ people are positioned as paternalistic carers for ‘Them’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[‘Irish’] people are interested in refugee and asylum-seeker issues. Irish people...do have a very strong sense of sort of…obligation to more vulnerable people (4:18).</td>
<td>(‘vulnerable’ asylum seekers and refugees).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The stratifications or differentiations highlighted in Table 4.1 serve to construct ‘non-Irish’ youth and/or their families and communities within new categories of existence that make them more ‘knowable’ but yet still ‘Other’ than ‘The Irish’. These stratifications serve another function as well. In view of the roles which these service providers perform in relation to migrant youth, there is an element of necessity involved in differentiating these young people from other youth under their care. If migrant youth are not characterised as somehow essentially different to other young people to whom services are being delivered, difficulty arises in highlighting a need for resourcing and other forms of support tailored specifically to them. In other words, in order to effectively advocate for migrant youth as a group undergoing specific challenges that require specialised attention, service providers strategically engage in producing a discourse in which the migrant dimension of their clients’ identity is emphasised.

As originally conceptualised by Gayatri Spivak (1987), “strategic essentialism” referred to the ways in which marginalised groups temporarily put aside differences in order to forge a collective sense of identity through which to band together in political movements. In a broader sense, then, strategic essentialism involves the temporary acceptance of an ‘essentialist’ position in order to garner beneficial results. In the context of this research, the practice appears to operate amongst workers delivering services to migrant youth. In collectively constructing young service users from a variety of backgrounds as ‘non-nationals’, ‘foreigners’, ‘new Irish’, etc., important cultural differences amongst them may (temporarily) be minimised, but in differentiating them, as a group, from ‘Irish youth’, needs that are common to most of the ‘non-Irish’ young people can be effectively highlighted. In this manner, then, service providers use the suppression of difference within a highly diverse ‘migrant’ population to apparent advantage in garnering support for their ‘integration care’.

Such discursive strategies -- aimed at securing resources for migrant youth -- are simultaneously positive and problematic. The production and acceptance of these discourses by service providers constructs migrant youth as a uniformly needy
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population. As highlighted previously, these constructions suppress important differences between individual migrants and migrant groups. Additionally, they can be critiqued as running counter to migrant advocacy viewpoints that call for vigilance in regard to the exclusionary effects of viewing migrants as characteristically different and separate from non-migrants. This is particularly the case when the language used is not strategic or conscious, but, rather, is engendered by less overt banal Orientalisms.

It bears mentioning in this discussion that Ireland has a much shorter history of significant in-migration -- and (still) has a much lower degree of demographic diversity -- when compared to other ‘receiving nations’ such as the US, the UK and Australia. Multicultural discourse in Ireland is, subsequently, underdeveloped in comparison to that in the aforementioned countries. Therefore, service provider respondents in this study were required to become reflexive (for academic purposes) regarding issues of ‘migrant need’ when posed questions by the interviewer which they may have only recently begun to entertain privately. Even in view of these realities, however, given their integration-related roles, these workers might still be expected to possess heightened awareness regarding the potentially problematic effects of racialised, minoritised or essentialised stereotypes than might a ‘person on the street’ in contemporary Ireland. Nevertheless, the everyday or banal Orientalisms embedded within the language used to describe these workers’ integration practice are notable and, presumably, influential. In order to elucidate this point, it is useful to exemplify interview passages from Respondent 4 contained in Table 4.1.

In her narrative, Respondent 4 exhibits internalised imaginings of the Other that construct ‘Them’ as a homogeneous and vulnerable group who, overwhelmingly, desire to ‘return home’ someday; but who are (for now) in need of paternalistic care by members of the ‘host society’. When imagined in this way, these migrants may never proceed closer to ‘integration’, but, rather, are likely to remain quite separate. In this separateness, they will, presumably, continue to experience distinctly different needs and desires from ‘host society’ youth, and these distinct needs will then, (re)produce their separateness. Respondent 4, then, in Gray’s (2006) vernacular, appears to subscribe to the notion of the “promise of integration”; a conceptualisation
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wherein migrants are constructed as potentially ‘un-integratable’. In other words, if most migrant youth (in this service provider’s imagining) are present within the Irish state as temporary residents -- desiring only to ‘return home’ -- the services and programming offered by her may be provided as simply ‘stop-gap’ measures to ensure that they are ‘cared for’ in the interim. In this envisaging, ‘integration’ becomes less likely to be a processual phenomenon leading to a state of equal participation whilst maintaining cultural identity than it is to be a paternalistically-oriented period of temporary ‘minding’. In view of the fact that this respondent delivers integration programming specifically and exclusively to migrant youth, these constructions are concerning.

Despite the potential for Respondent 4’s imagining of ‘integration’ to problematically (re)produce stratifications that effectively prevent the eventual attainment of it, her conceptualisations do allow for the creation of ‘caring spaces of integration’ wherein ‘host society’ members’ act on their sense of pastoralism and paternalism in ways that can facilitate well-being. In her narrative, this service provider stresses her belief that:

If they [migrant youth] feel integrated, I think that goes a long way to becoming [sic]... people who don’t feel hard-done-by...who don’t sort of feel disillusioned by Irish life. ...That’s why it’s important for them to feel looked after, I suppose’ (4:17).

In this discussion, the respondent equates ‘integration’ with the ability to see oneself as ‘cared for’. Moving on from that conceptualisation, it can be implied that this youth worker would likely endeavour, in her work, to facilitate the creation of spaces wherein this sort of care can occur.

Despite potentially beneficial facilitations of migrant well-being through the creation of spaces wherein caring behaviour is possible, the ‘homeland-making’ phraseology used by respondents quoted in Table 4.1, nevertheless, constructs migrants as distinctly ‘Other’ with respect to ‘caring hosts’ and clearly positions them within the Irish state as ‘outsiders’. Haldrup et al. (2006) assert that the use of this type of phraseology occurs when ‘host group’ members attempt to accommodate the presence of new groups in their midst whose culture is unfamiliar and, therefore, potentially disquieting. By using phrases like ‘foreign people have come in’ and ‘most of them
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*harbour a hope to return home*, respondents designate in their minds boundaries around familiar spaces that are ‘Ours’ and clearly identify those from outside these boundaries. This reminds ‘Us’ who ‘They’ are and (re)produces nationhood and national identity through the use of language so ‘everyday’ that it often escapes attention (*ibid*).

Banal reproductions of the ‘homeland’ and national identity that occur *vis-à-vis* the use of hegemonic grammar, (such as that exemplified in Table 4.1), translate Orientalist discourse into the habitual experience of the ‘everyday’ (*Haldrup et al.* 2006). Within an imagined nation, the Other are made ‘knowable’ by imposing patterned representations on them that, over time, become highly generalised and also taken-for-granted. In the context of this research, social changes effected by recent in-flows of migrants to Ireland significantly disrupted the ‘everyday’. In the wake of these societal shifts, migrants have often come to be essentialised and generalised, through the employment of banal Orientalisms, to the point of becoming stereotyped. These stereotypes may be quite negative in tone, as the presence of the ‘Other’ is often portrayed in policy, the media and public debate as threatening or disruptive (*Haldrup and Koefoed* 2009). Even in cases where stereotypical generalisations about individuals within a particular ethno-cultural group are not overwhelmingly negative, they still serve to essentialise, racialise or otherwise depersonalise the people being represented. Table 4.2 highlights examples of such stereotypes embedded in service provider narratives.
Table 4.2: Ethno-cultural stereotypes embedded in respondent narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Role</th>
<th>Respondent Statement</th>
<th>Ethno-Cultural Stereotype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school teacher</td>
<td>‘You’re trying to help the [migrant] children to learn, but it’s difficult when the other twenty [“Irish”] children in the class are bored, and you’re trying to help [migrant] students, that are weaker students, with a language barrier.’ (12:35)</td>
<td>Students experiencing English language proficiency challenges are ‘weaker students’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant youth project director</td>
<td>‘I see them [migrant youth] being very determined. These young people are very resilient. They seek out help. They’re resourceful.’ (4:16)</td>
<td>Migrant youth doggedly seek out needed help because they are resourceful. If they do not receive the help they need, they are likely resilient enough to get on anyway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school teacher</td>
<td>‘Discipline is good among international students because they’re very focused. They want to learn.’ (17:23)</td>
<td>Migrant students are ‘good’ students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-migrant organisation director</td>
<td>‘The Brazilian and Polish communities didn’t really make any big attempt to improve their [English] language. ...A lot of the Polish immigrants were just purely focussed on earning money.’ (3:12)</td>
<td>(I) Brazilian and Polish people do not wish to learn/speak English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(II) Polish migrants are economically motivated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through the (re)production of stereotypes like those highlighted in Table 4.2, service providers de-individualise particular young people with whom they interact and position them as members of essentialised groups about whom We ‘know’ certain things. The narrative of one respondent in this research, a secondary school teacher, particularly exemplifies the way in which what is ‘known’ by members of the ‘host society’ about an array of ethno-cultural groups newly present in Ireland can become ‘catalogued’ -- in a banal fashion -- within a typology of expected, essentialised traits or behaviours. It should be noted that this respondent’s constructions of migrant ...
students have emerged in the absence of access to background/census information regarding student ethno-cultural background, family status/structure or socio-economic status.

Table 4.3: Ethno-cultural stereotypes embedded in a teacher respondent narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Role</th>
<th>Respondent Statement With Embedded Stereotype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Secondary school teacher | *I would have huge issues around the mental health of the Eastern Europeans coming into the country...particularly Polish...Ukraine...You can tell that they come from poverty...that they’re trying to get on, and there are a lot of issues (11:9).*  
Middle Eastern children...particularly India and Pakistan...would be absolutely aghast at the way teachers are treated over here. *They have a huge problem with that. And they lose respect for the teachers very, very quickly. ...And there’s an awful lot of anger then, that kind of bubbles up in a classroom. You know, because...they [Middle Eastern students] are actually very angry (11:14).*  
An awful lot of our students...particularly Pakistan and India...would be from very wealthy backgrounds (11:32).  
A lot of these [asylum-seeking] students are good students...they behave. Why do they behave? Because they don’t want to get in trouble. *They don’t want to get kicked out of the country. There’s always this fear. But yet, inside them, you have a bubbling mess (11:36).* |

Through the (re)production of stereotypes like those highlighted in Table 4.3, members of ‘Other’ groups become more knowable or predictable. Further -- and more importantly, in the context of this research -- if service providers can identify who ‘They’ are and what ‘They’ are like, ‘Their’ needs can also be imagined in essentialised ways that can (conceivably) allow for a typologising of service provider approach to the delivery of ‘integration’ services. For example, a service provider who ‘knows’ that asylum-seeking youth are ‘conflicted’ and ‘fearful’ may determine that paternalistically caring practice represents the best path toward facilitating their ‘integration’. This plan of action may be quite different to one which the same
service provider determines to be ‘good practice’ for the integration of a ‘resourceful and resilient’ Polish or Chinese child.

In her work focusing on street-level integration in Norway, Hagelund (2009) illuminates similar service provider tendencies to develop what she terms “response repertoires” when faced with workplace challenges encountered whilst engaging with a diverse client base, (i.e., “diversity dilemmas”). Hagelund (ibid:83-84) finds that when enmeshed in the business of ‘getting things done’, street-level workers attempt to streamline and simplify their work by resorting to material practices that allow for both the construction of the problematic situation and a strategy for resolving it. Service provider respondents in this research similarly discuss their integration work strategies within a loosely typologised frame. These strategies are elaborated in more detail in Chapter 6 of this dissertation. For the purposes of this chapter discussion, it simply bears noting that some of the typologised ‘diversity responses’ to which respondents allude appear to be based upon stereotypified perceptions by these workers of the needs and characteristics of particular groups of migrant youth.

4.4.1 INTERNAL ORIENTALISMS AND RACISM
The previous discussion highlights the potential for stereotyped ethno-cultural ‘knowledge’ of young service users to become incorporated into everyday street-level integration practice in banal ways that, over time, begin to go unnoticed. Through this process, ‘internal Orientalisms’ -- and the stereotypes they engender -- harbour the potential to minimise potentially damaging influences on migrant youth within the service provision setting. For example, based upon service provider beliefs in a stereotypified ‘resilience’ or a (collective) migrant youth capacity to deal with challenging circumstances, the material effects of bullying, discrimination and racism on individuals may be minimised or ignored. Several service provider respondents working for migrant advocacy organisations express concern over this possibility. These workers highlight a need for all service providers to be vigilant regarding racist and discriminatory behaviours occurring within their youth work settings, and caution against an assumption that migrant youth are able to ‘cope’ if/when these incidents arise.
Indeed, examples of such minimisation emerge within respondent narratives in this research. One local youth programme director assesses the impact of racism on his programme participants:

Many of the [migrant] kids that I’ve met... they seem very well-adjusted and well able to deal with any racism that they do come across. ...The young people that maybe have been targeted with racism don’t seem, from what I can tell, to take it to heart (2:17).

A respondent, who conducts anti-racism training sessions as part of her work, discusses her concerns regarding this sort of ‘down-playing’ of racism’s impacts. She believes that, particularly in the case of migrant youth, such minimisations have the capacity to silence individuals who may be fearful of political or social repercussions if they report racism to which they are subjected:

There’s a huge pressure on people who experience racism not to say that they’re experiencing racism...to minimise it. Because, I think, the risk is that if they speak up about it, then there’s this, “Well, if you don’t like it here, you can go back to where you came from.” And the potential for rejection...and sometimes very aggressive kind of rejection...is very likely. So, I find that, quite often, there is a nervousness about talking and also a reticence to name what actually happens. ...There is a real reluctance to look at racism, as opposed to ‘culture’ and ‘diversity’. So there’s kind of... ‘Well, we’re all different and we’re all special.’, but not to look at the ways in which some of our differences can really mean that [ethnic minority /migrant] people are subjected to quite hideous discrimination, for example. ...That seems to be a real taboo...looking at racism (6:19).

Several other respondents similarly assert that racism is often ignored or denied in Ireland:

Very few people would be willing to talk about it [racism], and everyone says, “I’m not racist. I’m not racist.”, but it is there (10:17).

We’re in denial here in Ireland about racism, I think. We like to pretend that it doesn’t exist (4:12).

Indeed, as these respondents suggest, many service providers participating in this research, as well as several individuals participating in events attended for observation purposes, exemplify this notable reticence to acknowledge or direct attention toward
racism and/or racialised stereotypes. Several youth service provider attendees at a stakeholder meeting focusing on a proto-type ‘integration toolkit’\textsuperscript{25} assert that use of the word ‘racism’, and/or direct discussions of it, in the toolkit should be ‘diluted’ so as not to ‘put negative ideas in people’s minds’ and to ‘put a more positive spin on things’. As predicted by Respondent 6, a similar reluctance to acknowledge and discuss racism and its effects is also observable on the part of some service provider respondents who are of ethnic minority/migrant background:

\begin{quote}
Racism does exist, of course, but I haven’t experienced it myself
(19:15).
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
[There are] true stories that he [the respondent’s son] brings home and things that he comments about the other kids in school. There are difficulties ...I wouldn’t say racist, but...
(13:37).
\end{quote}

In the interest of avoiding considerations of the potential impacts of racism on young service users, several service providers in this research seemingly seek to reassure themselves (and the interviewer) by reporting that palpable racial tension or racist incidents do not occur within their service provision settings. This racism-free -- or ‘racism-light’ -- atmosphere is described by a youth work project leader who asserts that he does not, ‘see a whole pile of direct racism’ (21:63) in the community in which his group operates. A secondary school teacher similarly states that she has not, ‘heard of any kind of bullying or discrimination issues [in her school]’ (12:36). A secondary school teacher working in a different school similarly reports an absence of racism:

\begin{quote}
Racism is not a problem. Once ['Irish'] students see that you [a migrant student] are basically like them...that you want to get involved in a sport, or you’re good fun or whatever, or you’re fun to be around...they couldn’t care if you’re luminous green or from Pluto. You know, realistically, that’s the experience I’ve had. ... I’ve yet to hear anyone say that they had any problems out there. I haven’t heard of any discrimination, to be honest (17:4).
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{25} This meeting, held in October 2009 in Dublin, was hosted by The Integration Centre (formerly, Integrating Ireland) in order to receive feedback from stakeholders across various sectors regarding their, soon-to-be-launched ‘Integration Toolkit’. I was invited to attend this meeting, (representing the education/research sector), based on my professional acquaintance with several local employees of The Integration Centre.
Despite these service provider assertions that racist incidents have not been brought to their attention within their respective youth service venues, research reveals there may still be reason for concern. Wide-ranging empirical evidence demonstrates that a reliance on self-reporting of racist incidents is problematic (Poynting and Noble 2004; Paradies 2006; Pilgrim and Scourfield 2007; Law 2008; Monks et al. 2008). Specifically in an Irish education context, research conducted by the ESRI (Smyth et al. 2009) concludes that many incidents of bullying and racially related harassment may not be reported to school staff. Other researchers similarly highlight that only a minority of students in Irish schools ever report being bullied to an adult, and that a greater proportion of ‘newcomer’ students than Irish students have experienced bullying (Smyth et al. 2004; Molcho et al. 2008). In view of the fact that only 56% of Irish second-level school anti-bullying policies currently in place explicitly address racial harassment, this level of under-reporting takes on even more significance (Smyth et al. 2009:92). Overall, then, it can be assumed that much of the racism present in local youth service arenas is likely going unreported or under-reported. Additionally, service providers, themselves, are often reluctant to name and acknowledge racism. In view of the aims of this research, it is important to consider the implications of these trends for service provider delivery of integration programming/services to migrant young people as well as to ‘Irish’ youth. These implications are discussed in Chapter 6 which elaborates street-level integration practice in Galway City.

4.5 CHAPTER CONCLUSIONS
This chapter discussion has addressed one dimension of the street-level “conditions of work” under which service providers in Galway City ‘do integration’. In elaborating the ways in which service providers imagine ‘integration’ and construct ‘diversity dilemmas’ that arise within the delivery of it to local youth, an important facet of these working conditions is illuminated. A second critical dimension to street-level “conditions of work” is addressed in Chapter 5 -- that is, resourcing structures within

26 Up-to-date data on the number of racist incidents in Ireland is not currently available. Since the dissolution of the NCCRI in 2008 there is no agency officially charged with monitoring the number and nature of racist incidents within the country. The Irish Human Rights Council (IHRC) has called for the remediation of this deficiency and recommend that another independent state agency be entrusted with the renewed gathering of such information (IHRC 2011:3).
the youth integration services sector. The resourcing *tableau* has wide-ranging implications in regard to the capacities of service providers to develop and implement everyday integration practice. Thus, in view of the objectives of this research, an examination of resourcing is essential to an investigation interrogating the operationalisation and delivery of integration at the street level. Taken together, then, Chapters 4 and 5 illuminate the setting within which everyday integration practice is emerging in Galway City. Chapter 6 elaborates this practice.
Chapter 5: Resourcing Street-Level Youth Services
5.1 INTRODUCTION

In order to further engage with an examination of youth integration service delivery in Galway City, it is necessary to consider the issue of resourcing as a significant informant of the “conditions of work” (Lipsky 2010) under which service providers operate. In tandem with service providers’ conceptual imaginings of ‘integration’, available resources (or the lack thereof) are central in shaping the ways in which these workers operationalise this complex phenomenon at the street level. In view of this key role, the resourcing milieu within which service providers operate locally is illuminated in this chapter through further use of the framework developed by Michael Lipsky (2010) in his seminal work on street-level bureaucracy. Within his theorisations of street-level processes, Lipsky highlights the vital importance of resourcing as a particularly key factor in shaping the “conditions of work”; stating that street-level bureaucracies characteristically possess fewer resources than necessary for workers to adequately do their jobs (2010:29). These resource deficits are not only of a financial nature, but are also, according to Lipsky (ibid:31-33) notable in other resourcing categories like time, staffing and personal resources. Guided by Lipsky’s examinations of these characteristic street-level resourcing challenges, this chapter will focus on the multidimensional resourcing conditions that service provider respondents in this research perceive to be informing their local youth integration work.

Though Lipsky’s (2010) theorisations focus largely on workers engaged in state-mandated services such as law enforcement, education and social welfare provision, his discussions of resourcing as a critical force in public/human service work at the local level are germane to investigations into the work of a broader range of workers. It is important to consider that Lipsky’s original treatise pre-dates widespread neo-liberal restructurings of health, welfare and service provision in many Western countries (Cloke et al. 2005; Milligan and Fyfe 2005; Edwards and Woods 2006; Crack et al. 2007; Kelly 2007; Carey et al. 2009). As a result of these shifts, the ‘third sector’ (composed of voluntary and community agencies) has increasingly come to participate in a relationship with states that recognise voluntary organisations’ capacity to provide services and support to marginalised and disadvantaged segments of the population that governments find difficult to engage (Lyons 2001). This ‘moving frontier’ of service provision (Finlayson 1994; Kears
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and Joseph 1997; Mohan 2003) has spawned an emerging body of literature that interrogates the ways in which these structural changes impact service users. However, work that examines the ways in which restructurings of service provision affect the individuals providing services (particularly outside of medical health care) lags behind. Focussing on this gap in the literature, Lipsky’s theoretical framework takes on heightened relevance for examinations of this under-investigated group of workers.

As a result of changes in the mechanisms for delivery of health and social policy objectives, research illuminating these shifts and the voluntary sector which they increasingly engage has emerged as part of broader social inclusion discourses in countries such as the UK and Australia (Kelly 2007). Within that research, a focus on resourcing as a critical dimension of this increasingly localised service provision has developed. For example, Milligan (2001) identifies a strong connection between resourcing and the establishment of conditions of work in the voluntary sector. Milligan (ibid:114) finds that, “the ability of voluntary organisations to act, and constraints to action, are in large part linked to the resources they are able to command, and the source and mechanisms through which these resources are accessed.” Similarly, Duff (2011:154) asserts that the therapeutic utility of sites in which health and welfare service provision -- including social spaces where caring interactions or an orientation towards caring -- takes place is mediated by the specific material resources available therein. In fact, Duff (ibid) elaborates a, “clear and established link between the proximity to material resources and the experience of health, well-being and development.” Research findings, then, directly tie the ability of third sector organisations to effectively provide caring services to issues of resourcing.

This research is situated at a conceptual and empirical nexus between Lipsky’s street-level investigations of public welfare service provision (including education) and examinations of more broadly imagined caring service provision within ‘third sector’ and other local agencies. Most respondents participating in this research are not, in fact, engaged in the delivery of public safety services or formalised state social welfare services with which Lipsky’s investigations are concerned. However,
findings emerging from academic research focussing on other forms of (increasingly restructured) caring service provision suggest an appropriateness and usefulness in employing Lipsky’s street-level bureaucracy framework for the further illumination of these sectors of service provision. Specifically, in contextualising the local resourcing conditions that inform the work of individuals engaged in these increasingly community-based forms of service provision, Lipsky’s framework is highly relevant. In light of the objectives of this research, a focus on (both public and voluntary) service provider perceptions of resourcing as a significant constraint is critical in that these perceptions shape many of the strategies for ‘doing integration’ chosen (or not) by these service providers. Therefore, resourcing conditions constitute a key dimension in this examination of service provider imaginings of the capacity to ‘provide integration’ to local youth.

5.2 THE EMERGENCE OF THE RESOURCING THEME

Across respondents in this research, discussions of resources and their vital importance dominate the service provision narrative. All of the respondents interviewed voice concern over scarce financial resources as well as limitations on other types of resources such as time, space, information, English language support and staffing. In fact, ‘Resourcing’ ranks second (in terms of the amount of respondent discussion devoted to it) amongst all the themes emerging from interview data in this study; out-ranked only by the theme of ‘Integration Strategies’. It bears mentioning that, when comparing prevalence regarding these two ‘top-ranked’ themes, the theme of ‘Integration Strategies’ likely overtakes the ‘Resourcing’ theme purely by virtue of the fact that interviewer questions regarding integration strategies were the primary focus of each interview and, thus, inevitably shaped the patterns and content of interviewee responses. In contrast, discussions of resourcing were nearly always initiated by respondents. These remarks precipitated interviewer ‘follow-up’

---

27 These strategies are identified and discussed in detail in Chapter 6.
28 The propensity for questioning in qualitative research studies to reflect the interests and biases of the researcher should not be interpreted as a weakness of the approach. Rather, it is a reflection of the fact that a quest for objectivity within any research is elusive (Milligan 2001:105). The bias introduced from unsolicited questioning of the interviewer is unavoidable, but such questioning allows the researcher to interpret responses -- filtered through her/his own experiences -- in such a way that knowledge is generated by both researcher and respondent in the interview process. This does not curtail the purpose of the research (ibid). It is in the interest of this acknowledgement that the impact of this researcher’s influence (vis-à-vis questioning designed to interrogate local integration strategies) upon the relative ‘weights’ of the top two themes emerging in this research is mentioned here.
questions to elicit further respondent discussion of the issue. Therefore, within the thematic analysis deployed in this research, ‘Resourcing’ can be arguably viewed as (at least) equal to -- and, perhaps, surpassing -- ‘Integration Strategies’ in terms of importance in informing an overall ‘thematic picture’ of street-level integration service provision.

Before embarking on the presentation and analysis of respondent data centring on issues of resourcing, it is necessary to point out that interviewee responses to questions focussing on this broad thematic area do not always address constraints introduced by resourcing deficits within the context of integration-specific youth programming. However, discussions by respondents of resourcing impediments to more ‘mainstream’ youth service delivery are, nonetheless, relevant to the aims of this research. As service providers imagine resource shortages to engender limitations on their capacity to provide ‘mainstream’ youth services, they simultaneously construct limitations on their capacity to target these services toward specific initiatives and goals, (e.g., integration). Therefore, the importance which respondents assign to resourcing challenges within (sometimes more general) youth service provision contexts directly translates to impacts upon their perceptions of street-level capacity to ‘deliver integration’.

5.2.1 RESOURCING AND STREET-LEVEL ‘CONDITIONS OF WORK’
When discussing their capacity and strategic range to ‘do integration’ at the street level, service provider respondents repeatedly cite scarce resources as a limiting factor that significantly informs the conditions of their work. These local service provider perceptions regarding resourcing are in line with Lipsky’s (2010:33) assertion that street-level workers chronically experience resource constraints and that their agencies are virtually never adequately provided for. Lipsky’s theorisations regarding resourcing deficits at the street level are also supported by the findings of Furlong et al. (1997:69) in their study of youth work with young people in Scotland. These researchers determine that resourcing, indeed, causes concern for individuals and agencies attempting to effectively deliver local services to youth. They find that, “resourcing affects all dimensions of service provision, influencing the scale of
operation, the methods of working, duration of provision and the opportunities for staff training (ibid).”

It is reasonable, then, that service providers working with youth at the street level in Galway City must be highly attentive to issues of resource availability, acquisition and allocation. In fact, Lipsky asserts that resource limitations are so influential on the day-to-day working conditions under which local service providers practice that these individuals must, “organise their work to derive solutions to the resource constraints they encounter (Lipsky 2010:83).” In the context of this research, given the significant capacity for resourcing to direct service provider decision-making and strategy, an elaboration of the ways in which youth service providers in Galway City view resourcing challenges as an influence on their work is critical. More specifically, a focus on the impact of these resourcing challenges on the everyday operationalisation of integration (within a broader local youth service context) is necessary for broader understandings of this street-level process.

When examining resourcing as a significant influence on street-level service provision capacity, all types of resources are ultimately reducible to the cost of financing them. However, resourcing is discussed by service provider respondents in this research as a complex array that goes beyond cash availability. Indeed, local service provider discourse clearly highlights several distinct categories of resourcing including: financial resources; human and time resources; space resources; information resources; and English-language support resources. The impacts of shortfalls within these various resourcing categories, in significant part, inform the nature, scope and durability of ‘spaces of integration’ that are created within local youth service settings. An illumination of such impacts is, therefore, critical to the interrogation of the research questions herein.

The remaining chapter discussion will elaborate relationships between resourcing deficits and the capacity to ‘do integration’ at the street level (as identified by service provider respondents). It bears noting that, certainly, the various resource types identified by interviewees do not exist or operate discretely at the street level. Rather, taken together, deficits across various resource categories engender a host of complex
effects within the context of youth service delivery. However, organisationally, the following discussion is framed in a typological format that adheres to similar discursive patterns within respondent narratives.

5.3 FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Within broad discussions of resourcing, as mentioned previously, service providers differentiate between various resourcing categories. Despite the importance assigned to resourcing across all of these categories, respondents in this research unanimously and vociferously identify cash funding as a necessary concern for every agency attempting to provide services of any sort. Therefore, this discussion of resourcing challenges within youth service provision begins with a focus on these ever-important cash resources and the ways in which they contribute to shaping street-level “conditions of work” (Lipsky 2010). In view of the research questions being interrogated herein, these working conditions are examined with particular respect to their influence on the (re)production of ‘spaces of integration’ as they exist within loosely constructed therapeutic networks of care.

In light of the recessionary times during which the fieldwork for this research was conducted (late 2008- early 2010), it is not surprising that financial resources emerge as a particularly key sub-theme within service provider narratives. Almost all organisations from the national to the local are currently grappling with budgetary cut-backs that dramatically affect their operational ‘bottom line’. Youth service agencies and programmes are not immune to this trend in funding decreases. As one service provider articulates, ‘funding…that’s a common cry if you ask anyone’ (21:130). Internationally, research focussing on youth projects highlights similar trends in funding shortages across many other countries (Furlong et al. 1997; Hartmann 2001; Eakin and Richmond 2004; Matthews 2006; Sundius 2007). Few youth projects are being funded indefinitely during the widespread economic downturn, so the majority of agencies charged with implementing long-term, policy-driven youth initiatives -- like developing ‘spaces/networks of integration’ -- are dependent upon short-term funding. This produces incongruence between broad programme goals and the ‘real-world’ capacity to achieve them (Crimmens et al. 2004:52).
Though respondents in this research identify funding dilemmas paralleling those in the international experience, they articulate the necessity for their own sustained funding in locally contextualised ways. Further, the ways in which local service providers perceive current funding deficits to hinder their everyday youth integration work is experience-specific. Subsequently, the following discussion of financial resources as an influential resourcing category within street-level youth work highlights the locally complex ways in which funding constraints affect the development of ‘spaces of integration care’ for local youth. Within this discussion, several distinct threads emerging from respondent narratives are identified. These interviewee-identified sub-themes focus on the ways in which financial shortfalls impact, (1) service provider capacity to deliver services and programming that have the potential to enhance migrant integration, (2) the sustainability of youth service programmes/services, and (3) service provider autonomy and discretion in financial decision-making.

**5.3.1 FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND THE CAPACITY TO PROVIDE YOUTH INTEGRATION SERVICES**

The specific issue evolving from a seemingly universal lack of funding that is most commonly highlighted by respondents in this research is a correlated lack of ability to provide the services that their respective programmes/agencies are charged with delivering. More specifically, in regard to the questions at issue in this research, there is concern amongst many service providers over lack of funding to provide youth services with enough depth and scope to accommodate the pursuit of integration initiatives with local youth. As one service provider summarises, ‘*Funding is not always there to support the work we’re doing*’ (14:3). Other respondents echo this general assessment of funding for local youth services:

*There is lack of funding. ...It’s very easy to write all these great ideas down on a piece of paper. But, somebody has to take [financial] responsibility for actually implementing them* (9:5).

*I don’t have the resources. There’s just not the money* (25:17).

These workers, as well as many other respondents in this research, follow such global statements with discussion regarding the myriad of ways in which these financial
shortfalls add decided complexity to the pursuit of youth service goals -- both integration-specific and non-integration-specific -- at the street level.

Indeed, deficits in financial resources available to both ‘mainstream’ and integration-oriented youth service programmes have critical implications for the achievement of nationally-stated integration objectives. Though this relationship may be more obvious in the case of integration-oriented programmes, embedded within many ‘mainstream’ youth programmes and services are elements of integration initiatives (prescribed by the State) that also suffer as a result of funding shortfalls. As discussed in Section 5.1, the bulk of responsibility for the implementation of national-level integration directives -- like many other initiatives relating to public health and welfare -- has, over time, devolved to a broad range of agencies within the voluntary and community sectors. However, the resources necessary to support these agencies in their integration efforts have not adequately followed suit.

Service provider respondents in this research reflect on this disconnect between policy-driven integration initiatives and the funding streams with which to implement them at the street level. A secondary school teacher highlights this dilemma within local schools:

On the one hand, they [the State] are saying, “This [policy initiative] should be done.” But on the other hand, they’re taking away the resources to be able to implement it (11:57).

Another service provider working in a migrant advocacy role speaks of similar inconsistencies between local funding streams and national-level policy mandates and agendas. She states that the Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration wants local youth service agencies to implement integration initiatives, but that this department ‘has no funds, so it’s hard to do anything’ (13:46). A respondent working in development and anti-racism education similarly highlights a lack of financial support for implementing national-level integration initiatives as she observes that, ‘intercultural guidelines for schools were introduced, [but] there was no funding line for publishing the results.’ In her view, then, the initiative ‘was commissioned and funded, and then NOT funded’ (6:10). Another service provider describes similar difficulties in securing funding for integration programming within his agency that works with asylum-seeker youth:
It is very difficult to get integration funds to work with asylum-seekers, because they [the Irish government] will say that they [asylum-seekers] haven’t been allowed to stay in the country, so there’s no need assisting them to integrate into Irish society (8:4).

This lack of funding for integration work with asylum-seekers, specifically, is of particular significance when integration is imagined as a ‘caring’ service or process. Despite national ‘integration’ policy’s failure to address this vulnerable population, surely, no group could be characterised as more ‘needy’. Asylum-seekers in Ireland are housed in meagre hostel accommodation whilst being forbidden to seek employment in the country; access entitlements extended to EU residents; or otherwise embark upon attempts to weave themselves into the social fabric of nation (Irish Refugee Council 2011). In this regard, the State-mandated settings in which these individuals live can arguably be regarded as the antithesis to ‘spaces of care’. Indeed, within these spaces, asylum-seekers become more and more institutionalised, marginalised and de-skilled with every year that passes whilst awaiting a decision regarding their asylum applications. In the case of unaccompanied minors -- with whom several respondents in this research work -- these institutional spaces are even more fraught; as these extremely vulnerable young people are housed with adults (previously unknown to them) from an array of national/cultural backgrounds and experiences (ibid). Local service providers attempting to mitigate these highly problematic circumstances are consistently unable to secure adequate funding and other resources that would allow for the ‘integration care’ of these ‘needy’ young people. Instead, they are left largely uncared for -- when care is imagined to extend beyond the bounds of basic physical necessity provision -- until such time (or if) their asylum applications are approved.

Though service providers working with asylum-seeking youth often articulate the effects of funding shortfalls in most dire ways, respondents representing agencies spanning all sectors of youth service provision provide examples of scenarios in which funding deficits impinge upon their everyday integration work with youth. Amongst these narratives, the sector of youth service provision that appears -- in

29 There are documented cases in Ireland wherein asylum decisions have taken up to seven years to be adjudicated. The film Seaview (that premiered in the Berlin Film Festival in February, 2008) highlights this protracted process.
terms of frequency and volume of discussion in respondent narratives -- to be hardest hit by national integration funding decisions is education. This may be largely attributable to the fact that schools are (in the Irish case) funded (to varying degrees) by the State, whereas other types of youth service agencies are often subsidised by multiple strands of funding. Therefore, cutbacks in State funding will likely be felt first -- and most severely -- by schools (when compared to other youth service agencies). Bearing this likelihood in mind, it is, nevertheless, prudent to direct discussion to a theme raised prominently by a particular group within the respondent population. When contextualised by existing funding realities, this discursive trend sharply illuminates the impacts of funding shortfalls in a specific youth integration arena. Further, given the amount of time that young people spend in school (as opposed to the time they spend in other youth service venues), schools may, arguably, constitute the integration arena most likely to have influence in young people’s lives. Therefore, funding shortfalls that impact disproportionately on this specific youth service sector are of significant interest in view of the research aims herein.

There is, indeed, widespread recognition amongst respondents participating in this research that, in an era of recent (and continuing) State budget cutbacks, schools are struggling to deliver basic educational services and curricula; leaving integration-specific programming and related support services even more woefully under-funded. The detrimental effects of these funding cutbacks on integration programming within schools are observable even to service providers working outside the education sector. A respondent working in a migrant advocacy role discusses the ramifications of decreased funding in terms of schools’ capacity to provide integration programming to the young people with whom she works:

*Some of the schools do make efforts [toward integration programming]. ...Given the restraints of their funding, they probably do make some efforts, but... it’s not enough, and they know that themselves. But they’re restricted by their funding too, which has become much more restricted now (4:20).*

A secondary teacher respondent corroborates this assessment of the relationship between decreased state funding for schools and a diminished capacity to ‘provide integration’. However, this respondent progresses his analysis to discuss specific impacts of this situation on particular groups within the school:
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There are no resources. None. ...There are obviously huge resources for members of the Travelling Community, people with disabilities, and so on. [But] the fact that you may be coming from a war zone, the fact that you may be coming from an economically deprived situation, the fact that you were traumatized by being uprooted from your stable home in the middle of Poland and coming to Ireland, is not taken into account. No funding, no counselling, nothing. No guidance whatsoever. No initiative (17:21).

Local teachers similarly voices concerns regarding the effects that State funding cutbacks have on her ability to facilitate the integration of particular students:

It’s all down the road of academia now. ...The funds that are left are for...you sit in the classroom and sit down, shut up, learn, and go out and regurgitate. And I think it says an awful lot about the view of our government and the way that they see education.... It doesn’t matter where you’re from, or what ethnic background you’re from, or who you are. “Just go in there, shut up, sit down.” (11:51).

Funding for small things... Obviously there is just a lack of resources. ...I look for funding for trips...like even simple things like a walking tour of Galway...just money to be able to pay a speaker a hundred euro to walk international students around or just show them what Irish life is about. ...But we don’t have any! ...Zero! (17:29).

These respondent observations illustrate that cutbacks in State funding for integration-related programming and the monitoring of integration efforts disproportionately affect -- not only schools in general (when compared to other youth service venues) -- but particular student populations within those schools. In parallel to previous discussion in the context of asylum hostels, this trend constitutes a way in which schools, then, similarly have the potential to become spaces of ‘care-less-ness’ for migrant youth. As broadly constructed in State policy -- and in education policy specifically -- these ‘needy’ young people are meant to be provided with inclusive spaces in which their integration can be facilitated by ‘host’ carers. However, schools appear to be resembling such ‘spaces of integration care’ less and less with each passing budget. This trend runs counter to State stipulations within the pre-eminent education policy

30 This is, clearly, a controversial and controvertible statement. It is, however, included in this chapter discussion in order to demonstrate that service providers perceive a ‘hierarchy of need’ to exist in the minds of policy-makers that dictates, to some degree, funding decisions in regard to migrant integration. It is outside the scope of this research to interrogate social inclusion -- and attendant funding decisions -- from a broader view that would include other marginalised groups such as Travellers and the differently-abled.
piece regarding integration to emerge in recent years. *The Intercultural Education Strategy, 2010-2015* (Department of Education and Skills 2010:2) mandates that all education providers be, “assisted with ensuring that inclusion and integration within an intercultural learning environment become the norm.” When “intercultural learning environment(s)” are imagined as ‘spaces of care’ wherein ‘needy’ migrant youth can be approached and engaged by carers, (i.e., teachers) for the purposes of enhancing their integration, current funding trends can be viewed as a threat to the capacity for their development within schools.

In addition to the provision of “intercultural learning environments” in schools, *The Intercultural Education Strategy* specifies other more specific integration-oriented actions as well. These actions are identified by respondents in this research as similarly under threat in local schools by the State ‘funding axe’. The *Strategy* states that actions designed to achieve intercultural education outcomes are to be monitored over the five-year duration covered by the document (*ibid*:55). This sort of monitoring clearly requires financial backing for additional staff hours; training; etc. …backing that is becoming less and less available. Indeed, teacher respondents highlight ways in which the capacity to monitor integration ‘progress’ within their specific classrooms is already being curtailed by funding shortfalls:

*The nature of secondary school is that children come into a class, you have them for 40 minutes, and then they leave. It’s very hard to see how they’re interacting, seeing as the money is gone for trips. These class trips [are] a real indication of who’s fitting in and who’s not. That’s all gone now. To me, they were exceptionally important. You learned an awful lot about how they dress, the way they behave, the language they used, who they hang out with…A wealth of information came back from trips like that. …All that’s gone (11:50).*

If this sort of informal monitoring is already suffering, or being eliminated, by education cutbacks, the capacity for the more formalised type of system-wide monitoring stipulated in *The Intercultural Education Strategy* appears dubious.

When viewed through the conceptual frame underpinning this research, State failures to financially support the monitoring and evaluation of ‘spaces of integration care’ are significant. Research regarding spaces of care across a variety of service provision sectors often finds these spaces to be fragile, ephemeral and transitory (Conradson 2003;
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Johnsen et al. 2005; Cloke et al. 2005). Indeed, caring spaces can ‘fracture’ for a multitude of reasons relating to both human and environmental influences (Mee 2009), and they can cease to exist if the site(s) or human interaction(s) necessary for their reproduction are intermittently available -- or no longer available at all (Conradson 2003; Johnsen et al. 2005; Cloke et al. 2005). Johnsen et al. (2005) particularly cite incohesive or inconsistently available funding streams -- such as those currently financing Irish education -- as one influence specifically found to affect the stability of caring spaces.

In addition to overt impacts upon spaces of care wrought by inadequate funding schemes, recent research also finds more implicit ways in which the fragility of spaces of care can be (re)produced as a result of financial influences. Spaces of care are shown, by empirical research to be differentially inclusive in nature. In other words, these spaces can be inclusive/exclusive to different actors within them and/or to the same actors at different times (Conradson 2003). When viewed as sites of ‘integration care’, teachers and other workers in under-funded schools are less likely to have the resources at their disposal to effectively monitor and evaluate ‘integration spaces’ within those schools for inclusivity in regard to specific individuals or groups. In order to provide the most durable, inclusive ‘spaces of integration’ possible for migrant youth -- and avoid the sort of ‘fracturing’ and ephemerality shown to be characteristically likely in these spaces of care -- specific resourcing focus is required. To fail to provide such spaces (inasmuch as is theoretically possible) runs counter to goals set out in The Intercultural Education Strategy calling for “intercultural learning environments” that are the “norm for all learners”. If sites of integration care are to become the “norm”, they must, by definition, be durable, and as consistently inclusive as possible, to as many learners as possible. This durability and inclusivity will require similarly durable funding.

5.3.2 FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND PROGRAMME SUSTAINABILITY

Another way in which respondents in this research perceive increasing financial constraints across youth service provision to be an obstacle to achieving effective street-level delivery of integration relates to programme sustainability. Under currently restricted funding conditions, funds that are allocated to youth service programmes in
Ireland tend to be in small packets that are distributed via short-term grants or funding contracts. This trend parallels that found internationally (Jenkinson 2000; Buckingham 2009). These packets of funding are increasingly coming from philanthropic, rather than public, sources (ibid). Indeed, funding for youth work in many EU states is increasingly becoming fixed-term in nature (France and Wiles 1997; Furlong et al. 1997; Matthews 2006; Sundius 2007). In the minds of service providers participating in this research, this short-term approach to resourcing has serious ramifications for the longevity and continuity of youth programming and services. Further, given that these local programmes are incorporating increased (restructured) responsibility for implementing State integration initiatives, respondents worry for the future of these initiatives and the young people they affect. Indeed, service providers fear that, amidst a constant scramble for funding with no guarantees of long-term support, focus on these integration initiatives may easily be lost. A respondent working in a migrant advocacy agency (that has suffered significant funding cuts in recent months), speaks to this issue:

Without political will, and without support from politicians and leadership and people who control the budgets for the kind of projects that can enhance and support integration, it’ll all fall apart, and that’s very grave. ...Funding is a huge issue for this project. Huge. From the very onset, we’re constantly fighting. ... So, with all the best will in the world, and with all the creative ideas and people taking initiative, if there are not the finances to support it...I’m very, very concerned. ....Some of the national support services for migrants have been cut. All the funding is gone. ...It’s a worrying time (3:32).

Another respondent expresses a similar sense of fatalism, as she reflects on her agency’s restricted capacity to deliver an intercultural education programme due to short-term funding schemes:

We only had funding for one year, and with the funding for one year, I felt there was very little could be done (24:2).

These discussions by service providers highlight the often short-term nature of programming designed to create ‘spaces of care’. As discussed in Section 5.3.1, caring spaces, themselves, are often found to be ephemeral (Conradson 2003; Johnsen et al. 2005; Cloke et al. 2007). This ephemerality frequently results from the fragmented monetary resource bases available to the types of services that encapsulate caring behaviour (Johnsen et al. 2005). Indeed, programmes reliant on piecemeal and sporadic resourcing continually face challenges in generating the finances needed to ensure long-
term sustainability (*ibid*). This type of funding scheme, then, bears serious implications; not only for service providers’ ability to plan and budget for the future of extant programming, but also for their capacity to develop new caring projects.

In the context of this research, if ‘spaces of integration’ are created via short-term allocations of funding from episodic or non-renewable sources, the fragility of these spaces is exacerbated. A respondent working in a migrant advocacy organisation identifies this fragility as a direct result of the lack of continuity engendered by short-term funding schemes:

[Integration] projects stop after awhile and there is no continuity. I think that’s the main difficulty at the moment. ...It’s always projects for awhile, and hire someone for awhile, and then it stops again. ...There are so many good initiatives and good projects and good outcomes, but nobody knows how to keep on doing them (18:12).

This respondent’s concerns are mirrored in Milligan’s (2000:56) findings regarding caring services, as she asserts that *ad hoc* project development often occurs under conditions of scarce funding because goals become based more on the availability of resources than on client need. This pattern of project development can, over time, contribute to the emergence of unequal access to services in local communities (*ibid*).

In view of previously identified finance-induced restrictions on programme/service availability, this further restriction of access to certain individuals or groups is even more significant.

In order to counteract the myriad of effects which short-term funding schemes engender within local youth service provision, service providers report having to attempt to increase the number of project bids/grant proposals they write in order to simultaneously pursue as many strands of funding as possible. Programme manager time allocation for fundraising -- at the expense of client contact time -- is subsequently increased due to the building of these complex funding portfolios. As a result of these increasingly multi-streamed approaches to securing adequate and consistent funding, the number of successful grant awards which programme managers must monitor and evaluate at any given time (hopefully) increases in turn. The associated reports which must be written for funding bodies then also increase (Crimmens *et al*. 2004:25). A respondent in this research, who works as the lone staff
member directing a local organisation for marginalised youth, laments exactly this sort of funding scheme-induced time allocation dilemma. She reports that much of her work time is dedicated to funding-related tasks that curtail contact time with her young service users:

*I do administrative work, so that can be writing reports to governing bodies for grants...to advisory reports [to existing funding bodies]. Every six weeks I have to write a report for that (25:12).*

Research findings emerging within the broader ‘spaces of care’ literature mirror this respondent’s narrative. Furlong *et al.* (1997:102) highlight the need for under-resourced street-level workers to forego time spent establishing relationships and building networks with their young service users in favour of spending more time pursuing continuing sources of funding for their respective programmes. Milligan (2001:129) similarly highlights the propensity for continual -- but necessary -- service provider pursuits of multiple funding streams to negatively impact caring service delivery. She finds that the unpredictability of fund-raised and short-term resourcing inhibits an organisation’s ability to provide a regular caring service. Further, the increased bureaucracy and administration inherent in short-term, piecemeal funding schemes engenders increased time allocations on the part of staff for the constant search for new funding. This reduces the amount of time available to engage in the caring services/programmes for which the funding is sought.

In the context of this research, the caring types of services of which Milligan speaks are increasingly responsible for (re)producing ‘spaces of integration’ for local youth. In view of increasing absences of State-led efforts to do so, restrictions on youth service worker time budgets become even more critical. Workers who do not have the majority of time in their everyday schedule available to spend with young people in need of integration care will likely experience reduced capacity to facilitate interactions that will enhance policy-imagined processions toward this ‘promised’ state (Gray 2006). Further, when this integration process is imagined as one requiring *care* by service providers, the implications of this time curtailment become even more far-reaching. Indeed, recent reconceptualisations of care highlight the complex networks of multi-directional connections between individuals necessary for the establishment of caring activity (Tronto 1993; Milligan 2000; Wiles 2003; 2003b).
Therefore, care can be conceptualised as a ‘necessarily relational’ activity that involves on-going commitment to the subject of care (Tronto 1989:282). This on-going level of commitment cannot be as effectively provided if youth integration service workers are increasingly required to spend time attending to fund-raising related tasks rather than to ‘needy’ migrant youth.

5.3.3 AUTONOMY AND DISCRETION IN STREET-LEVEL FUNDING ALLOCATION

Another problematic effect resulting from an increased reliance on fragmented and short-term funding schemes is identified by several respondents participating in this research. Many of the short-term, one-off funding packets available to local youth service organisations are conditionally provided by funding bodies. In other words, there are normally stipulations dictated in regard to the use of said funds. This phenomenon has been identified internationally, and has been described as a technology (used by funders) for exerting power over the voluntary sector (Buckingham 2009:235). Concerns have been raised about the potential for these power-enhancing strategies to erode the voluntary sector’s autonomy, its capacity to campaign for social change, and its capacity to engage local communities (Ilcan and Basok 2004).

Whilst serving in a volunteer capacity with a local youth service agency focusing on the needs of migrant youth, I witnessed this funding ‘power-brokering’ firsthand. During the period of my voluntarism, the agency received a small funding packet (€500) from a national-level sport-oriented organisation. This funding packet was granted with the proviso that the monies be used for an activity that promoted sport within Galway City. This very small, migrant services-oriented agency -- operating on a ‘shoe-string’ budget -- was currently experiencing extremely pressing funding needs for the support of basic services like English-language tutoring and other educational services. However, due to the aforementioned stipulations by the funding body, this agency ‘opted’ to use the funding packet for the development of a limited-run hip-hop dance class. This programming decision was made as a result of staff discussions regarding the sport activity that could be most feasibly implemented in view of staff qualifications, space availability, service user interest, etc. The €500 in funds was determined to be sufficient to cover the provision of a professional dance
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instructor for only a ‘handful’ of lessons. It was theorised that, following the completion of these few lessons, programme volunteers attending the dance class sessions (who were not, themselves, trained dance instructors and who did not have hip-hop dance experience) could take on the responsibility of delivering continuing dance class sessions to programme participants. Though this plan was met with decided reticence by the co-opted volunteers, it was selected for implementation in view of, alternatively, losing the funding packet.

Several respondents participating in this research identify other instances wherein funding packets for street-level organisations/programmes have come with ‘strings attached’ in terms of the way(s) in which funders wish the funds to be allocated. Some of these street-level staffers express an unwillingness to accept these allocation decisions from above in cases where they believe the funds are more desperately needed for other purposes within their programme(s). In such cases, these respondents report exercising discretion in allocating resources in ways unknown to, or unsanctioned by, funders. This tendency for local service providers to exercise discretion in exploring solutions to resourcing challenges is highlighted by Lipsky (2010:144) when he states that, in efforts to derive programming solutions under conditions of resource scarcity; street-level decision-makers often develop their own procedures to allocate resources. Some of these budgetary decisions are approved or indulged by service providers’ head organisations, while others are unsanctioned (ibid).

An example of this sort of discretionary resource allocation is provided in the narrative of a local youth club director. This service provider admits to allocating funding acquired for youth programming in a specific geographic remit area to finance programming for youth who reside outside that remit:

Given the nature of what we’re trying to do as a youth project, we’re trying to encourage integration and cultural diversity. We want to welcome people in. It’s all down to the funders. I mean, if the funders knew we were doing it, they’d slap us on the wrist and say, “You can’t bring people in from [name of adjacent neighbourhood]...from outside of [name of remit neighbourhood].” But for us, it’s an important element to try to actually work towards breaking down the barriers that are there (13:17).
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This example illustrates that, in some cases, there is (limited) breadth of choice available to street-level staffers in their ability to direct funds to areas of greatest (perceived) local need. However, in cases where funders become aware of such decisions and do not sanction them, they may choose to retain the ‘upper hand’ and this sort of street-level financial discretion may be forbidden.

Ultimately, what can be said of almost all financial decision-making within the youth service milieu is that there is scope for choice -- on some party’s part -- as these financial resources are liquid. However, when discussion by respondents in this research turns to other resourcing categories, a decidedly lesser degree of choice in the allocation and utilisation of these resources is articulated. The ‘non-financial’ resources discussed most often by respondents in this research include: human/time resources; space resources; information resources; and English-language support resources. The remaining chapter discussion is, therefore, devoted to a discussion (in turn) of these ‘non-monetary’ resourcing categories and the impacts of deficits within them upon street-level capacity to ‘deliver integration’.

5.4 HUMAN AND TIME RESOURCES

In the collective service provider narrative human resources and time resources (which are inextricably interwoven) are devoted significant attention. Indeed, much respondent discussion is focused on the ways in which seemingly universally scarce human resources within local youth service provision result in time resources also being in chronically short supply. The following sections addresses the ways in which service providers perceive shortages in these two intrinsically-tied resource categories to curtail their capacity to deliver optimum integration services to local youth. Like the previous discussion of financial resourcing within youth integration service provision, this discussion of human and time resources is framed by considerations of street-level “conditions of work” (Lipsky 2010) and how these conditions are shaped by resourcing shortfalls within the ‘human dimension’.

One youth worker respondent summarises the importance of this ‘human dimension’ for the effective delivery of local youth services as he asserts, ‘you just kind of need
staff and manpower’ (21:133). Despite the fact that almost all respondents interviewed in this research articulate this need, adequate supplies of human resource power are often simply not available to many street-level youth service agencies. Instead, notably small local staffs are required to perform a plethora of responsibilities requiring more human hours than are available. These worker responsibilities encompass a wide range of activities including fundraising; staff recruitment, supervision, training and support; project development and promotion; liaising with other agencies; policy and procedure generation; and monitoring, evaluation and report writing (Crimmens et al. 2004:24). Not surprisingly, the time required to accomplish this substantial list of duties (split amongst very small numbers of staff) can easily subsume the raison d’être of these street-level organisations -- to deliver services and programming to local young people.

Within their discussions of human resourcing as a critical resourcing category for the delivery of street-level youth services, several distinct, but related, threads emerge. These sub-themes include a focus on, (1) ‘supply and demand’ with regard to staffing, (2) reliance on voluntarism as a means of addressing staffing deficits, and (3) staff training and qualifications. Within respondent discussions of voluntarism and street-level youth service, several threads emerge. In some cases, issues raised within these threads also apply to paid staff. Therefore the following discussion cannot be organised strictly along the lines of volunteer versus paid staff. As a thematic approach is employed in this research, each thread is, rather, elaborated as it relates to both categories of worker. Overall, the thematic discussion to follow illuminates street-level human resource needs within the youth service sector and the problematic lack of capacity to fulfil these needs. The different strands of dialogue therein highlight the complexity of ways in which service providers perceive these human resourcing deficits to impact on their everyday “conditions of work”.

**5.4.1 STREET LEVEL STAFFING AND THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR**

Across service provider respondents in this research, the most basic issue raised in regard to human resourcing is, quite simply, the issue of ‘supply and demand’. Many of the local youth service agencies and/or programmes represented by respondents in this research are managed and operated by a paid staff of one. Therefore, the
prevalence of human resourcing supply concerns amongst these respondents is not surprising. Amongst several of these ‘lone staffers’, discussions of human resourcing are laced with emotions ranging from frustration to dejected acceptance:

At the moment we have me...one part-time education worker. That’s the extent of it (6:9).

There are a lot of different roles that I would carry because I’m the only project worker for this project. I would be the only one that would be managing the project, and I work part-time (25:1).

The only paid staff is myself, and there is only so much that I can take on...that I can do (9:7).

Shortages in support staff (e.g., programme workers, administrative staff, fundraisers, etc.) identified -- in a most extreme way -- by the above respondents are experienced, almost universally, by local youth service organisations. Most service providers participating in this research assert that these deficits dramatically affect the extent to which they and others (if there are others) in their respective agencies have time for face-to-face interaction with the young people they are attempting to engage. In his examinations of street-level bureaucracies, Lipsky (2010:30-31) highlights the likelihood for these sorts of staffing shortfalls to occur at the street-level. Though, perhaps, theoretically and empirically expected, nonetheless, most respondents articulate a desire to mitigate these deficits -- or, at the very least, their effects. In order to address the problem, most organisations represented in this research -- as well others examined in research internationally -- seek to remedy shortfalls in paid and/or full-time staff through a heavy reliance on volunteer labour (Jenkinson 2000; Edginton et al. 2005). By enlisting volunteers to carry out many of the day-to-day tasks involved in youth service delivery, paid staff hope to increase the amount of time they have personally available for youth contact and for planning and directing future programme growth. Many respondents discuss this strategy in their narratives:

One [paid] worker can only accomplish so much work, so we often have volunteers. Without people like that, the project would be very limited in scope (4:2).

[Name of local programme] is a wonderful service but on very limited resources and dependent for its impact on volunteers (7:4).
The reliance on volunteer staffing that these and other respondents participating in this research discuss is not necessarily as much a *choice* as a *necessity* for many small, street-level organisations. However, this reliance can prove to be problematic for such agencies. A discussion of the ‘drawbacks’ associated with employing largely volunteer staffs occurs later in this section. However, it is important to mention here that there are some arguable advantages inherent in this commonplace solution to meeting human resource needs. For example, volunteer workers are often neighbourhood-based and may, therefore, likely know individual clients, their families and their circumstances (Lipsky and Smith 1989:633). Despite these advantages, however, the bulk of respondent discussion regarding volunteer staffing emerging in this research focuses on problematic aspects associated with the practice. Before embarking on an in-depth examination of these respondent-identified issues, it is important to briefly highlight a growing trend within the voluntary sector more broadly that could, over time, add further complexity to these local staffing schemes.

As discussed in Section 5.1, since the 1980s, restructurings of service provision have engendered in an increasing role for the voluntary sector in delivering services to citizens within many neo-liberal states (Cloke *et al*. 2005; Milligan and Fyfe 2005; Edwards and Woods 2006; Crack *et al*. 2007; Kelly 2007; Carey *et al*. 2009). Through the course of this shift, the voluntary sector has undergone a progression toward higher and higher levels of ‘bureaucratisation’ or ‘professionalization’ (Fyfe and Milligan 2003; Milligan and Conradson 2006; Skinner and Power 2011). As a result of this trend, the ‘frontier’ between states and voluntary sector agencies is continually shifting in regard to the provision of social welfare type services (Kearns and Joseph 1997; Mohan 2003). This trend appears set to continue *vis-à-vis* attempts by many Western governments to establish formalised partnerships between the state, voluntary and private sectors (Kearns and Joseph 1997; Lockie *et al*. 2006; Milligan and Conradson 2006; Milligan 2008; Skinner and Fleuret 2011). These partnerships are being encouraged through the use of such measures as delivery contracts, audit trails, and the closer regulation of voluntary working practices (Butterworth and Butterworth 2007).
An examination of all of the measures currently being employed by states to co-opt voluntary agencies into closer and closer relationships (that have been assessed by some scholars as ‘shadow states’\(^\text{31}\)) is beyond the scope of this research. An interrogation of the ‘voluntary turn’ with enough depth to appropriately illuminate all the ways in which it impacts on the provision of street-level youth services is outside the bounds of this project as well. However, in view of significant respondent discussion regarding the heavy reliance on volunteer workers within under-staffed local agencies ‘providing integration’, these noteworthy phenomena taking place within the voluntary sector (more broadly) are referenced here in order to direct the reader to more in-depth treatments of this topic. It is important to note, as a conclusion to this brief discussion of the literature in this area, that none of the respondents in this research discuss the ‘voluntary turn’ explicitly in their interviews. Where it is invoked more implicitly, (e.g., within discussions regarding volunteer staff qualifications), attention will be directed to key literature that helps to illuminate issues underpinning this specific sub-theme.

The heavy reliance on volunteer staffing highlighted by many respondents in this research is, as previously discussed, established in the literature as a commonplace street-level phenomenon. Research that has emerged interrogating this phenomenon paints an overwhelmingly problematic picture of this ongoing organisational reliance on largely volunteer staff (Lipsky and Smith 1989:633). Voluntarism is widely characterised by a few donated hours per week, so much of the routine, day-to-day work involved in servicing a local programme will still typically fall on a very limited number of paid staff (ibid). In the context of this research, this need to perform duties which are routinely administrative or non-professional in nature directly translates to additional losses of time for scarce paid -- and typically well-trained -- youth workers to devote to working with youth, improving services and planning future programme initiatives. A lone programme director working with marginalised youth (who is only given part-time hours) frustratingly identifies this phenomenon in her organisation. Though she currently employs several volunteers, there remains a long list of ‘non-professional’ duties that befalls her as the only paid staff member:

\(^{31}\)See Wolch (1990) and Altman (1994) for discussions of this conceptualisation.
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*I do administrative work, so that can be anything. ...As well, I do the PR, posteriing, updating the web site and things like that. There is probably more stuff too (25:2)*.

In light of this worker’s part-time hours, her administrative work-load would seem to leave little time for day-to-day contact with the vulnerable young people with whom she is attempting to engage. As discussed in Section 5.3.2, the sorts of caring services that this worker (and other respondents in this research) are providing are relational in nature; requiring ongoing commitment to the subject(s) of care (Tronto 1989:282). As with time allocations required for fund-raising-related activities, time required for performing routine administrative work reduces these service providers’ capacity to make ongoing commitments to their service users’ care. Further, it is unlikely that there will be time in this respondent’s everyday schedule for developing and implementing new programming through which to construct longer-term, durable, caring ‘spaces of integration’ for the marginalised youth with whom she works.

Despite enlisting volunteers to perform much of the routine, ‘non-professional’ work involved in running a youth programme/service, most respondents participating in this research indicate that they still do not have adequate time in their schedule to meet all the expectations of their respective paid staff role. Indeed, these workers typically take on more work than there are hours in the day to perform. A local youth club director describes his current workload as a ‘full plate’, and says that he has a propensity to ‘be doing too much’, but doesn’t want to ‘say “no”’ to young people (14:13). Lipsky (2010:39) highlights this tendency for street-level workers engaged in caring service delivery to strive to avoid rationing or reducing services to their clients. This desire has been shown by research to stem from a ‘love’ for the human service work being performed (Meintel *et al.* 2006). Indeed, many workers in these sorts of caring roles describe their work as a vocation rather than a job (*ibid*).

Even though caring service workers typically perform their roles with notable passion, the ‘burn-out’ implications of self-imposed pressure to maintain service levels are significant. This pressure is often further compounded by pressure from ‘managers’ above to ‘cut the fat’ from street-level operations during times of constrained resourcing (Lipsky 2010:39). Adding even more strain, these demands from above are normally accompanied by simultaneous (and seemingly paradoxical) cautions to
maintain current quality and quantity of services provided (ibid). In continuing view of the relational nature of the work in which these street-level staffers are engaged, these sorts of pressures can be constructed as further detriments to the development of multi-direction flows of care (Tronto 1993; Milligan 2000; Wiles 2003b) between service users and over-taxed carers.

Despite a theoretically predictable desire by street-level providers to vigorously avoid the curtailment of services, given previously-discussed financial constraints, most respondents in this research lament that, ultimately, ‘something has to give’. One area of youth service provision that respondents in this research identify as particularly prone to suffering from a lack of staff hours on which to rely is outreach work. Empirical findings substantiate that outreach work is ‘time-expensive’ and often leaves street-level workers spread too thinly with expectations exceeding their capacity (Spence 2004:269). Discussion by respondents in this research echoes these findings:

We [organisation staff] continually say that we are available for outreach. ...The only thing would then be... I haven’t had enough time (23:16).

Because of resources and because of my own time...it’s [outreach work] something that I would like to work more on...being able to reach more people. You always could do more. It’s just getting the time and the resources. Everyone understands...just trying to get out there (25:4).

In particular view of the sector of workers that this research interrogates, unfortunately, if agencies fail to perform this ‘expensive’ outreach work, potentially socially-isolated migrant youth may not become aware of programmes/services available to them and the opportunity to influence their activity choices may be quite limited. Subsequently, programmes may fail to attract new youth participants; prohibiting them from growing in size and scope.

Service provider respondents in this research widely identify this critical link between sustained outreach work with local youth and increased awareness of programme/service offerings. Unfortunately, under currently scarce human resourcing conditions, these workers assert their capacity to perform this critical
outreach work is diminished. This results in a decreased lack of awareness by youth of programmes operating in their local communities:

They [young people] don’t have enough knowledge about what really is on offer. ...There is ignorance... of not knowing or having the right information of what is going on in the youth clubs (18:35).

There is an awful lot that young people wouldn’t be aware of. They’re literally not aware of supports that are there for them and, until they’re aware of them, they can’t access them. So, even just the awareness...getting the message out to them...gaining access to the young people and letting them know what’s out there can be fraught. It really can (22:80).

A respondent who liaises with youth workers nationally assesses this trend toward lack of outreach capacity across youth service agencies as highly problematic:

People don’t have time for outreach. ...Outreach takes a humungous amount of work, and that’s where the voluntary sector falls down, because they “Don’t have time”... they “Cannot do it”, and that’s what needs to be done. There’s no other way around it (24:11).

Despite widespread service provider recognition of a need for sustained outreach work with local youth, and equally widespread lamentations of inadequate human/time resources to dedicate toward such an effort, Lipsky (2010:35) suggests that the maintenance of current -- albeit unsatisfactory -- levels of outreach may actually serve over-stretched, under-resourced street-level workers. Lipsky asserts that if service providers do change the nature or amount of outreach in which they engage, they can generally expect to further increase demands on themselves and their programme due to resultant increases in programme participation. Therefore, ironically, if already over-stretched street-level providers do make time for increased outreach -- either by performing it themselves or by directing increased staffing resources toward the effort -- there is a likelihood for increased programme demand to, subsequently, further increase demand on already scarce programme resources. Lipsky (ibid) asserts that an awareness of this likely progression may cause street-level service providers to keep outreach work close to current levels despite potential programming gains that could be realised from such effort.
In addition to failing to significantly create time for the enhancement of street-level worker ability to engage in adequate (or increased) youth outreach and failing to effectively reduce paid staff workload in other areas, a heavy reliance on volunteer workers in street-based youth service agencies also creates some specific managerial problems. Communication between programme managers and volunteer staff is often difficult because youth work conducted by volunteers often occurs in the evenings or on weekends when direct contact with programme managers can be limited. Finding times when volunteer workers and paid staff can attend plenary and evaluation meetings or training events together is similarly difficult (Crimmens et al. 2004:24). During my volunteer service with a local youth organisation within the course of this research, I witnessed this issue first-hand. The programme’s director was continually frustrated in her attempts to organise volunteer staff meetings and necessary training sessions because volunteers’ schedules were so incongruent. Many times when meetings were convened, several members of the volunteer corps were absent due to other scheduled commitments.

In view of the conceptual underpinnings of this research, this lack of opportunity for direct and frequent contact between paid staff and volunteer workers can be constructed as a form of ephemerality in regard to spaces of care. When such spaces are fleeting in nature, important opportunities for relational interaction within them are reduced. Fine and Glendinning (2005) identify this lack of opportunity to operate similarly between carers as between carers and the cared for. Indeed, individuals’ experiences -- service users’ and staff’s alike -- within spaces of care depend critically on the extent to which these individuals are able to engage with the practices of care expressed within the space (Conradson 2003; Milligan 2000; 2003). Therefore, inadequate levels and quality of interaction between carers is likely to be significant.

Another potentially problematic aspect involved in staffing local youth service agencies with mainly volunteer workers is that their typically minimal work hours may not allow them to pursue critical referrals of young participants to other youth agencies and programmes. In practice, this may mean that a volunteer working a short, isolated shift may be unable to incorporate time into her/his work schedule to accompany a vulnerable young person to another agency providing services of which
the young person may also be in need. These accompanied introductions have been shown by empirical research to be highly important to the success of such referrals (Lipsky and Smith 1989:634). Several service providers participating in this research similarly cite the importance of supporting youth in ‘first-time’ visits to a new youth group or agency:

*If another agency does identify somebody [as a prospective new service user], they’d usually bring them in. What we’d usually say is, “Bring them into [name of youth facility]. Come in with them the first time, and they’ll get to meet us.” It just makes it easier for them to come in (22:46).*

This sort of support is even more critical when working with migrant youth who may lack English-language skills, social confidence, and familiarity with the local community. So, where the capacity for accompanied referrals is reduced by deficits in staffing and ‘spotty’ volunteer coverage, ‘cracks in care’ -- particularly for vulnerable youth -- can emerge. For example, a young person feeling unsure or fearful of what awaits her/him at a receiving agency may fail to follow through with a referral if not accompanied. If service providers at the referring agency are unable to dedicate time/staffing to a follow-up on the completion (or lack thereof) of the referral, the young person may, then, disengage from the care network altogether and fail to receive services of which s/he is in critical need. Service providers at the (potential) receiving agency may assume that the young person was referred elsewhere and may also not have human resources available to dedicate to a follow-up. This sort of scenario illustrates how easily lack of adequate, available and reliable staffing can engender far-reaching implications for service users.

Another negative outcome emerging from a reliance on volunteer staffing within local youth service programmes that is identified by service providers in their narratives relates to lack of continuity in staffing. The afore-discussed short-term funding scenarios under which most local youth service agencies and programmes currently operate lead directly to challenges regarding paid staff retention. This phenomenon is identified locally by participants in this research:

*I’m working in the [youth] project here seven years now, and the one thing that I notice in relation to staff is consistency of staff staying on. The average lifespan of a youth worker is around 2-3 years, and then they move on. There’s no consistency there (14:26).*
This lack of paid staff continuity further increases the need for street-level organisations to rely upon volunteer workers. However, since volunteer workers are often less time-committed than paid staff, and may more readily pursue opportunities in other projects or search for full-time employment of their own, sustaining a corps of trained volunteer workers is fraught with its own set of continuity issues (Crimmens et al. 2004:54). Indeed, empirical interrogations of street-level youth work practice suggest that the very existence of currently prevalent models of service delivery may be threatened if voluntarism were to decline (Furlong et al. 1997; Jenkinson 2000; Pittman et al. 2000). This prospect (understandably) raises concern amongst (already) hard-to-attract funders who must allocate resources to organisations and programmes that appear to be sustainable.

Respondents participating in this research articulate similar worries regarding staffing continuity under conditions of heavy reliance on voluntarism. A youth programme director comments on the implications of such staffing issues for his young programme participants:

That [lack of continuity] sends out a message to young people. You’re engaging with them, and then suddenly you’re not, and they don’t know what’s going on (14:26).

This, again, constitutes a ‘crack’ in care that can easily emerge under conditions of scarce resourcing. Potentially vulnerable young people who have ‘taken the leap’ and engaged with a youth programme may quickly experience a loss of confidence in that programme if carers with whom they form trusting relationships regularly ‘disappear’; only to be replaced with new staff with whom these relationships must be forged anew. With a view to the relational nature of integration as a form of care, and the extent to which individuals’ experience within spaces of care are dependent upon engagement with the practices of care expressed by different individuals therein (Conradson 2003; Milligan 2000; 2003), these sorts of ‘disappearing acts’, then, significant bearing on young people’s experiences within local ‘spaces of integration’.

In addition to issues related to availability and continuity, other reasons for concern in regard to staffing youth service organisations with mainly volunteer workers are
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identified in the academic literature. The previously-discussed tendency toward transience amongst volunteer workers can curtail capacity to match training, skills and experience of volunteers with the needs presented by young people over the long term (Crimmens et al. 2004:72). Further, even amongst those volunteer workers who do stay for a considerable term, there is a reduced opportunity for professional development training when compared to full-time, paid staff. Consequently, relatively inexperienced and under-trained workers may find themselves undertaking sensitive work with high need/high risk young people, (e.g., asylum-seekers and refugees) (ibid).

Whilst conducting participant observation for this research, I witnessed the impact of this sort of under-training on a local programme being delivered to a particularly vulnerable group of migrant youth. Within the organisation delivering this programme, there was a lack of qualification and training amongst available volunteers regarding approaches to dealing with young people who have experienced trauma (as many of the programme participants had). Since the programme employed only a couple of paid staff (who were better trained in this area), these volunteer staffing ‘gaps’ resulted in the programme scope being curtailed so that programme activities did not run the risk of inadvertently triggering emotional responses amongst participants with which volunteer workers were ill-prepared to contend. In this case, then, a ‘space of care’ for ‘needy’ migrant youth failed to be created because of staffing deficiencies. Instead, programming was limited to ‘safer’ social activities and informational sessions which -- though useful and therapeutic in other ways -- left a specific youth integration need unfulfilled. This scenario illustrates another way in which resourcing constraints can engender ‘cracks in care’ that have far-reaching implications for service users. Further, carers in this situation were also deprived of opportunities for engaging in relational practices of care that have the potential to reshape their own experiences of the caring space.

In addition to issues of availability, continuity and training engendered by a necessary reliance on largely volunteer staffs, respondents in this research illuminate other human resource exigencies that stem from a chronically short supply of paid service providers within local youth service organisations. Another prevalent respondent
concern emerging from this staffing ‘solution’ is the associated inability to provide optimum -- or even adequate -- opening hours for youth service venues. Indeed, in the current era of budget cutbacks, many youth service agencies and programmes have been forced to cut service hours to local youth and their families. A respondent working at a youth drop-in venue identifies these impacts on the youth with whom she engages:

_We would love to see extended hours here [at the centre]. At the moment, for summertime, we stop at the weekends. But we go until 10:00 on Friday night. We’d love to see the same on a Saturday, and that’s not happening (22:67)._ 

Another local youth worker laments not being able to ‘provide more things [in which local youth could participate] throughout the week, rather than just on Saturday; especially during the academic year (25:18). Similar concerns related to short-staffing are identified by educational service providers. A secondary school teacher describes the lack of counselling staff available at her school to deal with the academic and social concerns of vulnerable migrant students:

_If you’re taking in people [migrant youth] who are hurt and who have been through huge trauma, you can’t just shove them into schools and go, “Oh, that’s ok. Now we’ve dealt with it.” …particularly children. …It does mean the Department of Education would need more counsellors and skills. At the moment, we have one and a half counsellors for 690 students’ (11:35).

In view of the questions being interrogated in this research, these examples of service curtailments can be understood as further reductions in spaces of care engendered by resourcing constraints. As these reductions progress (over extended periods of resourcing shortfall) these spaces could conceivably become ephemeral in nature; available to ‘needy’ youth only episodically. Research regarding ephemeral caring spaces finds that their ephemeral nature influences not only who is cared for and what resources they receive within that care, but also the nature of the relationships formed between service users and carers (Johnsen et al.2005:328). Therefore, as service hours or staff coverage for sites of care (e.g., youth drop-in centres or counselling offices) are reduced -- engendered by shortages across both paid and volunteer staffs -- changes in the way in which carers and the cared-for alike experience these increasingly ephemeral ‘spaces of integration care’ are effected. Further, as a result
of service cuts in sites of care, an on-going commitment to the subject(s) of care engaging with those spaces (Tronto 1989:282) is, again, jeopardised.

5.4.2 RESOURCING SHORTAGES: A ‘VICIOUS CYCLE’
Overall, street-level human resourcing shortfalls identified in the service provider narrative emerging in this research -- coupled with previously-discussed funding constraints -- produce a problematic, self-perpetuating cycle. Widespread funding shortfalls necessitate an ever-increasing reliance on volunteer labour within street-level youth service agencies. Greater reliance on volunteer labour then introduces decreasing levels of ‘professionalisation’ into street-level youth service provision -- particularly in regard to the delivery of integration-specific programming. It is important to note that this street-level trend runs counter to calls by many Western governments for the broader voluntary sector to become more ‘professionalised’ (Fyfe and Milligan 2003; Bondi and Laurie 2005; Jenkins 2005; Owen and Kearns 2006). Nevertheless, over time, respondents in this research assert that properly qualified and trained staff become less available; necessitating additional cutbacks in services and programming (beyond those already engendered by funding shortfalls). Ultimately, this cycle effectively reduces street-level capacity to serve the integration care needs of (already marginalised) local migrant youth. At every step within this cyclical progression, spaces of care are made more ephemeral and less open to engagement with practices of care between carers and the cared-for within.

5.5 SPACE RESOURCES
In addition to the constraints on street-level youth service provision engendered by scarce financial resources and human/time resources, local youth workers also struggle with challenges brought about by a scarcity of space resources. Indeed, facilities suitable for accommodating youth activities and programmes are a resource in increasingly scarce local supply due, in large part, to afore-discussed budget cutbacks in the current recessionary era. Many respondents in this research cite this lack of appropriate/available spaces within the city as a limiting factor in their capacity to develop youth programmes to the degree desired. The following discussion addresses the implications of constraints within this resourcing category with particular regard to the (re)production of caring ‘spaces of integration’.
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Most street-level youth programmes in Galway City are currently operated out of small venues that are often shared between one or more programmes/agencies. These venues are not typically dedicated youth space. Rather, administrative space -- for both youth and adult programming -- is frequently ‘carved out’ of them as well. The ‘youth space’ within these sites is often, then, at best, intermittently available. This resourcing reality illustrates yet another way in which local ‘spaces of care’ for youth can frequently be imagined as ephemeral spaces. As such, they are also contested and fragile spaces; defined to a much greater degree by adult needs and activities than by young people or those that provide caring services to them.

Some youth services in Galway City are, according to respondents in this research, provided within more ‘durable’ sites, (i.e., fixed, indoor locations). However, these respondents highlight -- as do literatures addressing spaces of care and children’s spaces -- that buildings dedicated to these purposes often, “dictate, rather than serve”, the needs of both staff and service users, and are, “commonly experienced by users and staff as substandard, depressing and institutional” (Waters 1992:74). Many respondents participating in this research report that youth programming within Galway City is hosted in sites already dedicated to other activities. I was able to observe this trend within many of the youth service venues I visited for the purposes of conducting respondent interviews. Indeed, most of the sites appeared to be defined primarily by office functions, and were not, in the main, decorated and fitted with ‘youth-friendly’ amenities. These cramped office spaces were spartanly furnished; accommodating only the occasional sofa and few other bits of inviting, youth-appropriate décor or furniture. Most walls were painted bland, institutional colours with little youth-oriented artwork on display. Overall, in these venues, there was little feeling of warmth, welcome and fun for youth.

Many respondents in this research describe the settings which they are allocated for the provision of their respective services/programmes in a similarly negative manner. A local youth club director discusses the ‘non-teen-appropriate’ space in which he hosts his group’s activities:

32 I did not conduct any interviews within school buildings, but I envision that these sites may be decorated and furnished in a more ‘youth-friendly’ manner than the sites I observed.
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This is an office. It's not very comfortable. It’s not very inviting for young people (14:28).

Other service provider respondents similarly lament the amount and quality of ‘youth spaces’ available to their respective programmes:

I’d like to have a space for young people... a bigger space (23:23).

Wheeler (2000:51) voices concern over deficits in ‘youth-friendly’ space within service provision internationally. She posits that, “youth organisations and programmes need to provide secure and comfortable spaces for young people to develop a positive sense of personal, spiritual and cultural identity.” Wheeler also asserts that these spaces should be welcoming, safe, nurturing and reflective of youth interests (ibid).

The use of space by young people across a broad range of activities has been interrogated extensively within children’s geographies. A deeper examination of this immense topic here is beyond the scope of the research questions being interrogated. It is simply important to state that young people’s (and adults’) use of space has important consequences for their social experience (Milligan 2000, 2003; Conradson 2003; Olwig and Gullov 2003) and for the relationships in which they engage within those spaces -- including relationships with carers. For example, if appropriate spaces are not made available to youth, they may fail to find opportunity to make localities into places of their own (Amit-Talai 1995). Subsequently, if they cannot personalise spaces in some way, young people may fail to develop a sense of ‘ownership’ in the activities and social processes taking place within these spaces (ibid). When young people are granted agency within spaces -- including spaces of care -- their use of the space gives insight (to carers and others engaging with them in that space) into the patterns of their relations (Richter 1996; Hil and Bessant 1999; Halpern et al. 2000; Gagen 2004). This sort of information is highly relevant and valuable to service providers when attempting to enhance the effectiveness of programming or service delivery for the particular young people with whom they are working. If spaces wherein young people can express this sort of agency are not available, that important observational data may not emerge.
In addition to issues regarding the lack of ‘youth friendly’ space available to service providers and their programmes in Galway City, space resourcing is discussed within the service provider narrative in regard to a more general lack of space as an impediment to programme/service delivery. Many respondents express a belief that they could deliver increased or enhanced quality services if more physical space in which to implement these services were made available. Service provider assertions in this regard address both indoor and outdoor spaces and emerge in the discussions of workers across all youth service sectors:

*We don’t have a hell of a lot of space here. We have two big rooms. ...We’re limited in how much we can offer because of space (22:68).*

*We always would like outdoor space. ...We could do so much more here if we had outdoor space (15:8).*

*We have 690 students, and we have physically nowhere to put them if we wanted to do something like this [a school-wide intercultural programme or event]. There is nowhere available. Of course, if we got funds for a gym, there would be...at a cost of €10,000-€20,000 (11:22).*

*The project has been, for a number of years, campaigning to try to get a youth drop-in space where we could provide better service. Because some [young] people just want a place to hang out, to be safe. ...We haven’t got the space here. We can’t afford the rent either. We haven’t got a proper facility to do it (14:7).*

*We’ve been trying to set up a youth club for the past two years, but [there is] no premises available (5:3).*

These examples illustrate the widespread lack of availability of space resources -- ‘youth-friendly’ or otherwise -- across all youth service sectors within Galway City. The types of spaces for which these service providers yearn, if made available, could extend capacity for the creation of ‘spaces of care’ -- that have the potential to also be ‘spaces of integration’ -- for local youth. However the creation of these spaces is curtailed by resourcing constraints. This reality constitutes another example of the way in which resourcing informs the “conditions of work” (Lipsky 2010) for street–level youth service providers.
The inability for local service providers to secure space resources for their respective services and programming will only likely increase in future; with cut-backs in resourcing to public services and other sectors seemingly set to continue in Ireland. For many facets of youth service provision, these cut-backs have far-reaching implications; and in the case of space as a resourcing category, the capital outlays required to rectify deficits present, perhaps, even more daunting potentialities when compared to other resourcing categories. For example, smaller amounts of funding may be able to finance slightly increased staffing or programming budgets, but are unlikely to finance the building/leasing of entire facilities. Therefore, space is a category of resourcing even less likely than most to be free of shortfalls anytime soon.

5.6 INFORMATION RESOURCES
In addition to discussions of deficits in financial, human/time and space resources that affect capacity to deliver youth integration and other services at the street level, respondent narratives also highlight shortfalls in information resourcing. Lipsky (2010:90) asserts that such information deficits are characteristic within street-level resourcing. Indeed, this resource category is no more immune to scarcity than are more tangible types of resources like money and space (ibid). An examination of this critical resourcing category is, therefore, important to an overall understanding of the multi-dimensional ways in which resourcing shortages constrain street-level “conditions of work”.

Information shortage impacts on everyday service provision emerge most prominently in the narratives of respondents participating in this research during their discussions of gaps in knowledge about current (or potential) service users. For example, most respondents in this research reveal a notable lack of knowledge regarding critically important service user characteristics such as national/ethnic origin and cultural background. These information deficits are critical in that they contribute to a diminished capacity to accurately assess the service needs of these individuals. In the absence of such assessments, there is an increased chance that scarce resources may be misallocated or under-allocated. This shortfall in client background information exists despite National Youth Council of Ireland (2011) recommendations that all
Chapter 5: Resourcing Street-Level Youth Services

Youth services/programmes make a concerted effort to gather such information as a first step toward intercultural good practice.

The NYCI (ibid) recommend accomplishing the gathering of information regarding ethno-cultural background by including an ‘ethnic identifier’ on youth programme registration forms. This registration component should, according to the NYCI (ibid), request of new service users information regarding nationality, ethnicity, place of birth, family background and native language(s) -- as well as the same for parents or caregivers. The Youth Council asserts that this is a good way to begin the needs assessment process for any young service user presenting for the first time to a service agency. Where this sort of information has not been collected, to date, the NYCI (ibid) recommend that a registry (including this data) of young people already active in the programme or engaging in the service also be created. Despite these recommendations, very few of the organisations represented by the interviewees participating in this research conduct such recommended information-gathering amongst incoming or existing service users.

Even in educational service settings -- where one might expect that quite extensive background information on all students would be gathered -- integration-relevant information, such as national background of students, has only recently begun to be collected and is still quite limited in scope. A spokesperson for the Department of Education and Science addressed this limited data gathering at a recent conference on intercultural education, stating that the Department, for example, ‘stops short of asking for data on ethnic identity’ for reasons related to simplicity of data management and potential sensitivity of the information. In her narrative, a teacher interviewed in this research illustrates the results at the classroom level of this lack of information resourcing:

One student I had last year...I’m not sure where exactly she’s from...somewhere in Eastern Europe anyway (12:29).

This teacher similarly acknowledges that she is ‘not sure of the backgrounds of all [her] students...whether they’re even foreign, or where they’re from’ (12:6). A

---

33The conference in question was The Conference on Interculturalism in Irish Education and took place at The University of Limerick in February, 2011.
teacher at another local secondary school identifies a similar lack of awareness of student ethno-cultural background amongst her teaching colleagues as she recounts discussion that emerged at a staff meeting:

I stood up, and said, “You know, there are 36 different nationalities in our school.” People [teachers and staff] were like, “What??!!” Do you know? ...It isn’t even on their radar (11:29).

Other notable failures to gather integration-relevant information from young service users emerges in discussions by service providers participating in this research who work in non-educational settings. These workers widely report reliance on a range of information ‘sources’ -- from deduction to guesswork to hearsay -- in order to construct an ‘informal profile’ of service users. This sort of guesswork is illuminated in the discussion of a respondent who conducts anti-racism training sessions with local youth:

I would make a guess based on who’s in the room...how they’re describing themselves... that there sometimes are migrant teenagers within the group (19:4).

In light of the relevance of the service that this worker is providing to integration initiatives, the lack of reliable information about young participants upon which she is basing her decision-making and strategy is problematic. In using this information-gathering ‘strategy’, this service provider may fail to accurately identify young people in need of other integration services. Additionally, sensitivities raised vis-à-vis this respondent’s training session may go unaddressed in individuals needing more in-depth or individualised follow-up.

Other respondents working with diverse youth populations cite similar methods of ‘information-gathering’ regarding their participants. A service provider delivering recreational programming to local youth admits relying on ‘guesswork’ when assessing the composition of groups with whom she endeavours to facilitate intercultural youth work. This respondent is seemingly aware of the problematic implications of this ‘strategy’, but explains apologetically:

I’m not able to give you answers [regarding youth participant backgrounds] because we haven’t done a kind of profile of our participant socio-economic backgrounds, or even like ethnic backgrounds, really. ...We haven’t officially made...these are
things that we haven’t, as an organisation, we haven’t really thought about very much (23:33).

The shortfalls in information resourcing highlighted by these respondents have the potential to engender the curtailment or misdirection of other types of resources within service provision targeting ‘needy’ young people. As with other resourcing category shortfalls, this potential could then (perhaps, more indirectly) translate to a curtailment of developing ‘spaces of integration’.

Highlighting deficits in information resourcing within local youth service provision even more strongly than previous examples wherein service providers rely on ‘guesswork’ to ascertain service user background, some respondents in this research reveal a lack of any attempts to gather such information. Discussion by a worker at a local drop-in centre for marginalised youth illustrates this point:

Some lads were coming in [to the drop-in centre] and they were speaking their own dialects. I don’t know what they were actually speaking; to be honest [laughs] (15:12).

Knowledge of a critical aspect of service users’ cultural identity(s) like language has the potential to enhance relationships between service providers and service users, in that endeavouring to learn about a service user’s linguistic preferences and abilities communicates a sense of interest on the part of service providers. In this example, this message is not communicated to service users for whom English is not a first language. This information resourcing failure has the potential to precipitate a lack of further engagement with the service on the part of these individuals; thereby decreasing service provider capacity to facilitate their integration trajectory.

In view of research findings regarding ‘otherness’ within spaces of care (Waters 1992; Parr 2000; Johnsen et al. 2005), loss of opportunity for engagement with a service user’s cultural/linguistic background (as in the previous example) has further implications with regard to exclusion. Though spaces like the youth drop-in centre in this example are meant to be inclusive spaces wherein differences are tolerated (Johnsen et al. 2005), and an ‘open-door’ policy is in force (Ball and Griffin 1999), spaces of exclusion can emerge within them for particular service users exhibiting forms of ‘otherness’ that stray too far from some tolerated norm (Waters 1992; Parr
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2000). In such cases, a sense of ‘license’ in regard to the expression of ‘Otherness’ within the space may be ‘revoked’ (Goffman 1961). Particular service users within the space may then come to be viewed as a matter ‘out of place’ (Cresswell 1996).

The service provider in this example alludes to such a ‘revocation of license’ in her determination that only English should be spoken by service users within the ‘space of care’ she manages:

_We felt that...it’s not OK to huddle off in a little corner and have your own little private conversation. It’s [the drop-in space] very small, as you can see. So, we kind of felt, not only were they excluding the other people in the room, they were making themselves be excluded from whatever was going on_ (15:12)

With particular view to the ‘spaces of integration’ under interrogation in this research, the determinations made regarding practice of care by the service provider in this example are significant. In justifying her decision-making within an (ostensibly) inclusive space, this respondent highlights that the use of non-English language(s) is/are exclusive to other service users. This assertion reflects a duality within caring spaces highlighted in the literature. Research findings assert that ‘spaces of care’ are frequently simultaneously inclusive to some and exclusive to others (Parr 2000). Although this phenomenon is shown to be intrinsic to many caring spaces, it does, nevertheless -- in the context of this research -- diminish the capacity for such spaces to function as ‘spaces of integration’ for non-English-speaking migrant youth.

The street-level lack of familiarity, and failure to engage, with young service users’ ethno-cultural/linguistic backgrounds identified by some respondents in this research is found, by participant observation, to be widespread amongst youth service agencies within Galway City. I attended a training session focusing on service provider supports for doing intercultural youth work 34 as part of this research. This session was well-attended by local youth service workers. When trainers at this session discussed NYCI recommendations for data-gathering in regard to participant ethno-cultural background, most session participants said that they and/or their organisations do not currently collect such information. As a result of the importance

---

34 The training session in question was conducted by the National Youth Council of Ireland (NYCI) and held in Galway City, March, 2010.
placed on this vital form of information resourcing by NYCI trainers, several participants stated that they may consider gathering such information going forward. One session attendee (anonymous) did report attempts to gather information regarding the backgrounds of service users. She stated that her agency uses a registration form in which new service users are asked to identify their nationality, ‘so that we’re kind of aware [that there] might be dietary requirements or religious kind of things we might need to cater to or be aware of.’

A youth worker respondent in this research discusses using a more ‘conversation-based method’ employed in this sort of background information-gathering with young people newly presenting to her service:

\[\text{I do try and do research so I can be culturally sensitive to where they’re [young migrant service users] coming from and find out. And I’ll ask them... I’ll say, “I don’t know. Can you tell me?” ... I think that they want to tell you ...as long as you don’t appear to be judgemental and critical (4:11).}\]

Though, perhaps, preferable to not gathering any background information from service users, this conversational approach to information resourcing could prove problematic if personnel were to change; necessitating the re-gathering of the same information by new staff.

The use of a registration form for the gathering ethno-cultural background information (as recommended by NYCI) allows for standardisation, not only of the data gathered, but also of the method by which it is collected. If this approach to data gathering is used with all newly-presenting service users, conversations can be avoided that may be perceived by (potentially vulnerable) migrant youth newly-presenting to the agency as differentially interrogative. Such perceptions could cultivate a feeling amongst these youth in that they are being ‘singled out’ due to their ‘Otherness’ within the space (Waters 1992; Parr 2000; Johnsen et al. 2005). In this way, spaces of exclusion could emerge within an ‘inclusive caring space’ that cause some individuals to experience their differences as ‘outsiders’ rather than as ‘insiders’ (Johnsen et al. 2005:327). However, if background information is gathered systematically at the outset from all new service users, several advantages stand to be gained: (1) this sense of ‘outsider otherness’ may be minimised, (2) scarce programme resources can be immediately
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directed toward areas of greatest need for particular service users, and (3) service providers can (potentially) engage in meaningful and caring interactions with these new service users; equipped with basic ethno-cultural/linguistic background information to facilitate these conversations.

Despite potential advantages to be gained from the systematic gathering of ethno-cultural background information from service users, most service providers participating in this research report not yet conducting such formalised queries. The most commonly cited reasons for this information resourcing shortfall are a lack of human/time resources to commit to the endeavour and -- on the part of some service providers -- unease regarding the best way in which to conduct such sensitive information-gathering. This resourcing shortfall is not unexpected in view of street-level bureaucracy theorisations. Lipsky (2010:29) maintains that a lack of information gathering regarding client background is characteristic of many street-level agencies. He validates reasons for this shortfall cited by respondents in this research, as he asserts that reliable information about clients is often difficult to obtain and may involve significant cost to street-level agencies already experiencing resourcing shortages in other areas. Lipsky (ibid) also asserts that, for many street-level workers, the nature of encounters with clients can be quite episodic. Therefore, there is a ‘cost/benefit’ factor inherent in decisions to gather information from all service users (or not).

As Lipsky predicts, expectations of limited or once-off contact with young service users emerges as a resourcing concern in the narratives of several respondents in this research. These service providers express belief that many young service users may be transient and, therefore, may not represent a prudent target for the allocation of scarce information resourcing. In particular, some migrant youth -- particularly those seeking asylum -- are expected by many service provider respondents to engage with local services in a temporary way:

*The* [asylum-seeking] children *keep changing, and one week they’re there...next week they’re settled or they’re gone or they’re home or whatever, you know? So, there’s no continuation. It’s transient. ... One week, the [asylum-seeking] family is with you...next week, they’re gone* (5:14).
It has become an issue in our school. There are a few [asylum-seeking] students who haven’t known from month to month whether they’d be back in the school again (11:33).

This perception by service providers of asylum-seeking youth as highly transient is quite problematic for these individuals in terms of the potential for them to receive inadequate resourcing by virtue of ‘cost/benefit’ type decisions. Asylum-seekers are exposed to many forms of pre-migration, migration and post-migration stress; (potentially) including war, persecution, poverty, rape and torture in the pre-migration stage and exploitation and separation during and after migration (Nwachukwu et al. 2009). When they arrive at their asylum destination, (e.g., Ireland), as discussed previously, they must then endure a protracted process wherein they are repeatedly interrogated whilst attempting to adjust to life in highly problematic hostel accommodation. During this time, these vulnerable individuals are exposed to repeated racism and a sceptical and hostile press (ibid). Being placed in a position of dependency on others, they may also experience a loss of self-worth and loss of assertiveness (ibid).

The afore-described potentialities for vulnerable asylum-seeking populations cause beliefs on the part of local service providers regarding transience within this group to become even more problematic. Clearly, many of these ‘needy’ individuals will be present in Ireland for protracted periods -- even if their asylum pleas are ultimately rejected -- and will require care (in many imaginings) and resourcing to support that care to the highest degree possible. With a particular view to youth within the asylum-seeking population, then, information resourcing within programmes/services with which they engage is critical. If this information resourcing remains minimally addressed in favour of allocating elsewhere the scarce human/time and financial resources necessary for such data gathering, care may suffer significantly. Within such a scenario, the service provision environment, again, fails to become a ‘space of care’ that might facilitate the integration of vulnerable young people. Further, a space of exclusion emerges within the caring space in regard to certain individuals based upon their ‘otherness’ (Cresswell 1996; Parr 2000).
5.7 ENGLISH-LANGUAGE SUPPORT RESOURCES

It is clear, at this juncture in the discussion of street-level resourcing, that service providers overwhelmingly perceive the currently constrained resourcing climate to significantly inform the “conditions of work” under which they strive to ‘deliver integration’ to local youth. Despite significant concern on the part of service providers in regard to all of the resourcing categories addressed thus far, there is no single resourcing category that garners more respondent attention in discussions of youth integration service provision than that of English-language support. Nearly all interviewees in this research cite a lack of adequate support for youth with LEP (limited English proficiency)\(^\text{35}\) participating in local youth services (including formal education) to be a formidable obstacle to the delivery of both integration-specific and non-integration-specific services/programmes. Indeed, for many respondents in this research, the everyday ‘diversity dilemmas’ (Hagelund 2009) that arise from this lack of support come to significantly overshadow many broader, long-term youth service provision initiatives and goals.

Due to overwhelming service provider focus on English-language issues within the context of street-level resourcing, it is necessary to discuss language support as a resourcing category. Particularly, it is vital to illuminate the ways in which local shortfalls in this resourcing category are perceived by service providers to actively constrain their capacity to deliver both ‘mainstream’ and integration-specific youth services to young people with LEP and/or to young people whose family members may have LEP. It is important to note at the outset of this discussion that English-language support issues arguably impact on providers of formal education services in more extensive and complex ways than they impact on providers of informal education, (e.g., youth work, sport, etc.) In view of this differential impact across youth service sectors, the discussion of this resource category will be limited to aspects of English-language support resourcing that have implications both within and outside of strictly formal education settings. Issues related to language support, as they impact formal education specifically, (e.g., problems associated with special resource (EAL) teaching schemes in Irish schools such as staffing shortages and the

---

\(^{35}\) Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is a term used in the education literature to describe individuals whose proficiency in English has not yet progressed to the point where they can fully participate in an ‘English only’ (learning) environment (Olson and Goldstein 1997:35).
social exclusion of EAL learners) are treated extensively in the education literature and are outside the scope of questions being interrogated in this research.

In the context of youth service provision, many respondents in this research stress the importance of English-language skills for effective youth participation in programmes and activities as well as for the broader success of integration initiatives. Yet, English-language skills amongst local migrant youth (and their families) are, according to many respondents, lacking to a degree that significantly limits these capacities across youth service settings. Observations of these language-skill deficits abound within the service provision narrative and cross all sectors of youth service provision:

*English is a difficulty for a lot of young [migrant] people. That’s something that we’ve been identifying more. There are an awful lot of young people struggling to keep up’* (22:40).
~ ‘Mainstream’ youth drop-in centre worker

*There’s one girl in particular that I’m thinking of that has very little English that came from Poland. She’s not interacting with the group [her peers in school], so she really stands out’* (11:3). ~ Secondary school teacher

*Many young people find it very difficult because they might be dealing with a new alphabet completely, so they’re starting from scratch, and that creates huge challenges for them’* (4:9). ~ Migrant youth service director

When discussing these language-based challenges, many service providers articulate a direct (perceived) association between LEP and a decreased potential for young people experiencing this challenge to achieve integration. This association bears implications for service provider imaginings of their capacity to deliver integration services to these youth. However, when interrogating these associations on the part of service providers between language skill and the capacity to ‘integrate’, it is important to bear in mind the wide variation in understandings of ‘integration’ amongst these workers (as discussed in Section 4.3). In other words, depending on what a particular service provider believes to constitute ‘integration’, the English-language ability required to accomplish it may vary widely.

One of the ways in which an association between language learning and the provision of street-level ‘integration’ emerges in the service provision discourse is in
discussions of youth programme/service awareness. Though some of the challenges for service providers relating to programme/service awareness are addressed by respondents in the context of generalised information resourcing shortfalls related to outreach capacities (see Section 5.4.1), many interviewees also specifically discuss this lack of awareness as a direct result of English-language skill deficits. Therefore, in this discussion of English-language resources, these communication barriers will be discussed with a view to these service provider perceptions.

Many service providers participating in this research articulate a belief that a widespread lack of awareness amongst migrant youth of the youth programme/service offerings within Galway City is attributable, in large part, to English-language related communication barriers. Indeed, many respondents believe that young people ‘with low [English] language skills have difficulty accessing any kind of service’ (3:12).

Within respondent narratives -- spanning all sectors of youth service provision -- perceptions of this (perceived) direct causal relationship abound:

They’re [youth programmes/services] not reaching everyone -- or at least they’re not reaching as many people as they could -- and I think the major issue is the language barrier. Definitely. Absolutely. ...If you have an ad for a scouts group or whatever in English, they [non-English or English-limited speakers] don’t know what it’s about, so they wouldn’t feel... they won’t know what it’s about’ (13:39).

Typically, for the [migrant] young person to even find out that the program [that this respondent directs] is out there...to be referred in... somebody in the family would have to be able to speak English’ (2:6).

Compounding these types of widespread English-language communication challenges is, according to respondents, a lack of ability to furnish informational resource materials to young people in languages other than English. This incapacity is, in the minds of many service providers, an additional obstacle in the path to the door of local programmes/services for many young people. Though some attempts have been made to publish such materials in recent years by a number of agencies, some service providers participating in this research believe that these forays have been misdirected and based on erroneous perceptions of service provider and community need. For example, a secondary school teacher discusses his opinion of an informational booklet
on Irish education for migrant students and their families published by The Galway City Partnership (GCP):

They [GCP] were on to us about this booklet for I don’t know how long, and it was going to be fantastic. It was going to be this, that and the other, you know? [It] talked about a typical day in Irish schools and all the rest. It was in four or five languages, including Japanese. ...I don’t know how many Japanese students are in Galway? Maybe one? You know? (17:39).

In the interest of representing the rationale of the publishers of the booklet that this respondent addresses, it is stated that, “information for this booklet has been gathered through documentation and information from the following sources: Department of Education, Jesuit Refugee Service – Ireland, National Education Welfare Board and other statutory/ local agencies” (GCP 2011). One would presume that this consultation was, at least in part, related to appropriate content and language need(s). Also, it is important to note that the languages in which the school induction booklet is actually available for download are English, French, Irish, Polish, Portuguese, Russian and Slovak36. Japanese is not available as one of the downloadable language formats.

The previous example demonstrates that it is not only important to determine what English-language resources are needed for the facilitation of local young people with LEP, but also what resources may already exist. It is also vital to ascertain, in view of the objectives of this research, what resources are perceived by local service providers to exist (or not). With full acknowledgment that there are decided deficits in non-English-language resources in almost any English-speaking society, some resources (like the GCP school induction booklet) are available locally in select non-English languages. However, service providers may not pursue accessing these resources if they have formed misconceptions about what is ‘out there’. In such cases, another problematic gap in communication within local ‘networks of integration’ is illuminated. If service providers are not made aware of what integration resources exist for their use, they may fail to access all potential avenues for facilitating their young service users’ integration.

36 These downloads are available from the Galway City Partnership web site at http://www.gcp.ie/communityBasedYouthInitiatives.htm.
Johnsen et al. (2005:331) assert that -- as highlighted in the discussion of financial resourcing in Section 5.3.2 -- fragmentation in resourcing to caring service provision can cause spaces of care to become fragile and ephemeral. In the context of this discussion, in cases where adequate English-language resources are not made available to direct young people with LEP to programmes and services, or to inform them about these services, potential ‘spaces of integration’ are rendered -- temporarily or intermittently -- inaccessible or ‘invisible’. If this inaccessibility extends over a period of time, these spaces may, effectively, cease to exist for young people whose continued efforts to approach them with limited (or no) help from language resourcing in their native language(s) were met with frustration. Such break-downs of spaces of care also impact the carers within those spaces, in that their attempts to reach (some) vulnerable youth have failed due to resourcing shortfalls outside of their control.

Many service providers participating in this research comment that linguistically-generated gaps in information resourcing within local ‘networks of integration’ that limit youth awareness of, and participation in, local services and programmes also limit awareness of, and participation by, parents with LEP. Many respondents assert that the lack of ability to communicate with migrant parents in their native language(s) may cause them to remain unaware of potential benefits to their child if the young person were to avail of local youth programmes and services. Scenarios of this type are discussed by service providers across youth service sectors:

*I think it could be a language thing for the parents at home. If they’re getting the application form, and if they don’t understand it fully, or they’re uncomfortable contacting us to find out more about the programme…maybe it’s a language thing. Maybe they don’t feel confident enough to pick up the phone and ask questions’ *(2:14). ~Youth organisation director

*We had a group where we had Pakistani mothers. They had absolutely no English skills, or hardly any English skills…. They weren’t really involved with schools. Most [migrant] parents know that education is very important for the kids, but they don’t get really involved. There are many, many, many barriers for them…the lack of knowledge…the lack of language skills’ *(18:22). ~Migrant advocacy worker

These discussions of parental exclusion from participation in their child’s integration based upon language barriers highlight the capacity for ‘spaces of care’ to operate
dualistically (Waters 1992; Cresswell 1996; Parr 2000; Conradson 2003; Johnsen et al. 2005). For young people whose parents are proficient in English, opportunities exist for inclusion in youth activities and programmes that provide caring services. For young people whose parents have LEP, spaces of exclusion -- engendered by resourcing shortfalls -- are experienced in regard to these same activities and programmes.

English-language obstacles to communication with migrant youth and/or their parents are clearly established in the service provision narrative as being of great concern. When service providers discuss instances wherein migrant youth and/or parents do manage to become aware of a local programme or service, and establish youth entry into it, according to respondents, LEP may still present a significant challenge to these young people in engaging with the programme or service. Participants with LEP may experience social isolation in comparison to non-LEP service users due to their inability to equally interact within the service setting in the language of instruction or language of socialisation. Respondents in this research provide numerous examples from their respective programmes wherein youth with LEP have experienced these language-based challenges to participation. A service provider working in a youth drop-in centre recounts a situation in which a young person presenting to her agency exhibited a (perceived) lack of awareness of service offerings within the space due to LEP:

> If you don’t have the [English] language and you don’t have the literacy, it’s crazy. We had a girl in here last week. It was the first time I’ve met her, so I knew very, very little about her. She’s from Turkey, and that girl does not have a word of English. She did not understand one word that I said to her. I mean, she was here for an hour. She didn’t understand a word. And she went away, and I was thinking to myself, “She understood nothing around her!” It’s awful’ (15:22).

Other respondents directing youth programmes recall instances in which LEP created obstacles to engagement:

> Last week we were running workshops, and there was one girl who had no English whatsoever. ...We were teaching, and we just assumed that she understood. ...I suppose she just picked up on what we were showing [in regard to recreational skill instruction] naturally’ (23:5).

> There was a kid there a couple of months ago, and he had no English at all. And that’s quite difficult. He was trying to join
Again, these anecdotes highlight the propensity for spaces of service provision -- meant to be inclusive to all local youth -- to develop within them spaces of exclusion for particular individuals. Where this occurs, the potential for ‘spaces of integration’ to develop within sites of youth service provision is curtailed. This potential -- similarly highlighted in other contexts within this research -- impacts most heavily on already marginalised migrant youth.

When discussing English language-related challenges to engagement with local youth services and programmes faced by migrant youth and/or their families experiencing LEP, street-level service providers highlight a problematic corresponding lack in an information resource that could greatly reduce these barriers -- that is, access to translation and interpretative services. A noted shortage of these services affects service provision capacity across every sector. The effects of this resourcing deficit are felt by young migrant participants and by their parents experiencing LEP, as they often struggle to communicate with youth service providers using scarce or inadequate translation assistance. Oftentimes, translation assistance is absent altogether.

As a result of widespread and severe local shortfalls in translation and interpretive resources, many service providers report relying on the assistance of other youth participants, fluent in both English and the needed translation language, to provide informal translation/interpretation services to youth and their parents with LEP. A local secondary school teacher discusses this ‘solution’ to the translation service shortage in his school:

*We have no translation services at all. They’ve [school administration] been talking about possible translation the last number of years, but we’ve seen nothing. . . .Somebody might come in here at 14 years of age, and can’t say “Hello”. . . .So, we have an ambassadorial system set up with the kids where you’d ask maybe some of the more mature students...will they act as ambassadors for their country, so they can explain to the parents ...maybe somebody from Poland or Uganda or wherever they’re from... as to what the story is, and explain through me or the principal as to what the school is like’* (17:16).
This practice of recruiting ‘informal translators’ is identified by local service providers as an all too common necessity in the course of everyday service provision within increasingly diverse communities. However, many respondents highlight serious ethical and privacy-related implications involved in the street-level employment of this problematic resourcing ‘solution’:

[There were some] parents [who] had no English whatsoever, so we actually had to get a PLC [post-leaving-certificate] student from that country to translate. ... We don’t have the resources, you know? ... So I think the only possible solution is to look at maybe mature PLC students from those countries, and offer them some kind of renumeration [sic] to type up a couple letters and send them home. That’s a ridiculous system as well...very unprofessional. But that’s what we’re left with’ (17:31).

Difficulty could arise with some of them [migrant youth]. … Their parents don’t have English, and they’re then put in a position where they’re interpreting for parents, and it’s just wrong’ (20:32).

In such situations where young people are enlisted as translators or interpreters for other young people, or for their own or other parents, service providers assert that ‘that the child kind of gets lost in the middle’ (3:14). In the context of caring spaces, this propensity constitutes a necessitated change in role for these young people from the cared for to the carer -- albeit temporarily. In being asked to help bridge English-language related gaps in communication emerging within spaces of care, young people (who are, themselves, in need of care are may be experiencing exclusions of their own) are undertaking caring roles for which they may not feel adequately equipped. Conversely, serving as a translator or interpreter may, in some cases, provide migrant youth with a temporary elevation in status within the group -- known as a ‘liminal phase’ (Turner 1969) -- that may engender self confidence, strengthen cultural identity and enhance social interaction with other young people in the group (Bramadat 2001). This potential for both positive and negative outcomes highlights, yet again, the way(s) in which ‘spaces of care’ can effectively include some whilst excluding others (Waters 1992; Cresswell 1996; Parr 2000; Conradson 2003; Johnsen et al. 2005).
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As a result of the problems associated with migrant youth acting as translators and interpreters for parents and/or other youth with LEP, several local organisations report attempts to recruit a corps of trained, adult translators/interpreters who could be utilised in such circumstances:

*The solution we’re trying to put in place is to train up a panel of interpreters specifically to work within the community sector...one of the main areas being within the education sector’ (3:13).*

*I ran an interpretation and translation course for immigrants. ... I’ll be working at trying to form a coop for them. ... So, it will be like self-employment for them, but at the same time, providing a service to government and other agencies’ (10:7).*

These proposals to mitigate a wide-spread information resourcing shortfall, if properly funded, have the potential to address future translation/interpretation needs across various youth services sectors. For the time being, however, current constraints leave local service providers struggling with inadequate, once-off ‘solutions’ to a significant resourcing problem. This gap in the street-level resourcing *tableau* illuminates further gaps in local ‘spaces and/or networks of integration’ in Galway City.

The overwhelming voice within the service provision narrative given to issues relating to the under-resourcing of English-language support services within local youth service provision is not unexpected in light of previously discussed financial resourcing deficits and given the State’s retreating involvement in the provision of this, and other, social services. Resourcing shortfalls in the area of English-language support place a greater amount of focus on the formal education sector than to deficits in other resourcing categories. In times past (when education budgets were not so constrained they are now), language support services for youth and their parents would have been expected to be furnished, in large part, by the formal education sector. However, due to successive cut-backs to education budgets over recent years, service provider respondents in this research identify a growing demand for English-language support resources within non-school-based organisations. These new demands place additional strain on already under-resourced and over-burdened service providers and agencies in
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the informal education and non-educational sectors to provide unprecedented services and resources within local youth programmes.

Due to the recentness of this demand for language support services within local youth service, some service provider respondents reveal that they are not yet fully versed in the acquisition of such resources for young service users (in cases where their own organisation does not furnish them). The discussion of a service provider working in a youth drop-in facility reflects this uncertainty:

_The Literacy Service down the road…where is it? _
_Merchant’s House? Merchant’s Road? I don’t know. It’s just down there. …I’m not sure. I know they leave posters and stuff up for where they [youth with LEP] can go to get language or things like that. …I do know that some of the lads that have come in here would have already been there …so they find out about them some way’ (15:24).

This lack of knowledge regarding availability of language support resources within youth service sectors outside of formal education illustrates another gap forming within emerging local ‘networks of care’ for youth. As with other highlighted ‘holes in the network’, these gaps impact on both carers and the cared for. Certain young people are not able to fully engage with services/programmes being offered due to exclusions engendered by English-language-skill deficits, whilst carers are further burdened by resourcing tasks (in attempting to locate and access appropriate language supports); again, reducing time available for caring interactions with youth. In view of the on-going commitment to the subject of care required of such interactions (Tronto 1989:282), these street-level information resourcing realities are, then, again, implicated in shaping “conditions of work” that curtail the development of ‘spaces of care’.

5.8 CHAPTER CONCLUSIONS
This chapter discussion has addressed a second dimension of street-level “conditions of work” for service providers in Galway City. This resourcing _tableau_ combines with service provider conceptualisations of ‘integration’ -- as discussed in Chapter 4 -- to substantially inform the local setting in which service providers practice to ‘deliver integration’ to local youth. Indeed, resourcing has been shown to have wide-ranging implications in regard to the capacities of service providers to develop and implement
everyday integration practice. Particularly, in view of the objectives of this research, resourcing shortfalls have been constructed as influential constraints to the development of ‘spaces of care’ within which service providers can engage in caring interactions with ‘needy’ migrant youth. In fact, as a result of resourcing-related curtailments, spaces of care that do develop locally are quite fragile -- sometimes even ephemeral -- in nature. This ephemerality can preclude the sort of on-going interactions between service providers (carers) and youth (the cared for) shown to be critical to the relational act of caring. Where spaces of care do emerge, and are sustained, resourcing shortfalls have been shown in this chapter discussion to engender spaces of exclusion within them for certain individuals.

Taken together, then, Chapters 4 and 5 substantially illuminate the setting within which everyday youth integration services are delivered in Galway City. Building upon this discussion of street-level “conditions of work”, Chapter 6 will elaborate specific ways in which service providers attempt to operationalise their (often highly individualised) understandings of ‘integration’ as they engage in everyday practice. In view of the objectives in this research, this practice will be analysed with regard to broadening conceptualisations of care and the way in which this relational act impacts on, and is impacted by, the spaces in which it occurs. In doing so, relationships between integration -- as a caring facilitation of well-being for migrant youth -- and place will be better understood.
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6.1 INTRODUCTION

Taken together, the discussion in Chapters 4 and 5 has elaborated the “conditions of work” (Lipsky 2010) that significantly inform youth service provider capacity to ‘do integration’ at the street level. These conditions have been discussed as the result of enablements and constraints engendered by a range of factors. On the one hand, in the absence of a clear and cohesive body of national integration policy, service providers employ autonomy and discretion to, in large part, construct their own understandings of ‘integration’ -- and those who ‘need integrating’ -- at the street level. These constructions are informed significantly by internalised, practical Orientalisms that serve to position migrants as ‘foreigners’ from ‘out there’ to whom membership in an imagined nation of Ireland is aspirational; perhaps, not even attainable. On the other hand, the ability to operationalise these highly individualised conceptualisations of migrants and ‘integration’ in the form of everyday integration service delivery practice at the street level is constrained by severe resourcing shortfalls across a range of categories. So, in other words, though local service providers are imbued with certain capacities that allow them to act, to a large degree, as de facto integration policy-makers within their respective local agencies, these capacities are simultaneously curtailed by resourcing realities.

The street-level integration practice emerging within the dualistic working conditions described is at the heart of this investigation. This chapter discussion will elaborate this practice in view of several themes identified within the service provision narrative. These themes illuminate the complexity of ways in which service providers in Galway City operationalise a problematic concept; thereby (re)creating, not only de facto integration policy, but also ‘spaces of integration’ for local young people. Further, service provider choices to minimise the need for integration amongst youth at the street level are highlighted as another form of ‘policy-making’ that, in effect, then, fails to create such spaces; thereby curtailing the development of a caring integration network within the city. The thematic frame employed in developing this discussion includes focuses on: (1) access to integration services/programmes for local youth, and (2) the most common locally employed strategies for ‘doing integration’ -- (a) emphasising ‘sameness’ and an associated ‘do nothing’ approach,
(b) suppressing cultural difference via ‘social mixing’ of youth from diverse backgrounds and (c) the display and performance of cultural identity.

6.2 ACCESSING YOUTH SERVICES

Before embarking upon any specific strategies for the ‘delivery of integration’ to local youth, service providers at the street level must first make determinations regarding the specific youth population(s) to whom they intend to target such services. Sometimes, (as discussed in Chapter 5), these decisions are determined by resourcing constraints. In a two-way fashion, resourcing informs both outreach capacity on the part of local youth service agencies attempting to recruit youth interest (see Section 5.4.1), and also curtails youth capacity to move toward youth programme/service offerings (see Section 5.7). However, sometimes, as highlighted by Lipsky (2010), street-level decisions can be more discretionary in nature. When such discretion is exercised by service providers in decisions regarding youth access to local services and programmes, access to integration -- as embedded within these youth services -- may be differentially granted. In this chapter discussion, as a preface to the elaboration of street-level strategies for ‘doing integration’, these discretionary-type street-level decisions are examined. This examination is critical in that service provider decisions to target or extend services/programming to certain youth and not to others constitute, in effect, a key facet of emerging local youth integration strategy and practice with which this chapter is concerned.

6.2.1 TARGET AGE REMITS

Respondents in this research, in their discussions of everyday youth work practice, reveal that access to programmes and services for youth is not uniform across various youth populations within Galway City. One way in which this lack of uniformity is manifest is in regard to age remit. Indeed, respondents assert that, often, decisions regarding target youth population(s) for any particular service or programme revolve around age cohorts. These age-related remits -- along with other participation criteria -- are sometimes dictated by funders from above (as discussed in Section 5.3.3), but, other times, they are determined by service providers in response to perceived local youth need. In either case, decisions regarding age requirements for participation in youth services/programming contribute to the creation of spaces of inclusion for
young people of certain ages, whilst creating spaces of exclusion for young people who fall outside chosen age remits. In view of these impacts, decisions regarding age remits made by street-level service providers bear significant implications for the questions under investigation in this research.

Definitions of ‘youth’ embraced widely within the Irish youth work sector encompass ages 12-25 (personal communication, 2011\(^\text{37}\)). Similarly, in the international academic literature, individuals in the 18-25 year old cohort have been identified as ‘youth’ who are embarking upon pathways to adulthood that are decidedly more problematic and complex than those followed by youth in previous generations (Wyn and White 1997; Jones 2002; Webster et al. 2004; Mayock and Carr 2008). For young people experiencing this transition, the procession to adulthood can be extended in nature if access to familial supports, (e.g., housing, financial assistance, access to higher education) is available (Arnett 2000; Jones 2002). However, for young people who have become marginalised for a variety of reasons, (e.g., homelessness, migration, family dysfunction, school-leaving), this progression to adulthood can become ‘fractured’ (Coles and Craig 1999), extremely complex (MacDonald et al. 2001) and chaotic (Ward et al. 2003). Indeed, in the absence of familial or other social supports, these young people -- who frequently are not engaged in education or employment -- have decreased power to shape their lives and face, “enormous obstacles in their efforts to move successfully into adulthood” (Jones 2002:23). These obstacles include increased unemployment, decreased access to third-level education and high rates of poverty (Mayock and Carr 2008). As a result of these pressures, young people in this age cohort are found to suffer increased risk of physical and mental health problems (Bonvin and Moachon 2008).

In view of research findings concerning the marginalisation of 18-25 year olds coming from ‘chaotic’ and/or ‘fractured’ experience, young people in this age cohort are identified as particularly ‘needy’ of youth services and supports (Stein 2004; Courtney et al. 2005; Cashmore and Paxman 2006; Bonvin and Moachon 2008;  

\(^{37}\) This information was gained through follow-up email communication with Respondent 24. In order to protect respondent anonymity, further details of this communication cannot be cited. However, this information is included in the discussion because of this respondent’s capacity -- given her professional role -- to speak on national trends and broad understandings within Irish youth work.
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Mayock and Carr 2008). In the specific context of this research, migrant youth from 18-25 -- who, often-times, have a ‘fractured’ history due to migration and associated disruptions -- can, then, be viewed as a population in particular need of extended youth services. However, despite this identified need, data emerging from this research reveals that many Galway City youth programmes and services establish the upper age limit for youth participation at well under 25:

*Our project works with young people from the age of 9 up to 18 (14:1).*

*[Name of youth programme] operates like an adolescent support project, but the target group is specifically teenagers (4:1).*

*We have 8-20 [in the youth group]. That’s our age limit (23:9).*

Discordances between street-level determinations of ‘youth’ status and actual youth need bear significant and specific implications for migrant youth and youth from other marginalised populations; in that young people who find themselves pushed to the margins in their late teens may become socially excluded in the long term -- possibly permanently (Blackman 1997; Roberts 1997; Williamson 1997). This exclusion and vulnerability can potentially be mitigated by caring service provision to individuals within this youth cohort, but if this care is not extended, these young people may fail to transition successfully to independent living (Elsley et al. 2007). Subsequently, this critical need for service provision directed toward marginalised ‘older youth’ has been addressed in recent years by a number of organisations and agencies. In the Irish context, for example, the NYCI specifically focussed on this issue at a recent annual conference. A respondent attending this conference emphasises that, ‘it is obviously harder to engage that [older] age group [as opposed to younger cohorts], but it is hugely important’ (personal communication, 201138).

Several local service provider respondents participating in this research echo the National Youth Council’s stance on the importance of opportunities for ‘older youth’ -- particularly older migrant youth -- engagement in youth services. However, these

---

38 In order to protect anonymity, the respondent making this comment (in follow-up communication to an interview) cannot be further identified. The conference referenced occurred in November, 2010 in County Dublin.
workers also similarly highlight the difficulties inherent in doing so. In her narrative, a youth group director highlights the lack of opportunity for local ‘older youth’ to engage in spaces that do not incorporate the drinking culture of young Ireland:

*It’s a huge issue. There’s not really a middle ground for young people in Galway who would prefer to socialise without alcohol being in the picture. That’s very, very difficult. I’ve had many people come to me that are outside of that [teen] age group that would like to be in a safe space. So, I really do find that to be a problem. … I think there is a major need in Galway’*(25:3).

Though identifying a deficit in local spaces for ‘older youth’, this respondent goes on to explain that there are obstacles to correcting for this deficiency. She asserts that, if older youth were included in the programming her organisation offers, the large age span (then encompassed) within the group could become problematic:

*Most youth groups are not that big of a [age] stretch. You know, it goes maybe to 18 or 17. So, with that, we have to be quite strict. So it does make it very difficult* (25:3).

Respondents participating in this research also note that, even when decisions are made to include older youth (in a group setting with younger age cohorts), engaging with these ‘older’ individuals can be problematic. Indeed, most interviewees report that their current service user group profiles are skewed toward young people in their early teen and pre-teen years. Perceived reasons for these participation trends range from waning interest on the part of older teens, to preferences on the part of directors and volunteers to work with younger teens and adolescents rather than older youth:

*The majority of people we get in the project are aged between 10 and kind of 13 or 14. We’re always trying to get the older teenagers, but the majority is the pre-teens...kind of 9, 10, 11, 12’* (14:8).

*Once a kid hits 16, 17, 18...we wouldn’t have as many of them at that age involved, because it's not ‘cool’ then. ...The numbers would be, I’d say, skewed toward kind of 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15-year olds’* (21:105).

*You have very few [participants] in secondary [school ages]. So you’d have maybe a handful. We don’t run any specific programme with them. ...That was because of both...that was what the volunteers wanted, and the older kids didn’t seem to be that interested* (20:4).
Given that local youth services are extended much more readily to young people up to (around) age 18, and are significantly withheld from ‘older youth’, spaces in which the caring facilitation of integration -- *vis-à-vis* youth programming -- is (potentially) enacted are, therefore, also curtailed for individuals over 18. This street level trend introduces a duality into spaces of youth service provision that -- as highlighted in the context of resourcing constraints -- effectively excludes some individuals (based on age), whilst including others. However, a critical difference exists between spaces of care that are constrained by resourcing considerations as opposed to those constrained by age limits. In the former case, there is at least a potential for these spaces to become intermittently accessible to some youth if various types of resources periodically become more available. In the case of age-related curtailments to spaces of youth care, however, the bounds of accessibility are set and will not change (unless age-limit decisions are to be reconsidered). In view of the fact that many of the local migrant youth with whom this study is concerned are already highly marginalised and at risk of falling victim to a myriad of negative social outcomes, the enduring exclusivity of these spaces for these particular 18-25 year-olds is even more problematic.

**6.2.2 SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND ACCESS TO STREET-LEVEL YOUTH SERVICES**

In addition to decisions made regarding age limits on youth service access, another factor that conditions youth access to integration via street-level services and programmes are the cooperative links (or lack thereof) formed between the education sector and the youth work sector. This cross-sector networking warrants focus as a street-level integration strategy because the pro-active establishment of such networks -- or the failure to do so -- is, in many cases, a matter of discretionary choice that impacts directly on youth access to ‘spaces of integration’. Further, the discussion of ‘networks of care’ in this chapter will show that their development (or lack thereof) is highly variable across Galway City and is heavily influenced by the decision-making of individual service providers and agencies.
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In view of previously identified tendencies for many street-level youth service agencies outside of formal education to focus recruitment efforts and programming decision-making on the teen-aged cohort, local secondary schools become important avenues of access to potential service users. A director of a local youth centre highlights this connection in her discussion of youth recruitment within her organisation:

Because most young people are in school, schools would be our big link [to potential youth service users] (22:32).

This obvious linkage becomes central to discussions of the provision of integration when recent State policy directives regarding interculturalism are considered. For example, in the Intercultural Education Strategy, 2010-2015, service providers working within both the youth work and formal education sectors are charged with advancing national integration initiatives and are positioned as partners in that endeavour. Enshrining this partnership, the Strategy addresses the youth work sector as a provider of “informal education”, and states that there are already good practice examples of agencies within this sector forming strong links with local schools (Department of Education and Skills 2010:34). The continued development of these relationships is encouraged in the Strategy; asserting that the policy piece will help to further an intercultural learning environment within both sectors (ibid).

Despite identified links -- and aspirations for growth in relationships -- between secondary schools and (informal) youth service agencies, many respondents participating in this research assert that existing relationships between local schools and the youth work sector in Galway City are less than ‘open’ or cooperative. Specifically, several respondents identify overt reluctance on the part of local secondary schools to interact to any significant degree with youth work agencies -- particularly when it is for the stated purpose of furthering integration. In view of the fact that the youth services being examined in this research are those targeted (in large part) toward secondary school-aged youth, this trend is of import. Several service providers working in the youth work sector highlight this reluctance to engage on the part of secondary school staff by contrasting local secondary schools with (perceivably) more cooperative primary schools:
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The operators of the primary schools are more open than those of the secondary schools [to working cooperatively with youth work agencies]’ (1:8)

The primary schools, in the main, are easier to work with. ...It’s easier to get into primary schools. What you could offer in terms of intercultural activities or workshops on human rights...they were more acceptable in the primary curriculum. ...When you get into the secondary schools, people aren’t quite so open’ (7:12).

The primary [school level] seems to be much better than the secondary [school level at forming cooperative relationships with youth agencies] (3:17).

When secondary teacher respondents are asked to discuss bridging with the youth work sector for the purposes of furthering integration, however, a different picture is painted. Decidedly less active descriptions of a reluctance to build relationships are provided, and shortfalls in this area are constructed, rather, as more passive failures for such interactions to be ‘on the radar’:

I haven’t heard of anything like that happening at the moment with the school communicating with any outside [youth work] organisations. But it could be something, I suppose, that could be looked at if there was [integration] issues arising. ...But at the moment, I’m not aware of any communication with other organisations. But it definitely could be something very positive (3:34).

Respondents working in the youth work sector, however, are wary of believing this sort of ‘unintended’ lack of participation in cross-sector networks. Instead, many service providers outside the formal education sector assert that individuals working within education often actively choose not to engage with the youth work sector. The highly discretionary and individualistic nature of these street-level choices is seen by many service providers in the youth work sector as problematic, in that they never know what sort of reception to expect when approaching education staff (particularly principals) at various schools within the city in regard to accessing students for participation in integration-related programming:

That ‘ad hoc-ery’ comes in, because you could have a principal who is supportive...a principal who is open. And you could have a principal who isn’t. We had a project for two years which was looking at developing a profile of ethnic...
minority children in Galway. Looking at what their needs were in the education system. The worker that we had working on that project...some schools wouldn’t let him in. ... But then other schools would be completely open. We had another worker ...and she did human rights education in schools, with specific reference to minority communities...But again, she found some schools more welcoming than others (7:12).

For the project, I was contacting schools. I think it really comes down to the personality of the principal. You know, it’s not so much about the school, but really, if the principal is interested in integrating young people or students from new communities, then the initiatives are really good, and they were really helpful for my project... and really encourage students ...to participate in the project. ...But also, there are schools where nothing is happening. And even just taking in students from new communities could be a challenge for them, and they wouldn’t be interested at all. So, it’s down to the personality of the principal, which is really a shame. ...The Department for Education has intercultural strategies, and it’s really time for this to come out and be implemented in all the schools, and not be down to preferences of individuals (18:16).

It’s [the level of cooperation with this worker’s youth programme] generally down to personnel. Typically it would be schools that maybe have a school completion officer or a home-school liaison officer who would hear about the program and just think it’s something good, and they would then go and tell it to the school principal (2:12).

These highly discretionary choices on the part of individual school principals (and other school staff) to cooperate (or not) with service providers in the informal education or youth work sector in the delivery of youth integration services have far-reaching implications for the development of local ‘networks of care’. If networks within which integration is (potentially) facilitated contain significant gaps, (e.g., entire schools failing to engage with the network), large numbers of young people may be denied access to local ‘spaces of integration’. As care is a relational activity requiring on-going interactions between carers and the cared for (Tronto 1989:282), this lack of access to durable networks (as sites of care) is problematic. Further, in contrast to previous discussions of gaps in local ‘networks of care’ as a form of resourcing shortfall that is largely outside the control of individual service providers,
in this discussion, the gaps are being created by individual discretionary choice to refrain from cross-sector engagement. This exercising of street-level discretion (Lipsky 2010), in effect then, produces spaces of exclusion for young people who attend schools managed by staff ‘opting out’ of local networks of care. Simultaneously, young people attending other schools may find themselves included in the same networks; highlighting, once again, the (potentially) dualistic nature of ‘spaces of care’ (Waters 1992; Cresswell 1996; Parr 2000; Conradson 2003; Johnsen et al. 2005).

6.2.3 ‘NEEDY’ YOUTH AND ACCESS TO INTEGRATION SERVICES

Another way in which service providers discretionarily influence youth access to integration services at the street level is through the determination of ‘neediness’ on the part of particular young people. In their discussions, many respondents report that ‘needly’ status is typically initially assigned to a young person by a local professional such as a teacher or social worker who identifies an issue or problematic circumstance with which the young person is challenged. Subsequently, the young person -- once assigned ‘needy’ status -- is made known (through the referral process discussed in Section 5.4.1) to other service providers working within the city as an individual who may benefit from further services:

We might target school-age children who are going through the care system, early school-leavers...that kind of really high-need, high-risk category (15:1).

We [staff in this service provider’s programme] come across families where a lot of them would be involved in social services already’ (2:4).

Young people would be referred to me from community care...from schools, from counsellors. At that stage, I would do a needs assessment. They’ve been referred for a reason (4:4).

As discussed in Section 4.4, when working with migrant youth specifically -- though arguably a form of labelling -- a service provider may strategically assign ‘needy’ status to a particular young person in the interest of garnering resources for her/his care. Similarly, when determining youth access to programming/services, (in the case of both migrant and non-migrant youth), certain individuals will be designated as
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‘needy’ of access to local programming. This, then, causes youth not determined to be ‘needy’ to become disadvantaged with regard to access. These differential outcomes can be viewed as a direct result of street-level service provider discretion.

In his theorisations of street-level bureaucracies, Lipsky (2010) addresses decision-making amongst service providers that effectively differentiates service users. Lipsky asserts that street-level service providers make these decisions as part of their everyday practice; reducing individuals to her or his qualifications for intervention (ibid:105). In this respect, then, service providers are set a task of developing appropriate sets of categories in terms of which people will be dealt (ibid). In the context of this research, service providers making differentiated decisions to assign ‘needy’ status to certain youth -- whilst refraining from identifying others as such -- can be seen to establish the categories within which these young people will engage (or not) with local youth services. Lipsky posits that this process is akin to the ‘mapping’ of clients in terms of their qualifying or disqualifying characteristics (ibid).

This process of ‘mapping’ clients at the street level occurs for a variety of reasons, according to Lipsky. Service providers may do so in order to select those individuals whom they believe will ‘succeed’ most overtly with the benefit of services. In doing so, the providing agency achieves success by proxy; thereby increasing its chances of maintaining support from funders (ibid:106). In view of the fact that most of the agencies represented by respondents in this research are already severely under-funded, this motivation seems plausible when considering possible reasons for identifying ‘needy’ status in some youth but not others. Lipsky asserts that differentiation amongst potential service beneficiaries may also be attributed to service provider preference for some individuals over others (ibid). In other words, service providers may, in fact, derive greater satisfaction in interacting with some clients over others and are imbued with discretionary opportunities to do so (ibid). Though none of the respondents interviewed in this research identified such preferences for working with particular young people, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that they may, nonetheless, exist.
The afore-described process of differentiating between (potential) service users at the street level is problematic in view of national youth integration policy directives stating that all young people in Ireland -- not just migrant youth -- should participate in a ‘two-way process’ of integration (IWGIRI 1999). Given that, (a) only certain young people are identified as ‘needy’ of integration (and/or other youth services) by street-level service providers, and (b) the broader youth population that remains outside this ‘needy’ sub-group are not widely recruited to participate in youth programming by currently inadequate levels of more generalised outreach (as discussed in Section 5.4.1), large segments of the local youth population may be experiencing reduced access to local ‘spaces of integration’. This disparity in access, once again, highlights the way in which these caring spaces, then, operate dualistically to include certain youth whilst excluding others (Parr et al. 2004).

It is, at this juncture, prudent to highlight once again that the potential for ‘spaces of integration’ to be exclusionary is of particular significance to already marginalised migrant youth who may be experiencing LEP, do not have access to adequate financial resources (e.g., asylum-seeking youth), or have undergone trauma and may be experiencing associated decreases in assertiveness and self-esteem. Any or all of these exigencies could greatly reduce the likelihood of these young people approaching youth services on their own. Further, when interrogated through Lipsky’s bureaucratic framework, these particular young people constitute just the sort of ‘clients’ that may be ‘avoided’ by service providers in favour of extending services to less vulnerable youth who may be seen as more likely to flourish and ‘succeed’ within a youth programme. Therefore, a (potential) failure to be identified as ‘needy’ of youth services -- including integration services -- could exclude these vulnerable young migrants and cause them to become victims of localised ‘cracks in care’.

6.3 STREET-LEVEL INTEGRATION PRACTICE: A PATCHWORK OF APPROACHES

Despite the afore-discussed ways in which youth can be excluded from access to services and programming at the street level, many young people do find their way to the door of agencies (and certainly to schools) providing ‘care’ in various forms.
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Once engaged with these programmes or services -- across all youth service sectors -- young people are exposed to a variety of practices of care by individual service providers. It is this range of practice that is the focus of the remainder of this chapter discussion. Specifically, in view of the questions being investigated in this research, what is of particular interest are the ways in which this everyday service provider practice (re)creates (or fails to) ‘spaces of integration’ within these more broadly imagined ‘spaces of care’.

In responding to recently emerging “diversity dilemmas” (Hagelund 2009) within an increasingly multicultural Ireland, results from this research indicate that local youth service providers are developing multi-dimensional “response repertoires” (ibid) within their everyday practice that allow them to engage with youth of diverse backgrounds and to ‘deliver integration’ as part of that work. As Hagelund (2009) highlights in her research examining street-level service providers in Norway, such repertoires vary amongst service providers. Moreover, they are often employed differentially with regard to particular situations and service users -- even within the practice of the same service provider at different times. In the context of this research, this variance is most effectively interrogated through a framework consisting of the two main strategic pathways to street-level ‘integration’ identified by respondents: (1) to treat all youth ‘the same’; thereby eliminating the need for integration in favour of creating ‘unified spaces’ for all youth, and (2) to create opportunities for cultural performance in order to facilitate the creation of ‘intercultural spaces’ for both migrant and non-migrant service users. These two broad approaches, and specific practices associated with them, will be elaborated in the remainder of this chapter discussion.

6.4 ‘WE’RE ALL THE SAME’: ‘DO NOTHING’ INTEGRATION

Within everyday ‘integration practice’ emerging across Galway City, interview data from this research reveals that “response repertoires” enacted to ‘provide integration’ sometimes involve simply injecting new intercultural sensitivities into extant youth programming. Other times, service providers make efforts to address integration as an explicit agenda within everyday programming or service offerings. However, a significant number of respondents in this research identify in their narratives a
preference for taking *neither* of these approaches to the fulfilment of national integration directives. Instead, this group of service providers choose to employ a sort of ‘non-strategy’ based on a belief that the ‘provision of integration’ may not, in fact, be necessary or prudent in a youth service context. This belief is based, largely, on a collective assertion amongst this group of service providers that young people of all backgrounds have a desire to be treated ‘the same’, and that integration is a process that will happen ‘naturally’ without proactive effort. In view of the questions being interrogated in this research, this ‘non-strategy’ warrants examination as a conscious choice amongst service providers to refrain from the active construction of ‘spaces of integration’ within youth service venues.

When asked to discuss their approach to addressing integration within the scope of the youth service(s) or programme(s) they deliver, several service providers interviewed in this research reveal a preference for minimising -- or even ignoring -- racial /ethno-cultural differences amongst the youth with whom they engage. Instead, these respondents employ an approach wherein ‘we’re all the same’ becomes the favoured refrain. This group of workers collectively report that this practice contributes to group cohesiveness whilst better facilitating non-integration-oriented service delivery goals. This ‘non-strategy’ for addressing cultural diversity is quite antithetical to recommendations emerging from research focussing on interculturalism in youth services and education, however (Smith 1997; Chamberlain 2005; Department of Education and Skills 2010; NYCI 2011). In light of this divergence from established ‘good intercultural practice’, a closer examination of these service providers’ ‘non-recognition’ of diversity is warranted.

Recently published good practice guidelines for intercultural youth work highlight the importance of recognising that all people are individuals and stress the importance of acknowledging and valuing each person’s cultural identity (NYCI 2011). Similar tenets are embraced within intercultural good practice guidelines emanating from the education sector. For example, the newly published *Intercultural Education Strategy (2010-2015)* (Department of Education and Skills 2010:introduction) for Ireland calls for, “all students to experience an education that respects the diversity of values, beliefs, languages and traditions in Irish society”, and directs educators to ensure that
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an “intercultural learning environment becomes the norm” in their schools and classrooms. Recent academic research similarly supports the recognition of cultural difference when working with young people. Outley and Witt (2006) state that this recognition on the part of youth service providers is required to rectify historically inadequate attention to culturally-based differences amongst youth in perception, behaviour, value orientation, identity, language, religious beliefs and family structure. These researchers assert that understanding how these differences influence the types of programmes and services that youth want and need is of utmost importance (ibid).

In view of the afore-mentioned research findings and advocacy recommendations regarding service provider acknowledgment of, and respect for, youth cultural differences, current ‘good practice’ guidelines subsequently suggest that service providers strive to become more ‘culturally competent’ when designing and implementing youth programming. ‘Cultural competence’ is defined as, “a set of behaviours, attitudes, and policies that enable a system, agency or professional to work effectively in cross-cultural situations” (Isaacs and Benjamin 1991). In view of significant recent interest in this phenomenon within the literature across a number of disciplines, scholars have taken on the task of devising measures for it (Greenholtz 2000; McAllister and Irvine 2000; Boyle and Springer 2001; Johnson et al. 2006). Mason’s (1993) continuum of cultural competence is one such model devised for this purpose. It is beyond the scope of this research to attempt measurement of cultural competencies present within local youth service programmes using this (or other) scale(s). However, the illumination of issues related to cultural competence (as highlighted in respondent narratives) is facilitated by discussion of the third level of Mason’s (ibid) scale; the level of “colour blindness”.

Mason (ibid) states that, in the context of service provision, at the level of ‘blindness’ to cultural difference, services are provided with the express intent of being unbiased. At this level, service providers function as if culture makes no difference and all people are ‘the same’. In effect, then, ‘colour-blindness’ is used as a way of thinking that is organised around an effort not to ‘see’ or acknowledge differences (Frankenberg 1993). Despite the positively-intended avoidance of bias motivating this approach, empirical findings caution that practicing ‘colour-blindness’ may
communicate subtle messages to people from certain groups that they are not valued or not welcome (Mason 1993). Other researchers echo Mason’s concern, stating that claims to not ‘see’ colour, and attempts to disregard ethnicity, may be rationalised as fair and desirable practice for treating children equally (Moon et al. 2009:80), but there is a fallacy in this belief (Delpit 1995). Delpit (ibid) asserts that, if professionals working with young people do not ‘see colour’, they do not really see children.

A significant body of research addresses this propensity for some service providers to claim ‘colour blindness’ in their work with ethnic minority young people. Findings by these scholars suggest that, in doing so, what these workers are, in effect, doing is ascribing to and perpetuating a normative standard of ‘whiteness’ to which all practice defers (Cochran-Smith 1995; Nieto 2000; Solomon et al. 2003; Sefa Dei 2008). In other words, where ethnic and cultural differences are ignored for the sake of ‘neutrality’, what becomes ‘neutral’ is a white, middle-class norm in which other cultures must be located (Bhabha 1990). In this way, claims of ‘colour-blindness’ mask a disposition toward, “perpetuating inequality through an expectation for young people to assimilate into ‘mainstream culture’, (i.e., the white, middle-class)” (Solomon et al. 2003:22). This expectation systematically ensures the reproduction of a racialised status quo (Sefa Dei 2008), and can set up both service providers and service users for conflict and misunderstanding; as culturally defined definitions and expectations of behaviour will not always mesh with the established ‘mainstream’ norm (Moon et al. 2009:82).

Despite the problematic nature of the ‘colour-blind’ approach, as argued by scholars, many respondents in this research rationalise its use by citing (perceived) preferences of youth participants themselves as the genesis for service provider choice to ‘downplay’ youth diversity. Many street-level youth workers state that ethnic minority/migrant young people with whom they work would rather be recognised simply as ‘young people’, rather than as young people from particular racial or ethno-cultural backgrounds that carry with them unique sets of experiences and values:

_They [ethnic minority/migrant youth] are just young people. I think they just want to be seen as young people and they don’t want to be distinguished too much (17:26)._
I’m familiar, in particular, with one [migrant] guy that’s involved in our group. He actually doesn’t even really want to be associated with the country that he’s from. So, even talking about it…even if somebody meets him for the first time and they ask him what country he’s from… he actually doesn’t really [want to talk about it] (25:14).

These assertions of a (perceived) youth desire to avoid being ‘singled out’ based on racial or ethno-cultural background are often further rationalised by service providers in arguing that the young people, themselves, do not recognise differences amongst them but, rather, view one another as ‘all the same’:

You have all these different children in together and they really don’t see the colour of skin or black and white and stuff like that. It’s not an issue to them (11:52).

I think, as a child, you’re unaware of barriers and you’re unaware of negative perceptions. You’re just a kid. It doesn’t matter what colour your skin is (3:28).

I think, the young people I work with, they don’t care where you come from. It just never comes up in conversation…so it’s never an issue for them (23:34).

If you’re in school with a lad and he’s black and you’re white…he’s Chinese…it doesn’t really matter. You’re all just friends and that’s grand (21:65).

Despite significantly widespread belief amongst service providers participating in this research that young people do not ‘see colour’ and do not want (or need) recognition of difference, research finds evidence to the contrary. Rastas (2005:157) states that even though children are often said to be ‘colour blind’, they do, in fact, notice differences such as skin colour, and learn very early that these differences can be turned against them or other individuals. Respondents in this research who do not advocate the ‘colour-blind’ approach echo these empirical findings, as they express unease with their peers’ assumptions of youth indifference to racial/ethno-cultural diversity. Rather, these service providers maintain that young people do recognise cultural (and other) differences and need access to spaces wherein they can engage with and discuss these differences. A teacher respondent asserts that ethnic minority/migrant young

---

39 The ‘ideology of colour-blindness’ has been widely critiqued by scholars in education, psychology and sociology. For more in-depth discussions of the problematic nature of this ideology, see Katz (1973;2003); Lewis (2001); Schofield (2001) and Ebert (2004).
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people in Ireland are ‘bombarded by Irish culture and the Irish way’, and, therefore, need to talk about issues related to cultural identity, ‘in an open set-up or group so they can communicate their ideas’ (14:31). A youth worker similarly discusses a need for ethnic minority/migrant youth to be recognised as individuals with unique backgrounds and experiences:

We ['Irish’ and ‘non-Irish’] are both human beings. We’re both the same, but we have different cultures and different things are important to us (4:34).

Divergence in service provider opinion regarding the need (or lack thereof) for recognition of ethno-cultural difference amongst young service users is particularly notable in the narratives of two respondents participating in this research. These interviewees articulate this issue so compellingly that a side-by-side comparison (See Table 6.1) of their discussions provides an exceptional opportunity to analyse the debate regarding ‘colour-blindness’ and recognition of difference, and the implications thereof for the delivery of youth programmes and services.
Chapter 6: ‘Doing Integration’ at the Street Level: Access and Strategies

Table 6.1: Divergence of service provider opinion regarding ‘sameness’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent 17 – Secondary School Teacher</th>
<th>Respondent 6 – Anti-Racism and Development Education Worker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘They [young people] don’t care if you’re luminous green or from Pluto’ (17:4).</td>
<td>‘I believe that they [young people] do see skin colour. ... Of course they see skin colour! I find it bizarre that we think children will say, “That plant is green.” or “That car is red.” ... “That person is... NOTHING.”? So, I don’t think it’s true that they don’t see skin colour. I think what we’re saying is, we hope they don’t see the inequalities associated with skin colour. That’s our dearest wish, but it’s fanciful’ (6:28).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘We [referring to himself and his teaching approach] try to show the commonality of what goes on around the world’ (17:6).</td>
<td>‘I think...it’s like ...we’re [people from various racial/ethno-cultural backgrounds] all meant to be on this sort of even field now, and ignore the heritage that we brought to it (6:6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I think what when people make a big issue of where you’re from...that highlights difference. They keep going on about celebrating difference, when realistically...people are the same. You just reword it and celebrate similarity. I think when people celebrate difference, the more people see you as different’ (17:32).</td>
<td>‘In some cases, it can be more, “Yeah, sure, we’re all the same. We’re all Irish now.” ... There’s a kind of taboo in some places about putting too much attention on diversity...not to look at ways in which some of our differences can really mean that we’re subjected to quite hideous discrimination (6:19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘You just have to highlight...people are people’ (17:43).</td>
<td>‘Our best effort, in many cases, is “we’re all the same”. I think that’s our best thinking because, frankly, we’re terrified most of the time to actually delve into issues with our children that we haven’t looked at ourselves’ (6:31).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite significantly widespread belief amongst service providers interviewed in this research that ignoring and/or minimising racial, ethnic and cultural differences amongst youth is a valid integration strategy, there is a notable use of language by these respondents in their narratives that is quite antithetical to such beliefs. Table 6.2
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highlights this discordance. Respondent passages in the first column reflect the belief that youth are fundamentally ‘all the same’. The second column highlights language used by the same service providers, (at other junctures in the interviews), which belies these claims.

Table 6.2: ‘Othering’ language used by service providers who report the use of the ‘we’re all the same’ approach to integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Role</th>
<th>Respondent Statements Reflecting a Belief That ‘We’re All The Same’</th>
<th>‘Othering’ or Stratifying Service Provider Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Organisation Project Director</td>
<td>‘It’s better just to treat all the kids as kids’ (21:68).</td>
<td>‘It’s more sort of settled people, some Travellers, and then some non-Irish [in the youth programme]’ (21:40).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School Teacher</td>
<td>‘With students’ backgrounds, you try and be as neutral about things as you possibly can’ (12:1).</td>
<td>‘I have a class in which there are no foreign students’ (12:4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School Teacher</td>
<td>‘Basically, you want to see the common humanity in people. That’s what you want to kind of highlight. ...I think the less things highlight difference in the world... regardless of where the person is from... the easier life becomes’ (17:2).</td>
<td>‘That would bring the biggest challenge...to try to break down barriers within... like Polish students. ...If you have a student from like Brazil or south African countries, they tend to integrate in a matter of weeks’ (17:12).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The clear demarcation of youth as ‘non-Irish’, ‘foreign’, Polish, Brazilian or south African provides evidence that the ‘practical Orientalisms’ discussed in Section 4.4 are, indeed, at work shaping understandings of individuals from various groups in highly internalised fashion (Anderson 1991; Haldrup et al. 2006). Despite claims by these service providers to be ‘neutral’ or ‘colour-blind’ and to see the commonalities amongst young people rather than their differences, young people from ‘non-Irish’
backgrounds are clearly represented in ways that signal difference between ‘Us’ and ‘Them’ (Haldrup et al. 2006). Moreover, these constructions are so internalised, that they appear to go unnoticed to these service providers as they discuss strategies for treating all young people ‘the same’. Such constructions of the ‘Other’ operate to allow individuals from ‘out there’ to become less foreign and more knowable whilst simultaneously maintaining some imagined difference from ‘Us’ (Said 1978).

When interrogated in view of research findings regarding 'spaces of care', service providers engaging in the afore-highlighted imagined geographies can be seen to (re)construct ‘non-Irish’ youth as the ‘nearby Other’ (i.e., those who are spatially proximate, but socially distant from members of ‘mainstream’ society) (Parr et al. 2005) in ways that allow for their care, but simultaneously situate ‘Them’ as categorically distinct (Waters 1992; Parr 2000; Conradson 2003). In the case of many respondents in this research, this process occurs despite claims to not ‘see’ the differences upon which these distinctions are made. Given the highly internalised nature of this practice, differential experiences of the spaces in question by service users of diverse backgrounds also have the potential to go unnoticed -- and, therefore, unaddressed -- by service providers. According to empirical findings, these differential experiences critically influence the extent to which individuals are able to engage with the practices of care expressed by service providers and other service users in these spaces (Milligan 2000, 2003; Conradson 2003). If spaces of care are (as asserted by respondents in Table 6.2) (re)constructed with a ‘blindness’ to individual difference, the extent to which individuals who do, in fact, differ can fully engage with the relational practices of care taking place therein -- is, therefore, dubious. Nevertheless, a significant number of the service providers participating in this research assert that their everyday ‘integration practice’ (or lack thereof) is based upon the intentional (re)construction of such ‘universal’ spaces of care in which difference is suppressed or ignored.

In the narratives of service providers endeavouring to construct ‘universal’/‘colour-blind’ spaces of care for local youth, a lack of need for overt efforts toward integration is frequently articulated. These workers believe that integration will, in fact, happen quite ‘organically’ without any direct programming effort. Exemplifying this belief, a
youth worker states that though ‘integration’ is the ‘buzz word’ at the moment; youth are ‘not looking at integration’ and are just ‘enjoying making friends’ (14:31). A local teacher believes similarly, and reports that he has ‘dropped all connotations of integration’ because he believes that ‘students will integrate naturally’ (17:4). So, despite directives emanating from the national level mandating local agencies and service providers to facilitate integration for all youth in Ireland, many respondents participating in this research believe that engaging in practices of care at the street level that temporarily ignore or suppress differences amongst young service users will, over time, all but eliminate the need for such facilitations.

The prevalence of the ‘do nothing approach’ across youth service provision in Galway City emerges clearly within respondent narratives. A service provider, working as an intercultural advocacy worker liaising with youth organisations, highlights this street-level trend when asked to identify what she observes local service providers to be doing to facilitate integration within their programmes and services. She replies, ‘You mean the things they’re NOT doing’ (24:9)? Indeed, several service providers interviewed in this research validate this worker’s observations; rationalising their choice to refrain from pro-active integration strategy by citing a belief in the ‘organic’ nature of the integration process:

*We would never have done...anything targeted directly... that would be obviously ‘integration’. It would happen by chance. ...For it to happen kind of organically, is the way it’s kind of worked best here. So, there isn’t attention drawn to it (21:52).*

*It [integration] wouldn’t be something that we would have in our strategic plan or anything like that. ...We kind of treat everyone the same across the board. So, I suppose, interculturalism and integration and things like that maybe happen as a by-product of what we would do in our day-to-day work, as opposed to being something that we would work towards’ (15:6).

*What I’ve learned the last 6 or 7 years is...the students integrate anyway. ....Students integrate regardless’ (17:3).

These service provider assertions that integration will evolve ‘naturally’ and, therefore, does not merit overt service provider attention, have implications for the provision of care to young people from diverse backgrounds. As discussed previously, messages
may be communicated to young people that their cultural identities are of little consequence to service providers meant to be engaging in caring relationships with them (Mason 1993). Further, practices of care developed to engage youth that disregard ethno-cultural background may also ignore critical differences in the way in which certain young people experience that care. Due to these potentialities, a more in-depth examination of the strategies -- and the rationales for them -- undertaken by service providers to suppress difference amongst young service users is warranted.

6.5 SUPPRESSION OF ETHNO-CULTURAL DIFFERENCE: ‘MIX IT UP’ INTEGRATION
Within the narrative emerging from this research, the strategy most identified by service providers for the suppression of ethno-cultural difference within a youth service provision context is to simply proactively ‘mix up’ youth from all backgrounds. In doing so, service providers suggest, such differences become less ‘visible’. Respondents participating in this research report approaching this ‘mixing’ through various strategies ranging in nature from quite forceful to more suggestive. What is common to this group of strategies is that they are all clearly based upon an assimilationist understanding of ‘integration’ that imagines ‘success’ as the extent to which minority group members ‘fade’ or ‘blend’ to achieve the closest approximation possible to the established white, ‘Irish’ normative standard of the majority. Language used by respondents in their discussions of the ‘mix it up’ approach illuminate these assimilationist expectations. For example, a local secondary school teacher observes that, in her school, ‘the African children seem to be blending in the best’ (11:15). The implication embedded in this statement is that ‘blending’ is preferable to ‘standing out’ and, further -- given Ireland’s predominantly white demographic -- the preferred ‘blended’ shade alluded to can be assumed to be white. In such service provider imaginings, then, if ‘blending’, (i.e., assimilation) occurs sufficiently enough that differences ‘fade’, these differences cease to matter, and ‘integration’ will have been accomplished.

Respondents employing the ‘mix it up’ strategy report that it is most successful when youth socialisation based on shared language(s) or other ethno-cultural characteristics is discouraged. A respondent now working in a migrant advocacy capacity recalls
experiencing this strategy as a service user upon migrating to Ireland and attending secondary school in the early years of the Celtic Tiger:

\[
\text{In classes… or if we had assembly or anything like that…you weren’t allowed to sit next to another African person. You had to sit next to another Irish person or another person from another country (19:18).}
\]

An on-going employment of this approach is supported by many service providers participating in this research across the education and youth work sectors. There is a belief amongst these workers that to allow socialisation amongst young service users based on shared ethno-cultural traits runs counter to ‘integration’. Subsequently, some of these service providers actively seek to eradicate this type of socialisation within their programmes, whilst others lament its existence but report an inability to eliminate it:

\[
\text{If you have three or four people of an ethnic minority in a classroom with loads of other different ethnic backgrounds, what tends to happen is they all tend to stick together. Whereas, if you have them spread out…they’ll do very, very well. …In the [school] corridors, they [migrant students] stick together; even though we’ve tried in our school …they still come back together (11:4).}
\]

\[
\text{The biggest problem we have with integration would be students from let’s say the likes of Poland. We have about 40 students from that country. …So, that would bring the biggest challenge, really…to try and break down barriers within a ‘block country’ like that. …Now, we obviously respect everything, but… I think the larger group tends to cause, you know, resentment, confusion, and isolation (17:12).}
\]

\[
\text{I think that different groups are inclined to stick together. …It’s not healthy though. That’s the thing. …So there is certainly work to be done…to sort of split them up and mix up the two groups [Irish and non-Irish]. You’re sort of forcing the issue a little bit at the start, but…I think that once people have a conversation, and talk and break down the boundary, they realize that they’re not that different. …Sometimes you have to create the circumstances that allow that to happen. If you allow them to stay in their groups, you’re not really facilitating change, I think. …And then once they start talking and getting to know each other, then your work is done, because they’ll do it naturally themselves, I think’ (4:21).}
\]
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Embedded in these service provider discussions is an assumption, again, that ‘integration’ is some end state that will be realised ‘naturally’ if only ethno-culturally-based visibilities within the group are suppressed long enough to allow ‘non-Irish’ youth to assimilate into the ‘mainstream’ culture. This is, apparently, meant to be accomplished by the conduction of conversations by migrant youth with ‘Irish’ youth; followed by the forming of friendships based upon these conversations. It is imagined, then, that within these newly formed friendships, ‘non-Irish’ youth will cease to adhere to their previous cultural identities and will become (or at least appear) ‘like Us’. The assimilationism embedded within ‘integration practice’ predicated on such assumptions goes unnoticed -- or is not explicitly acknowledged -- by these service providers. Rather, they appear to have internalised similar notions of ‘integration’ as those enshrined in national policy that ‘promises’ integration to migrants who are willing to abandon their native cultural identities in favour of new ones based on affiliation with, and similarity to, ‘host society’ members (Gray 2006).

In a street-level youth service context, imaginings of ‘integration’ as an aspirational state that will be achieved ‘naturally’ when young people become a ‘white-washed’ conglomeration -- with no visibly expressed ethno-cultural differences -- implications arise for the development of spaces of care. As discussed previously, when tolerations of difference, (e.g., adherence to a ‘non-mainstream’ cultural identity) within spaces of care are reduced or eliminated, these spaces become exclusionary to certain individuals (Waters 1992; Parr 2000). In other words, in effect, ‘non-compliant’ individuals come to be identified as ‘out of place’ within such spaces (Cresswell 1996). Research suggests, however, that this outcome is not unavoidable in instances wherein the ‘cared-for’ group composition is diverse. If individuals are allowed to express difference as ‘insiders’ rather than ‘outsiders’, spaces of care can become characterised by a collective sense of ‘license’; reducing the threat of ‘Othering’ so often implicit in ‘mainstream’ spaces (Goffman 1961). However, in order for such ‘license’ to be granted, spaces of care must incorporate a tolerance -- or even a welcoming -- of such difference. In the ‘spaces of care’ (re)created by respondents adhering to ‘mix it up’-type approaches, instead of tolerance, clear exclusions appear to operate for individuals not wishing to suppress their unique ethno-cultural identities. These sorts of exclusions, again, are found to occur.
frequently within spaces meant to be ‘open to all’ (Waters 1992; Cresswell 1996; Parr 2000; Conradson 2003; Johnsen et al. 2005).

6.5.1 SPORT AS A VEHICLE FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF ETHNO-CULTURAL DIFFERENCE

Another strategy for the suppression of ethno-cultural differences amongst youth widely identified by service providers in this research who ascribe to the ‘do nothing’, or ‘organic’, approach to integration is to ‘erase’ differences through sport. In fact, the encouragement of migrant youth participation in sport is the second-most commonly mentioned strategy for ‘doing integration’ by respondents in this research. This widespread reference by local service providers to sport as a vehicle for integration parallels broader European trends toward the same (Elling et al. 2001; Walseth and Fasting 2004); with the Council of Europe officially recognising sport as a means of facilitating social integration among young people (Gardiner et al. 2006). In view of this European sanctioning of sport as integration tool, Irish organisations such as the Football Association of Ireland (FAI) and the Gaelic Athletic Association (GAA) have implemented programmes specifically targeted toward the integration of migrant youth via participation in sport throughout various age groups and organisational levels (FAI 2011; GAA 2011).

Within the academic literature, promotions of sport as a means to reducing barriers amongst people of diverse backgrounds (Elling et al. 2001; Keim 2003; Northcote and Casimiro 2009) provide street-level youth workers embracing the same with arguable ‘good practice’ validation. However, other scholars critique this ideology of ‘sport as integrator’ as problematic. For example, some researchers argue that, rather than breaking down ethnic and cultural barriers, sport may actually reinforce ethnic differences and magnify inter-ethnic tensions (Guilbert 2004; Krouwel et al. 2006). Indeed, empirical findings increasingly highlight a potential for sports clubs and programmes to be exclusionary and marginalizing to youth from certain socio-economic and cultural backgrounds as well as to young women (Carrington et al. 1987; Collins and Kay 2003; Walseth and Fasting 2004). In view of the questions
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56% of respondents in this research identify sport as a facilitator of ‘integration’ amongst young people.
being interrogated in this research, this potential for sport to be exclusionary bears significant implications for its strategic use in the development of inclusive local ‘spaces of integration’. Subsequently, local espousals of sport as integration strategy warrant further elaboration in this discussion.

The widespread local turn to sport as a vehicle for youth integration may be due, in the opinion of some respondents participating in this research, to a shortage of other available activities. Indeed, as discussed in Chapter 5, widespread resourcing shortages have significantly curtailed local youth activity offerings in recent years. In their discussions of sport, several respondents, highlight this shortfall and assert that, with the exclusion of sport, there are few options for local youth when looking for outlets in which to spend their free time:

- With sport aside, it’s very limited what public amenities there would be [for local young people]’ (21:145).

- If young people aren’t into organised sports… and a lot aren’t…it’s [scope for youth activity] very limited’ (22:71).

- In our community, if you don’t play hurling or football, that’s it, you know? There is nothing else. There might be the sporadic or odd rugby club or something, but it’s generally sport anyway. So, if you don’t do sport, or you’re not into sport, that’s it… you’re twiddling your thumbs, or playing with computers or going to the pub’ (5:13).

Given the widespread perception of sport as one of few readily available outlets for youth recreation, the portrayal in the service provision narrative of sport as one of few accessible vehicles for engaging migrant youth in ‘integration’ is, perhaps, not surprising:

- I think the biggest things would be music and sports. I think they’re great for bringing people together (20:29).

- In general, it’s [sport] supposed to be international because it’s not necessarily based on language. … [It is] a tool of inclusion or integration. You don’t necessarily need words so, therefore, it’s always kind of international (23:2).

In their discussions of sport as an integration tool, many service providers participating in this research attribute sport’s success in this area to its (perceived)
‘levelling’ capabilities. In other words, these respondents believe that sport, in effect, puts young people on an ‘even playing field’ and negates -- or, at least, temporarily masks -- ethno-cultural differences. In this way, many service providers feel that ‘integration’ (when simply constructed as interaction between young people of diverse backgrounds) is facilitated. Though seemingly straightforward, as in service provider discussions of the ‘mix it up’ approach, these conceptual imaginings equating integration ‘success’ to ‘levelled’ interaction clearly possess assimilationist underpinnings. In strategically employing sport as a means of ‘blending out’ differences amongst migrant youth and ‘Irish’ youth on the sports pitch, what service providers are, in effect, attempting to render ‘invisible’ are the unique cultural identities of many of their service users. As discussed previously, pursuit of this ‘integration’ goal has far-reaching implications for the creation of inclusive ‘spaces of care’ for migrant youth.

A secondary school teacher respondent participating in this research exemplifies in his discussion the significantly widespread belief amongst participants in this research in the ‘levelling’ capabilities of sport and in the equation of that accomplishment with integration ‘success’. As this respondent’s narrative demonstrates, this ‘success’ appears to hinge on the degree to which those who ‘need integrating’, (i.e., ‘non-Irish’ young people) are accepted as being ‘like’ their white, ‘Irish’ sporting peers. This ‘likeness’ is largely measured vis-à-vis migrant receptivity to playing sports:

> Once ['Irish'] students see that you’re basically like them...that you want to get involved in a sport... I had a young lad who came in here from the Ivory Coast. He came in the Monday morning from the Ivory Coast, and by Wednesday, he’s the most popular fellow in the year, simply because he went straight up to play football that morning. So people didn’t know him as “Yer [sic] man from the Ivory Coast”. He was simply “John” (17:32).

According to this respondent’s discussion, the point at which the student from the Ivory Coast ceases to be recognised as an individual with an unique cultural identity, and comes to be recognised as ‘simply John’ who likes football, is suggested to be a point of integration ‘success’. In other words, integration is equated with the accomplishment of ‘sameness’. In such service provider imaginings of ‘integration’,
through sport, young people of diverse backgrounds can conceivably -- and desirably -- become less racially or culturally ‘visible’ within the predominantly white, ‘Irish mainstream’. Other respondents participating in this research similarly identify ‘sameness’ as a desirable outcome signalling integration ‘success’. A youth centre worker highlights this construction of ‘integration’ in her discussion of a football programme that her agency sponsors:

I think some of our [white, ‘Irish’] clients learned how to fear the [migrant] lads because of their skin colour. All they saw was their skin colour to begin with. But then, as they started to mix...it’s brilliant now. At the beginning, it was...so racist and so... “We’re not playing on the same team.” ...Whereas now...they’re all friends. They all shake hands and they’re all making an effort, and there’s no difference. There’s no division between the two (15:11).

In this narrative, a ‘mixing’ of the lads -- to a point wherein their skin colour ‘fades’ -- is attributed with bringing about a state of integration wherein there is ‘no difference’ within the group. This construction, again, implies that the achievement of ‘sameness’ is the barometer by which integration ‘success’ is measured.

In the academic literature, findings suggest that ethnic minority/migrant participation in activities like sport can engender benefits for these individuals in that the attainment of a ‘liminal phase’ (Turner 1969) is possible, wherein one’s social status and prestige within the ‘majority group’ is temporarily elevated due to a recognition of ability that contributes to group success, (e.g., football talent that contributes to a team win). However, despite providing spaces wherein migrant status(es) are temporarily enhanced, it is important to consider the ephemeral nature of these ‘liminal phases’ and the effects that ephemerality may have on the youth in question. Further, due to differentials in sport ability, not all youth may have access to these ‘liminal spaces’; highlighting, once again the potential for spaces in which well-being is (potentially) enhanced to be simultaneously inclusive and exclusive in nature (Waters 1992; Parr 2000; Johnsen et al. 2005; Parr et al. 2005). It is also worthy of note that respondents in this research espousing sport as an integration tool make no mention of this potential for sport to (albeit temporarily) ‘showcase’ ethnic minority/migrant youth. Rather, these workers focus solely on sport’s (perceived) capacity to ‘blend out’ differences and make all young people ‘the same’.
Though (perceived) positive outcomes associated with the use of sport as an integration tool are highlighted again and again by respondents in this research, in their discussions of sport and integration, some respondents caution that not all youth have equal access to sporting participation. Service providers identify migrant youth -- particularly females -- as being vulnerable to exclusion from many sport activities. In their narratives, several respondents discuss religious restrictions associated with ‘girls’ sports’ as a source of this exclusion -- particularly in the case of Muslim girls. For example, a secondary school teacher describes limitations on sport participation within her school for Muslim girls who are impacted by wardrobe restrictions and sanctions regarding male/female interaction in public spaces:

I know some of the [Muslim] girls aren’t involved in soccer because it’s men that run it. I know they’re not involved in basketball or hockey because of the uniform. It’s too skimpy, too short (11:5).

These sorts of restrictions, and their impact on the use of sport as an integration tool, are highlighted in the academic literature (Keogh 2002; Taylor and Toohey 2002; Walseth and Fasting 2004; Krouwel et al. 2006; Walseth 2006). Findings from this research suggest that sport activity is rarely offered in accordance with minority women's/girls’ cultural needs, and that this failure has consequences for their integration in sport (Walseth and Fasting 2004). For example, Cortis et al. (2007) focus on limitations on female sport participation engendered by the sort of religiously-derived restrictions on dress highlighted by Respondent 11. These researchers, indeed, validate this respondent’s assertions, stating that notions of modesty make it difficult for some females -- particularly those of Muslim background -- to participate in ‘mainstream’ sport and recreation activities (ibid). Empirical results further highlight that attempting to modify sports attire, (e.g., wearing longer clothing or additional garments underneath sports uniforms) may be recognised as an option by some ‘modesty-restricted’ females interested in accessing sport. However, many find this ‘solution’ to be physically uncomfortable and potentially stigmatising (ibid).
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In addition to exclusions related to gender, other ways in which both male and female migrant youth can be effectively excluded from participation in local sport activities are highlighted by participants in this research. Frequently, issues of cost are identified as one such barrier to participation. In their narratives, several respondents relate instances in which young service users are unable to muster the financial (and other) resources necessary for engagement with a sport activity in which they are interested:

*There are not many things unless you pay for them. ...It’s very difficult to afford. ...Everywhere you go, you pay. And even if you don’t pay...even if the fee for the [sports] club is small...then there is all the [athletic] gear. It isn’t easy* (13:28).

Such financial barriers to participation in sport are even more strongly highlighted by service providers working specifically with asylum-seeking youth (whose parents subsist on a government stipend of only €19.10 per adult per week41):

*The FAI [Football Association of Ireland]...they’ll do an open club day...and I’ve raised it with them. I’ve said, “That’s great. Do your open day”. But then, when they [asylum-seeking youth] go to sign up, they’re going to be asked for €200, or whatever it is* (20:29).

*They [a local sports organization] were trying to encourage young people to get involved in sports. It was €5 for five weeks. They did a bit of hurling, football, and stuff like that. We had one or two from the [direct provision centre] that wanted to go, but to get...to [name of sports club]...a child isn’t going to walk that way. There is no bus and the parents don’t have a car. So, while it’s fantastic that you’re doing this...the people running it have to be aware that there are different issues facing asylum-seekers* (20:31).

The financial barriers to participation in sport by migrant youth that these respondents identify are widely highlighted in the academic literature. Indeed, Cortis *et al.* (2007) find that for most migrants, the cost of sport and recreation activities presents barriers to participation. These cost pressures are felt most acutely amongst recently migrating individuals, (e.g., asylum-seekers) (ibid). However, migrants who have resided longer within a ‘host country’ also find costs associated with some sports to be prohibitive -- particularly for those coming from large families who have multiple siblings wishing to

---

41 Adding additional complexity, some of these youth are unaccompanied minors who have no parental support in Ireland.
participate (ibid). While it is acknowledged in the literature that there are opportunities for individuals to take part in less costly (or even free) sporting activities, (e.g., walking, jogging, exercising at home or playing with friends), organised and team based activities -- which happen to bear associated prohibitive cost -- are often preferred (ibid).

Overall, in view of the afore-highlighted barriers to sport participation for many migrant youth, the capacity for sporting spaces to become ‘spaces of integration’ must be interrogated. Multiple exclusions appear to operate within local sport; prohibiting equal engagement across youth populations. So, whilst service providers tout the capacity for sport to facilitate social interaction between youth of diverse backgrounds -- thus, accomplishing ‘integration’ -- it is clear from data emerging in this research that such pathways to integration are problematic. When considered in tandem with service provider assertions regarding the ‘erasure’ of ethno-cultural difference through sport, even further concerns regarding the use of sport as an integration vehicle emerge. These concerns even more specifically bear implications for service providers working with (a) girls and (b) youth with disadvantaged economic status. For these already marginalised young people, sporting spaces can become particularly exclusionary. This capacity for exclusion warrants careful consideration within decisions to prominently employ sport as a street-level integration strategy.

6.6 RECOGNITION OF ETHNO-CULTURAL DIFFERENCE: PERFORMING INTEGRATION

Though respondents in this research widely report using integration strategies that attempt to suppress ethno-cultural differences amongst the young people with whom they work, some respondents articulate a discomfort with this goal and, instead, express a preference for acknowledging and ‘showcasing’ the cultural identities of their diverse service user populations. In their discussions of street-level youth service provision, these respondents highlight a desire to ‘do integration’ in ways that go beyond simply constructing spaces wherein social ‘mixing’ occurs between young people of diverse backgrounds. Though it is acknowledged that there may be value in facilitating initial cross-cultural interaction in a youth service setting through the employment of these ‘mix it up’ approaches, these service providers believe that,
without efforts to overtly recognise and celebrate cultural diversity, youth integration cannot be adequately facilitated. Subsequently, several service providers interviewed in this research identify and discuss specific street-level practices employed to recognise cultural diversity and to promote it as a positive feature within youth service venues. Of these practices, the two most commonly identified are: (1) displaying ‘national/cultural identifiers’ to signal the presence of a diverse service user population, and (2) staging ‘festival-like’ events or smaller-scale activities that highlight select aspects of cultures represented within the service user group. Taken together, these strategies can be constructed as a ‘performative’ street-level approach to integration.

Performative approaches to the recognition and celebration of cultural diversity have been embraced internationally at a variety of scales. Much cross-disciplinary research focuses on the examination of these performances; ranging from international music and food festivals to smaller cultural events staged in towns and cities around the world (Piette 1992; Shukla 1997; Waterman 1998; Halter 2000; Bramadat 2001, 2001b, 2004; Harnish 2001; Rouse 2001; Thoroski and Greenhill 2001; Rath 2002; Permezel and Duffy 2007). However, these performances have not, to date, been specifically interrogated as a strategic means -- in response to policy-derived mandates -- for ‘doing integration’ at the street level. More particularly, this use of cultural performance has not been examined within a youth service provision context. In light of this gap in the literature -- and given that many service providers participating in this research report employing this ‘performative approach’ to addressing “diversity dilemmas” (Hagelund 2009) -- the remainder of this chapter discussion is devoted to the elaboration of this key street-level integration practice.

6.6.1 DISPLAYING CULTURAL IDENTIFIERS AS INTEGRATION STRATEGY

Service providers who wish to highlight the presence of cultural diversity within their youth service user populations often choose to display ‘national/cultural identifiers’ in the youth service venue. These identifiers include national flags, country maps, posters and artwork that reflect national or cultural heritage:
Chapter 6: ‘Doing Integration’ at the Street Level: Access and Strategies

There would be a load of posters around the place with, say Poland. And there’s a map of Poland ...all the kind of facts about Poland like main produce, population... (21:36).

They put posters all over about different religions, showing that they’re kind of open to it and that they support it (12:25).

You go into schools and you see a big map where there’s a little pin where every child has some sort of connection...or whether they came from that country, or whether they have family in that country...big flags...languages that are spoken... (6:19).

These displays are viewed by many service providers participating in this research as a tool for welcoming young people from diverse backgrounds to the youth service space and as a catalyst for their social interaction. Indeed, it is asserted by these service providers that young people who see these displays are encouraged to ask questions about them and discuss them with their peers from other nations and cultures:

One of our projects that we did there a couple months ago was the flags of the world. So, everyone did a flag of where they were from, which opened up communication about their own countries and sharing and that led onto projects about getting pictures from their own country and stuff like that (15:7).

In addition to stimulating social interaction between youth from diverse backgrounds, service providers posit that, by displaying flags, maps and other iconography associated with various cultures/nations, youth service venues convey a feeling of inclusion to all who use the space -- service users and service providers alike. This capacity for iconography to convey messages of inclusion (and exclusion) is highlighted in research focussing on processes of ‘homeland making’ (Haldrup et al. (2006:175). Findings in this area suggest that iconography is used in most cultures to signal to ‘outsiders’ that certain spaces are ‘Ours’ and that there is a recognisable difference between ‘there’ and ‘here’ (ibid). These designations frequently serve to reproduce national identity (Lipset 1990; Koring 1998; Osborne 2006) in ways so banal that they, over time, may come to escape the attention of ‘insiders’ (Haldrup et al. 2006). However, if an ‘outsider’ enters a space wherein nationalistic/cultural symbols are displayed, very clear messages are sent that s/he is ‘Other’ than those who reside ‘here’ (Anderson 1991). In view of this capacity for iconography to
actively communicate ‘insider’/’outsider’ status, service provider assertions regarding the power in, and significance of, displaying cross-national/cultural identifiers within youth service spaces are validated. In doing so, these ‘spaces of care’ -- that potentially operate as ‘spaces of integration’ -- can be better imagined by all users as inclusive spaces.

6.6.2 ETHNO-CULTURAL ‘SPECTACLE’ AS INTEGRATION STRATEGY

In addition to the displaying of national/cultural identifiers in the youth service space, service providers desiring to highlight and celebrate cultural diversity amongst local youth widely report staging ‘cultural performances’ at a variety of scales. In fact, 64% of respondents participating in this research report engaging with ‘integration’ through the organisation of both ‘micro-scale’ performative exercises in cultural sharing as well as larger-scale youth events; sometimes involving the wider community. In these performances, various aspects of culture(s) ranging from dance and music to food preparation and costuming are ‘showcased’ by young people from both inside and outside of those cultures. Some examples of previously organised performance activities and events highlighted by respondents are included in Figure 6.1.
Respondents reporting the previous organisation of youth cultural performance activities recall them in a collectively enthusiastic manner. They are touted by these service providers as an accessible means of recognising and including young people of diverse backgrounds, (sometimes, in addition to parents and the broader public).

Further, reports of fun being had by participants and appraisals of ‘success’ regarding these events abound in the service provider narrative. Due to these (perceived) successes, several respondents express intentions to organise similar events in future:

*We had an intercultural BBQ where we invited people to prepare food as they would do in their own country*’ (3:30).

*We got a flag of the country…and the girls who were in charge of England brought in scones and jam and cream. They looked up a dessert of that country and they made it and brought it in*’ (11:23).

*We had an international food day. …They [students] were allowed to pick a food from any country*’ (17:6).

*We organised intercultural days. …It involved music, drama, dance, and food from different cultures*’ (7:12).

*We have Culture Day, where you dress in African attire …Nigerian …if you’re from Congo, you dress in a different dress. The Irish…you come in whatever*’ (19:20).

*We organised a parade before the [school football] match starts where the young people would interpret, in parade form, the stuff they learned about [a certain country]*’ (21:115).

*We have a flag of the country…and the girls who were in charge of England brought in scones and jam and cream. They looked up a dessert of that country and they made it and brought it in*’ (12:9).

*We got a flag of the country…and the girls who were in charge of England brought in scones and jam and cream. They looked up a dessert of that country and they made it and brought it in*’ (12:9).

*There would be a parade before the [school football] match starts where the young people would interpret, in parade form, the stuff they learned about [a certain country]*’ (21:115).

When *I was doing the [intercultural] BBQ, I… wasn’t too sure of the level of participation. But, on the day, it was surprising that we got 25 groups, and everybody was there. …They are even asking that it should be done again, so it’s going to be an annual event*’ (1:6).
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We had …an International Food Day, or World Food Day. …It caused a huge wave of interest. So we’re looking at say music days, hip-hop events… (17:6).

Equally positive participant responses are not recounted by respondents when discussing the use of integration strategies based in more ‘formal learning’-type activities. In fact, the use of intercultural education curricula as integration strategy is reported to have been met with resistance or disinterest across youth service sectors. An anti-racism education worker offers an example wherein an educational event highlighting stereotyping was met with disinterest in local schools:

The stereotyping exhibition we did…we didn’t have much participation from the schools (1:10).

A teacher similarly describes a perceived lack of interest in ‘formal’ intercultural curricula (in comparison to cultural performance events) amongst students in his school:

Teachers giving out handouts on “This is the history of Romania”… students don’t respond to that. Whereas, like with the food day, that was very successful because you had a guy there from Sri Lanka and he was cooking whatever he was cooking, and it was just food’ (17:33).

This perceived resistance or disinterest on the part of young people in engaging with integration vis-à-vis more formalised learning techniques and materials further increases, in the minds of local youth service providers, the value of ‘performance-based’ strategies.

As mentioned previously, advantages that service providers participating in this research claim are inherent in performance-based approaches for ‘doing integration’ at the agency scale are under-interrogated in the academic literature. Further, studies of larger-scale cultural performances that have been conducted examine a more voluntary type of participation, (e.g., ethnic minority performance in festivals featuring music, dance and other art forms). The more obligatory sort of participation involved in youth performances of culture within ‘integration curricula’ is virtually absent from the literature. Therefore, the use of micro-scale cultural performance as a concerted, policy-
driven street-level integration strategy appears to be *terra incognita* in terms of empirically-established good practice.

Despite the lack of empirical evidence to support the use of performative strategies in a street-level youth service context, many respondents in this research discuss in their narratives a reliance upon them. In these discussions, these respondents widely highlight the intermittent nature of activities undertaken within this sort of performance-based approach to ‘integration’. Understandably, service providers are not capable of staging cultural performance events -- or even organising micro-scale performance-oriented activities -- on a frequent basis; as they require allocations of time, funding, space, staffing and (sometimes) publicity that is often outside of the normal levels/types available within resource-constrained, street-level agencies. Specifically, in the case of the education sector, prioritised exam-oriented curricula further impinge on time availability for such activities. Subsequently, respondents interviewed in this research overwhelmingly describe cultural performances organised for the purpose of ‘doing integration’ as infrequent or ‘once-off’ in nature (See Figure 6.2).

![Figure 6.2: Respondent passages highlighting the intermittent nature of cultural performance events and activities in youth services](image-url)
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Though notably highlighting this temporality in their narratives, only one respondent participating in this research characterises this feature as a shortcoming of performative strategies for ‘integration’:

They are [cultural performance events] not in any way sustainable in terms of long-term integration. ...They certainly don’t do anything in terms of cultural competency or...in terms of integration per se. ... If somebody from youth work is going to say to me, “Oh, we’re going to have an international day.”, I would be saying, “No, don’t.”, because that’s not sustainable. It’s just not enough (24:28).

It is important to note that this respondent does not directly engage in street-level integration practice with youth. Rather, she liaises with service providers nationally; advising on integration policy and good intercultural practice. Aside from this respondent, then, a virtual lack of attention to the ephemerality inherent in ‘performative integration strategies’ appears to exist amongst youth service providers in Galway City.

Service provider oversight regarding the ephemeral nature of cultural performance approaches to ‘doing integration’ bears significant implications for the development of the sorts of caring spaces with which this research is concerned. Irish national policy directs all education service providers -- in both the formal and informal education sectors -- to ensure that integration and inclusion within an intercultural learning environment become the norm (Department of Education and Skills 2010). ‘Performative strategies’ for facilitating integration and interculturalism that are (as indicated by respondents in this research) typically inserted between broader ‘mainstream’ curricula in a ‘once-off’ or intermittent fashion are unlikely to create such ‘normalised’ spaces of inclusion. Further, in view of conceptualisations (central to this research) of street-level integration practice as a form of ‘care’; the ephemeral ‘spaces of integration’ that are created through such intermittent strategy possess problematically decreased capacity for engendering the on-going sort of relational interactions shown to be essential in caring practice (Tronto 1993).

In addition to the aforementioned reasons, the lack of durability inherent in ‘spaces of integration’ created through ‘performative strategies’ is problematic in other ways. In
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the cultural performance activities organised by service providers participating in this research, the focus is (reportedly) on ‘having fun’ whilst temporarily ‘experimenting with’ or ‘consuming’ other cultures. Research focussing on larger-scale cultural festivals and spectacles similarly characterises these events as dramatic and entertaining; designed to take place only at a certain time or period. During these times, performers represent their ethno-cultural identities and transform themselves through relations with other social actors in the venue (Mato 1998). Bramadat (2001:88) states that, through these interactions, a “complicated kind of conversation” emerges between individuals, ethnic communities and broader society. Therefore, these performances can be seen to create spaces in which people from varying backgrounds can learn about each other, dispel misconceptions about each other, and strengthen ties within and between groups (ibid). However, because these social spaces exist for only a brief period, different systems of social status and prestige that come into effect within them for minority group-participants will also be transitory in nature (Bramadat 2001).

As discussed previously, these periods of elevated status for minority group-members are known as “liminal phases” (Turner 1969). Within these phases, an individual’s cultural identity may be enhanced due to the celebration by the broader community of her/his minority cultural characteristics, history and artefacts (Bramadat 2001:81). Though much research has been devoted to the effects of this liminality on performers taking part in large-scale cultural spectacles, there is a virtual absence of scholarly attention to the effects of such ephemeral shifts in status on individuals performing their culture in a micro-scale setting -- particularly in a youth service provision context. Also lacking in the extant literature are examinations, at a micro-scale, of the effects of these liminal status shifts on those who act as ‘the audience’ for, or consumers of, cultural performances, (e.g., non-migrant youth). Further, the effects of liminal status shifts on those who ‘direct’ these performances, (e.g., teachers and youth workers) are also virtually un-researched at a micro scale.

In view of the questions being interrogated in this research, the aforementioned gaps in the extant literature are significant. They represent an absence of empirical evidence upon which to base assessments (at a street-level agency scale) of the
differential experiences of cultural performances by various actors encouraged to participate in them as a means of ‘doing integration’. Research findings regarding ‘spaces of care’ suggest that examinations of such differential experiences of spaces meant to be inclusive and caring are critical to understandings of the practices occurring within those spaces (Johnsen et al. 2005). Indeed, the extent to which individuals are receptive to or able to engage with practices of care expressed by carers (and other service users) is inextricably intertwined with individual experiences of the space in which such practices occur (Milligan 2000, 2003; Conradson 2003).

These relationships between caring practice and space are shown to be of particular significance in examinations of sites created for the provision of services to migrants. In these spaces, ‘host’ carers may choose to temporarily suspend their ‘right to care’ in order that ‘needy migrants’ may experience feelings of ‘giving back’ or ‘contributing’ (Darling 2011). However, the ‘right to care’ is, eventually, reasserted by ‘hosts’, and migrant individuals shift back to being care recipients once again (ibid). These shifts in role and their attendant impacts remain under-interrogated in youth service provision contexts, however. Particularly, these impacts have not been examined with regard to cultural performance strategies for ‘doing integration’. Thus, even more rationale is provided for continued examinations of these sorts of differential experiences of caring spaces.

In addition to temporally-related shortcomings of cultural performance strategies for ‘doing integration’ at the street level, several respondents working in migrant advocacy roles voice additional concerns regarding these approaches. Some respondents assert that these events/activities tacitly communicate messages to service providers, service users, and other (potential) observers that minority cultures are a consumable commodity; exhibited or marketed for the benefit of ‘host society’ members. A development education worker discusses these implied supplier/consumer dynamics:

_It’s quite frightening really. …Like, “Well, show us your costumes and show us your dance, and cook food for us!” Basically, “Entertain us so that we can want to absorb you into the culture somehow.” I know it’s well-meaning, but_
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*there's something really voyeuristic...it's a consumerist kind of integration* (6:15).

This respondent’s comments highlight the lack of a dynamic, ‘two-way’ integration process (as enshrined in policy) in this approach to ‘integration’. Indeed, the sorts of cultural performance events purported by many service providers in this research to facilitate integration by ‘showcasing’ the food, music, costumes, dance and sport of minority cultures have been critiqued as static exhibitions; wherein members of the ‘host culture’ are positioned in the role of ‘tourists’ who “walk around and enrich themselves” (Permezel and Duffy 2007:369). This scenario can lead to the exotification of ethnic and cultural groups and encourage the devaluation of that which cultural performance events claim to protect and promote (Thoroski 1997; Hage 1998; Dunn 2001). “Culture [then] becomes an object for display, rather than the heart and soul of the individuals formed by it” (Bissoondath 1994). This does little to put ‘migrant cultures’ on equal footing with the dominant culture but *does* manage to conjure an imagined community of peaceful multiculturalism (Thoroski 1997:111).

Despite these largely negative critiques of cultural performance (on a larger scale), scholars do point out that such events can create important contexts in which newcomers negotiate identity (Ashkenazi 1987; Piette 1992; Thoroski 1997; Bramadat 2001). So, though it can be argued that ethno-cultural identities are articulated stereotypically in cultural spectacles, there are often elements of resistance to such banal descriptions of culture amongst participants (Bramadat 2004). In other words, ‘minority culture’ members can choose to challenge these stereotypes and engage in dialogue about the re-formation of identities (*ibid*:91). Through this dialogue, groups or individuals who are thought to be -- or who think of themselves as -- marginal with respect to the dominant culture, may be able to participate in significant ways (Bramadat 2001:81). The spaces created by cultural performance, then, can be seen to provide a site for minority group members to promote a framework of belonging and negotiated forms of local identity (Permezel and Duffy 2007: 367). Therefore, Permezel and Duffy (*ibid*) see cultural spectacles as sites for localness and belonging, even as -- paradoxically -- these events celebrate diversity and connections beyond that of the locally defined community.
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Taking into consideration both negative and positive outcomes associated with the use of performative strategies for ‘doing integration’ with (potentially vulnerable) youth at the street level, further interrogations of this practice are, clearly, warranted. However, at present, according to data emerging in this research, the cultural performance approach is likely to continue to be heavily relied upon by many under-resourced service providers working in small agencies charged with delivering a range of services in addition to ‘providing integration’. Working under such pressure and constraints -- whilst attempting to adhere (to some degree) to policy mandates from above that integration be incorporated into everyday service provision practice -- these workers are likely to avail of strategies that are accessible, short-term in nature (in light of short-term funding streams), and well-received by the majority of participants. Meanwhile, more complex and ‘resource-expensive’ integration strategies that could, perhaps, better engage with issues like racism, social justice and equality are less likely to be undertaken.

6.7 CHAPTER CONCLUSIONS

This chapter elaborated street-level practice focusing on access to, and strategies for, achieving integration. In doing so, the discussion illustrated the complexity of ways in which service providers in Galway City attempt to create ‘spaces of integration’ for local young people. Sometimes the need for such spaces is determined to exist differentially within local youth populations. In cases wherein particular youth are not ascribed ‘needy’ status (with regard to integration) access to ‘spaces of care’ is often curtailed; causing these spaces to operate dualistically as inclusive to some and exclusive to others. When youth are granted access to these spaces, practices undertaken with them can still render them exclusive to certain individuals. For example, practice implemented to suppress cultural difference amongst youth can engender expectations for assimilation to a ‘mainstream’ cultural norm that excludes those young people wishing to express their ‘minority culture’ identities.

When cultural difference is acknowledged, tolerated (and even celebrated) within spaces of youth service provision, integration practice centring on the performance of ‘minority’ cultural identities may problematically position migrant youth (and other youth from ‘minority cultures’) as ‘entertainers’ of ‘host culture tourists’. Though
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Aiding in the creation of imagined multicultural communities, this exoticisation of cultures ‘Other’ than the ‘host culture’ may lead to stereotypified and static representations of these truly dynamic cultures. Despite these negative potentialities, cultural performance-type strategies for integration can -- when implemented in conjunction with other integration curricula -- provide important opportunities for initial cultural exchange between young people of diverse ethno-cultural backgrounds and those who care for them. Additionally, through participation in these events, youth from ‘minority culture’ backgrounds may be afforded opportunities to (re)negotiate their cultural identities in new (local) contexts; allowing for the promotion of new frameworks of belonging.
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7.1 CONTEXT
There is widespread consensus amongst academic researchers, policy critics and front-line service providers that ‘integration’ is a complex concept that eludes precise definition and will likely continue to do so. Due, in large part, to this nebulosity, establishing agreed-upon good practice in the operationalisation of ‘integration’ at the street level is highly problematic. Nevertheless, policy espouses ‘integration’ as the most viable means by which to ‘manage diversity’ and to further state immigration-related agendas. Meanwhile, pro-migrant and human rights interest groups look to ‘integration’ as a path toward equality, full participation and the preservation of cultural heritage for Ireland’s newcomers. Whether ‘integration’ is a conceptual vision capable of advancing these widely divergent agendas -- and, indeed, whether it should -- is a question that continues to be actively debated at scales ranging from the EU to the national and on through to the local. These debates frequently highlight the material effects of ‘integration’ (in all its imaginings) on the economy and the political landscape of Ireland, but less often attend to its impacts on migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers. Even less considered in the national integration discourse are the impacts of any particular ‘integration’ agenda on young people within these marginalised groups and -- in the context of this research -- on the service providers who are responsible for the delivery of integration services to them.

A growing body of research in the Irish context has begun to redress the aforementioned imbalances in discussions surrounding ‘integration’ by directing more attention to the integration-related needs and interests of various migrant populations in contemporary Irish society (Murphy 2001; Ejorh 2006; Pillinger 2006; Begg 2007; Foreman and Hawthorne 2007; Feldman 2008; Southern Health Board 2011). A significant amount of this research has focused on asylum-seekers as a particularly vulnerable group (Begley et al. 1999; Kennedy et al. 2002; RAXEN 2003; Health Service Executive 2006; Ryan et al. 2008; Irish Civil Society Coalition 2011; Irish Refugee Council 2011). This research is producing valuable evidence that highlights a need for greater governmental and societal investment in efforts to facilitate ‘two-way’ interactions between migrant communities and the ‘Irish host society’. Some research has also begun to specifically address migrant youth as a marginalised population in Ireland with particular ‘integration’ needs and trajectories of their own.
(Devine et al. 2008; Bushin and White 2010; Gilligan et al. 2010). However, within the integration literature focussing on Ireland, a population that remains largely un-researched are the individuals charged with delivering ‘integration’ -- however constructed -- to these youth in cities, towns and communities across Ireland -- that is, the street-level service provider. Indeed, these front-line workers (with some exception in regard to educators) are largely overlooked in terms of their influential role in operationalising national and EU integration policies and initiatives. This research illuminates this gap in the integration literature and advances a cross-disciplinary conceptual framework for this, and future, investigations of the critical service provider role.

In addition to the under-researching of the role of local service provision in the delivery of ‘integration’ to Ireland’s youth within the migration and integration literatures, there is a parallel gap in examinations of this key group of workers from the standpoint of care provision within literatures across disciplines such as geography, sociology and public health. This lack of attention is in spite of the fact that, in contemporary Irish integration policy, migrants are constructed as ‘needy’ and ‘vulnerable’; placing integration service providers in a de facto role of paternalistic carer in relation to these individuals. Coupled with recently broadening definitions of ‘care’ emerging from the aforementioned literatures, this de facto role for integration service providers lends itself to interrogation as a ‘caring behaviour’ intended to facilitate or promote the well-being of migrants. Further, social interactions emanating from this caring role, and the spaces these interactions produce, represent meaningful ground for geographic enquiry.

The coincident under-examination of integration service providers as critical actors in the integration/migration literatures, and in the literatures addressing ‘care’ across multiple disciplines, positions this research as a viable cross-disciplinary entrée into the investigation of the provision of integration as a ‘caring’ behaviour less than fully illuminated by previous theorisations and empirical investigations. New imaginings of service provision within geographies of care, coupled with longer-standing approaches toward the interrogation of the immigrant incorporation process within migration research, constitute a conceptual nexus that illuminates youth integration
service provision as a ‘caring service’ performed within informal, local therapeutic networks. This research, thus, contributes to the filling of an identified gap in the extant migration/integration literature. Penninx et al. (2008:9) note that disciplines such as sociology, geography, economics and law have often developed integration research in isolation from other disciplines. Therefore, comprehensive interdisciplinary research projects are rare, and efforts to transcend the division of disciplines in research on migration-related topics are, “relatively new and few” (*ibid*). The following discussion of the research conclusions elaborates key findings and further highlights cross-disciplinary avenues for investigation in this topical area.

### 7.2 CONCEPTUALISATIONS OF INTEGRATION AT THE STREET LEVEL

Contemporary Irish national conceptualisations of ‘integration’ largely imagine ‘foreign’ migrants to be (arguably indefinitely) progressing along a path toward ‘belonging’ in the ‘host society’. Embedded within this envisaging are everyday Orientalisms that continually (re)produce ‘Us’/’Them’ binaries. These binaries not only impact on migrants, but they also significantly influence street-level youth service provider understandings of their role(s) whilst working with migrant youth. Indeed, despite increasing policy espousals of integration as a ‘two-way’ process, these Orientalist mechanisms continue to inform street-level service provision practices that often perpetuate the essentialisation and marginalisation of these young people. These Orientalist influences manifest themselves on the local youth service provision landscape as a ‘patchwork’ of approaches based more upon these highly individualised systems of thought than upon conceptualisations of ‘integration’ derived from policy. It is this ‘integration patchwork’ within the specific context of Galway City that is illuminated by this research.

The ‘two-way process’ of integration called for in Irish policy documents envisions adaptation on the part of both migrants and ‘host society members’. However, despite this policy, this research finds that a standard of ‘white Irishness’ is the norm to which many youth service providers in Galway City expect or imagine their services users to aspire. Additionally, everyday, internalised Orientalisms on the part of these service providers (re)produce messages of an ‘Irish homeland’ that is ‘Ours’ and constructions of migrants as the essentialised, racialised -- and, thus, marginalised --
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‘Other’ who are ‘tolerated’; but not yet integrated. Within this imagining the possibility is created that (some) migrants may actually be ‘un-integratable’. Ultimately, then, these ‘Us’/‘Them’ constructions (re)produce an assimilationist model of immigrant incorporation wherein ‘host society’ members are asked to be ‘tolerant’ of newcomers, but are able to keep them identifiably separate as ‘foreigners’ within ‘Our’ midst. Within this imagination of the ‘Irish host’ role in the ‘integration’ process, service providers become constructed in a de facto manner as paternalistic carers of ‘needy’ young migrants, until such time that they are able to, or might, satisfactorily become like ‘Us’.

The problematic nature of the afore-described version of ‘integration’ stemming from Irish national policy has been vocally critiqued in recent years (Gray 2006; Fanning 2007; Fanning and Mutwarasibo 2007; Boucher 2008). These critiques have inspired increased academic and (limited) political attention to migrant rights, issues, advocacy and empowerment within the integration process. Going forward, there is likely further ground to be gained by continuing to pursue these policy-focussed campaigns for a more authentic ‘two-way’ integration process. However, this researcher argues that, in the meanwhile, extant policy-conjured roles of the ‘needy migrant’ and ‘tolerant, caring host’ can be simultaneously and advantageously employed in a complimentary pathway toward material, street-level enhancements of migrant youth integration in Ireland.

By constructing service providers as actors in emerging networks providing ‘caring’ integration services to migrant youth at the street level, resourcing structures and good practice guidelines already found to be effective within longer-recognised ‘caring’ services and agencies could be applied in this new context. Further, existing negative and problematic constructions of migrant youth as ‘needy’, ‘vulnerable’ and ‘at-risk’, can be ‘parlayed’ into (temporarily) useful characterisations that highlight an urgent need for state, voluntary/NGO and public attention to the development of these networks of ‘integration care’. The following sub-sections will highlight specific ways in which this sort of ‘creative’ exploitation of existing policy-based constructions of service provider and migrant roles could prove advantageous to carers and the cared-for alike. This discussion will elaborate these suggestions in the
context of both resourcing and street-level good practice for youth integration service provision.

7.3 STREET-LEVEL RESOURCING AND THE PROVISION OF INTEGRATION

Due to recent and continuing devolutions of responsibility for ‘integration’ to the local level, workers across a wide range of street-level agencies are being charged with the delivery of integration-related services for which they were not previously accountable. This neo-liberal transition extends to workers employed in agencies focussing specifically on youth services, (e.g., youth clubs, schools, sporting organisations and youth recreation centres). As put forward in this research, these street-level service providers can be characterised as ‘caring’ practitioners interested in the movement toward (potentially) ‘needy’ or vulnerable young people for the purpose of facilitating or improving their well-being. Within those movements are caring practices specifically relating to integration. When these practices are imagined and circumscribed as ‘caring’ behaviour, they can be better supported by a networked approach more commonly found in other ‘caring’ sectors such as health care, mental health and welfare provision. Within such networks, identified good practice can be more readily shared between workers and agencies and, therefore, can become more quickly institutionalised.

Some specific agencies within Irish youth services have recently begun to attempt the dissemination of integration/intercultural good practice guidelines to their workers at the street level. This is despite the lack of under-established networks through which to do so. For example, the Department of Education and Skills (2010) as well as the National Youth Council of Ireland (2011) have generated good intercultural practice guidelines in recent years, but are frustrated -- to date -- by the lack of wide-spread awareness or uptake of these guidelines at the street level. This research suggests that these examples highlight inadequacies inherent in the failure to recognise and approach street-level workers as actors in broader (if informal) networks of youth integration service provision. In these cases, the dissemination of good practice guidelines amongst and between service provision agencies at a scale which would greater enhance support for them is pre-empted by a lack of this sort of networked approach.
In addition to the potential for the wider and faster spread of intercultural good practice amongst local youth service agencies, another way in which integration service provision would benefit by being constructed as part of broader networks of ‘care’ is through the application of cultural competence standards. These sorts of standards have been required for quite some time in more recognised ‘caring sectors’ such as physical and mental health care provision and welfare service provision in order to encourage culturally competent behaviours, attitudes and policies when working in cross-cultural settings. There is nothing to suggest that parallel strategies toward enhancing such cultural competence within integration service provision would not be similarly beneficial to service users as well as to service providers within this sector. For instance, internalised, everyday Orientalisms -- so prevalent amongst service providers working with migrant youth in Galway City -- could be more readily identified, discussed and redressed within a framework in which expectations of cultural competence are embedded. Normatised standards of ‘white Irishness’ could be challenged by modes of thought that recognise ‘colour blindness’ as but an early step along a continuum toward recognition and appreciation of cultural difference within service provision settings.

Another way in which integration service provision would benefit from the construction of this sector as part of a broader ‘caring network’ is through enhanced recognition of service providers as individuals in need of formalised support resources. In recent years, research focussing on carers in the areas of physical and mental health -- particularly in the home environment -- has identified a growing need amongst this population for economic and emotional supports (Czaja and Rubert 2002; Eisdorfer et al. 2003; Schulz and Martire 2004; Stoltz et al. 2004, 2004b; Willyard et al. 2008). This scholarship finds that, as these carers assume more and more responsibility for caring services (once provided by the state), their own need for care and support also increases. Similarly, providers of integration services at the street level -- often working in severely under-resourced agencies -- are in need of formalised networks to which they can turn for guidance, resource-sharing, enhanced training opportunities and other forms of support. Though afore-mentioned academic research attention has helped garner increasing resources for these sorts of supports
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for carers in other sectors, similar types of supports for integration service providers as ‘caring service’ workers lag well behind.

Deficits in integration services networking are but one facet of a woeful resourcing milieu that currently exists within street level youth service provision. Widespread shortfalls in paid staffing result in knock-on deficits in areas such as publicity/information dissemination regarding youth programming outreach to potential new service users, and shortages of time for one-on-one youth service worker contact with young people. These shortages are, in part, compensated for by a heavy reliance in youth services on volunteer staffing. However, this reliance engenders concerns regarding volunteer qualifications, time commitment and motivation. Further, the meeting of staffing needs through mainly volunteer labour calls the sustainability of programmes/services into serious question.

Shortages of affordable and ‘youth-friendly’ spaces in which to offer services and programming constitute yet another resourcing constraint within street-level youth integration service provision. Spaces that can be specifically dedicated to youth programming functions are found in this research to be in particularly short supply. The spaces that are available for youth programming must often be shared with other functions, such as administrative office work, during certain hours. This necessity for shared functionality causes local spaces of youth service provision to often be transitory and contested in nature. Research focussing on other ‘caring’ forms of service provision -- such as soup runs to the homeless (Johnsen et al. 2005) -- finds similar characteristics in other street-level ‘spaces of care’.

With the general exception of school spaces, this resourcing particularity across local youth service provision impacts on both service providers and service users alike. Without fixed and enduring spaces to make ‘their own’, young people -- particularly those who already experience marginalisation as migrants -- may fail to develop a positive sense of personal, spiritual and cultural identity (Wheeler 2000:51). Further, these youth may fail to take a sense of ownership over activities taking place within the spaces (ibid). Service providers are also significantly impacted by the lack of youth-dedicated spaces in which to host programming/services, in that observations and assessments of youth interaction are more difficult to conduct in spaces wherein
young people do not feel at ease and are not able to exercise agency in using the space (Halpern et al. 2000).

Given the unlikelihood of major enhancements in current resourcing streams for youth service provision and education within a recessionary Ireland, street-level service providers view themselves as highly constrained actors caught in a problematic progression. Significant shortfalls in funding translate directly to shortages in qualified youth service and education staffing. These staffing shortfalls necessitate greater commitments of time on the part of extant staff to engage in fundraising efforts and administrative tasks associated therewith or -- in the case of education -- to increasingly engage with young people who previously had greater access to dedicated special resource staffing. This time commitment restructuring reduces the time street-level workers have available for programme development, youth contact and other important role functions. Over time, these constraints on staff availability result in a scaling back of programming/services within already limited programmes. In an attempt to counteract this trend, agencies increasingly turn to volunteer labour to cover staffing needs. However, this highly transient (and often under-trained) labour force cannot be considered a sustainable means of long-term staffing.

Unfortunately, the progression described does not end with inadequate staffing and cuts to service offerings. A more insidious result of widespread under-resourcing in street-level youth service provision is that, as even ‘core’ programming begins to come under threat within an ever-shrinking economy, the spectre of non-sustainability begins to manifest itself in the form of limited planning on the part of service providers for the extension of services and programming. Service providers feel reluctant to commit highly limited resources to new ventures and programmes when ‘basic’ services are barely being sustained. Therefore, the street-level provision of integration fails to develop and grow in imaginative and potentially productive new ways, and service provider vision is stifled. Effectively, then, fiscal conservatism and fears of an ever-bleaker economic future restrain street-level agencies in ways that impact on service provider job satisfaction and goals; as well as having ‘knock-on’ effects for local young people as service users.
Ultimately, if potential routes to ‘integration’ -- no matter how it is constructed -- are imagined to be inaccessible due to street-level resourcing constraints, ‘acceptable’ material realisations of the phenomenon will become increasingly simplistic and more narrowly defined. Mao Zedong highlights the perils of this sort of narrowing of thought when he stated,

We think too small, like the frog at the bottom of the well. He thinks the sky is only as big as the top of the well. If he surfaced, he would have an entirely different view.

Current ‘well-like’ resourcing constraints within street-level youth service provision, likewise, produce a very limited view of the ‘integration sky’. This constriction of vision may reduce the potential for connectedness to other integration agencies and efforts and pre-empt new approaches to local integration delivery. In combination with previously discussed failures for integration service provision to be constructed as a ‘network of care’, this potential for dampening creativity and imagination is even more problematic.

### 7.3.1 ‘STRETCHING’ SCARCE RESOURCES IN STREET-LEVEL YOUTH INTEGRATION SERVICE

Given that street-level youth service providers view resourcing constraints to be a highly limiting influence on their ability to ‘do integration’, methods of ‘stretching’ resources and directing them to their most prudent use(s) rise to critical importance. A widespread lack of service provider awareness of service user background reflects a key area identified in this research in which this sort of ‘resource savvy’ is currently under-employed. If scarce resources (across every category) are to be best allocated to areas of greatest integration need, it is essential that service provider decision-makers are as aware as possible of the ethno-cultural identities and experiences of the young people with whom they are working. Good practice guidelines are available for the collection of this type of data, and support is available through youth and migrant advocacy agencies in Ireland for the sensitive treatment of young service users within that process. To date, however, these guidelines are not widely followed by youth service agencies and organisations in Galway City to the detriment of service providers and service users alike. Instead, young people are frequently approached (for the purposes of service provision), as ‘all the same’ in the absence of background information. Therefore, resources fail to be as knowledgeably and efficiently directed as they might be toward specific integration challenges experienced by particular young people.
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This research highlights another way in which youth integration resources often fail to be distributed and utilised to their best advantage within Galway City. Service provider awareness of resource availability is shown to be inadequate in many cases; preventing resources that do exist from being widely and/or fully accessed by street-level workers for the benefit of their service users. Across resourcing categories, many service providers demonstrate a lack of awareness of helpful aids and services ranging from printed resources in non-English languages to supports and events being made available by other local organisations. Many of these resources could be accessed at little or no cost to service providers and their organisations. As discussed in Section 7.3, much of this lack of awareness stems from under-developed networking (despite some inter-agency attempts to develop them). If youth service agencies were more formally networked, service providers could be better kept abreast of the activities taking place within the city and of services and resources available for sharing between organisations.

As the youth service provision sector currently operates in Galway City, activities and resources are developed across a broad range of disparate types of agencies who do not typically have close, frequent contact with one another, (e.g., schools do not have regularly established contact with youth support service organisation directors or pro-migrant organisation leaders within Galway City). Within this scenario, respondents in this research report situations in which they learn that another local youth organisation is hosting an event similar to one they are planning, or are providing a similar service/resource to one that their own organisation is developing. It can be presumed that, for every case wherein this duplication of effort is discovered at a stage when it is too late to be avoided, there are likely other duplications taking place that remain unidentified by the respective service providers involved. This sort of duplication of effort amongst desperately-stretched staffs in local youth service organisations constitutes an untenable waste of resources within a sector already swaying under the weight of severe resourcing challenges. With minimal resource expenditure, organisations could mitigate this issue to a large degree, (e.g., through the more extensive use of social networking sites, electronic community bulletin boards and forums, the print media, school message boards/newsletters, etc. to disseminate information about available resources/services and upcoming youth events).
Whilst highlighting the need for more formalised networking in regard to resources across all categories, this research illuminates two key areas in which resourcing deficits are causing the greatest concern on the part of local service providers. These key categories are English-language support resources for youth and their families experiencing LEP, and resources and services (within many categories) for ‘older youth’ (18-25 year-olds). The lack of English-language supports is reported to impact on the delivery of integration services to young people by every respondent participating in this research. From education -- where these deficits are the most visible -- to youth work, recreational services and migrant advocacy services; the lack of resources printed in non-English languages and the lack of interpretation and translation services causes constant and excessive difficulty to service providers in their attempts to engage and communicate with migrant youth and their families. Further, the lack of these resources precipitates complaints of ‘knock-on’ effects for members of the ‘host community’, in that already over-stretched service providers must spend more time working individually with youth experiencing LEP; reducing time spent with youth already fluent in English.

In addition to severe deficits in English-language resourcing, a lack of services and resources available to ‘older youth’ in the 18-25 year-old cohort is widely identified by respondents in this research. Though people in this age group are recognised by national and EU level youth organisations and policy as ‘youth’, they are much less able to access programmes and services in Ireland when compared to youth under age 18. Though some might argue that young people over age 18 are often either engaged in third-level education or participating in the workforce, this is not the case for asylum-seeking youth in Ireland who are not allowed to work and experience extreme difficulty in accessing third-level education. Additionally, under current recessionary conditions, many youth outside of the asylum-seeking population also find themselves effectively denied access to the workforce and/or third-level education. Therefore, demand for programming and support for youth over age 18 is higher now than ever; whilst availability of these resources remains in deficit. The outcome of this ‘economy of service provision’ for older youth is the increasing marginalisation of a cohort already garnering less integration attention than primary and secondary school-aged children. In light of research in other national contexts (Rizzini and Lusk 1995; Seekings 1995; Everatt 2000; MacDonald and
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Marsh 2001, 2005) that highlights the long-term, ‘lost generation’ effects of neglecting entire youth age cohorts or particular segments of the youth population, the existing state of service provision for older youth in Ireland is of great concern.

7.3.2 SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ALLOCATION OF EXISTING RESOURCES IN SUPPORT OF INTEGRATION

As highlighted in the chapter discussion thus far, inarguably, resources for the support of local youth services are scarce, and there is urgent need for the augmentation of these resources if integration -- however imagined -- is to be facilitated within the delivery of these services. Thus, long-range strategies for the improvement of resourcing structures sector-wide are vitally important. However, in the shorter term, direction must also be provided for the most informed and efficient allocation of currently available resources within a recessionary climate. In view of this need, several specific recommendations are put forward here. These summary recommendations are derived from a consideration of the multiple, broader recommendations for the overall enhancement of street-level integration service delivery made throughout this chapter discussion and are intended for the benefit of street-level service providers as well as policy-makers at the local and State levels.

Firstly, local youth service agencies (including schools) would benefit almost immediately from appointing a person currently on staff to act as a dedicated Intercultural Community Liaison to other local youth service agencies. As part of this expanded role, this individual should endeavour to inventory and regularly monitor current youth service offerings and resources available within the city. In doing so, opportunities for the referral of service users to other useful/appropriate activities and services would be facilitated and ‘duplication of efforts’ across agencies could be reduced. Further, within the Intercultural Liaison role -- as in the roles of liaison counterparts in other local youth service agencies -- responsibility should be assigned for the construction and maintenance of a support network for local service providers. Within this network, opportunities for regular communication between workers in local youth service agencies should be facilitated. This communication would enhance the exchange of ideas and information regarding integration ‘good practice’. Further, it would provide a much-needed outlet for the discussion amongst “diversity workers” of experiences -- positive and negative -- in the ‘delivery of integration’.
Secondly, local youth service agencies would gain benefit from the designation of an existing staff member as an Intercultural Information Officer to oversee the development and maintenance of a service user ethno-cultural background information database. As highlighted previously in this research, this sort of data is invaluable in the efficient targeting of resources to young people according to specific needs. In the case of schools, this data gathering could be coordinated with existing personnel and structures already in place for gathering more general types of student data. Working within these structures, the Intercultural Information Officer would be positioned to make knowledgeable recommendations for the allocation of scarce resources to integration-specific initiatives within the school. In the case of youth service agencies outside the formal education sector, the gathering of service user ethno-cultural background data is likely to be more easily accomplished given the smaller numbers of service users at issue and the less stringent bureaucratic frames within which these agencies typically operate (when compared to schools). As the NYCI (2011) recommends, the gathering of such data in a youth work setting is generally only a matter of adding ‘ethnic identifier’ item(s) to standard new service user registration forms already in use in most youth service organisations. In this manner, designated Intercultural Information Officers within such agencies could be provided access to valuable ethno-cultural data with virtually no increased resource input.

Thirdly, within currently available resourcing schemes, findings in this research suggest that staff training regarding integration-related issues and competencies could be enhanced through the implementation of an Intercultural Mentor/Mentee system. Currently, most local youth service agencies (including schools) can afford to send only limited -- or often only lone -- staff members to intercultural training and knowledge exchange events taking place around the country and in Europe. This, again, is a facet of contemporary resourcing realities. However, if staff members who do attend such events are formally directed to disseminate knowledge gained through them to the entire agency staff through a formalised mentorship programme, these valuable training resources could be ‘stretched’. Data gathered in this research indicates that, in most local agencies, this sort of dissemination does not currently occur. Until such time that intercultural training is a mainstay within broader staff training curricula across all youth service
agencies in Ireland, an Intercultural Mentorship programme is recommended as the best means of ensuring that valuable ‘off-site’ staff development resources are being (re)allocated as widely as possible.

7.4 STREET-LEVEL PRACTICE AND EMERGING ‘SPACES OF INTEGRATION’

Severe resourcing constraints coupled with highly individualised service provider imaginings of ‘integration’ (in the absence of clear and unified policy definitions) inform emerging street-level integration service provision practice in Galway City. Due to the discretion with which street-level diversity workers are imbued, this practice is evolving as a variegated patchwork of approaches across a broad range of youth service agencies that do not currently construct themselves as an explicit network of ‘integration care’. Therefore, the integration programming and services to which local youth have access are highly varied in nature and scope. This research elucidates this complex array of local approaches to ‘doing integration’ in order to discern broader typologies of behaviour that span the diverse practice composing ‘integration’ in Galway City. In elaborating this practice, the spaces being created through it are also illuminated.

As stated, youth service providers in Galway City approach the delivery of ‘integration’ services in a variety of ways. However, across these diverse approaches, two broad, ethos-driven trends in service provider ‘integration’ practice are identified by this research. The first of these trends is a tendency on the part of many service providers to suppress cultural difference when ‘doing integration’. Indeed, claims of ‘colour blindness’ frequently emerge from service provider narratives whilst discussing integration. Despite ample evidence in the academic literature regarding the significant effects resulting from the suppression and/or devaluation of cultural identities amongst young people (Smith et al. 1999; Phinney et al. 2001; Greig 2003; Rumbaut 2005; Berry et al. 2006; Outley and Witt 2006; Reynolds 2007), many service providers in Galway City persist in a largely assimilative approach to ‘integration’. Rather than espousing the ‘two-way process’ called for in many Irish policy documents, diversity workers ranging across education to youth work widely believe that most migrant youth want to be viewed as ‘the same’ as young people in
the ‘host’ population. Operating under this premise, a bi-directional movement toward interculturalism is pre-empted by a supposition that migrant youth only desire to move in *one* direction -- toward a white, ‘Irish’ norm.

Departing from the ‘all the same’ ethos underpinning much current street-level integration practice in Galway City, some service providers, instead, identify a need for diverse cultural identities amongst their young service users to be recognised and celebrated. This belief gives rise to the second major trend running through local integration service delivery in the city that is illuminated by this research -- the ‘showcasing’ of cultural identities in order to convey a message of welcome, interest and appreciation for diversity. Many service providers turn to these cultural performance sorts of strategies because they believe them to be a non-threatening, fun or ‘safe’ way for ‘integration’ to be advanced. Within these types of activities and events, issues like racism, inequality and human rights are rarely highlighted and addressed, so ‘doing integration’ takes on a much less controversial and contested quality. However, since these cultural performances are normally encapsulated in infrequent, ‘one-off’ events, the resourcing of them is often more possible than the resourcing of longer-term, broader integration initiatives within a youth service or programme. To address integration in in-depth, longer-term ways requires more funding and more trained staff with professional experience and commitment to a fully-developed integration curriculum or programming. So, though policy and good practice guidelines call for this sort of broad-based, long-term approach to integration, service providers are keenly aware of resourcing challenges that make this a formidable goal.

When local service providers seek to use more ‘performative’ strategies for ‘doing integration’ in order to recognise and celebrate cultural diversity amongst service users, a range of activities are deployed. Practices like displaying cultural identifiers, (e.g., national flags and maps) are combined with the engagement of young people in more active *performances* of culture such as intercultural ‘food days’ and arts and music expositions. These strategies can be more bi-directional in nature than approaches undertaken when service providers adhere to an ‘all the same’ ethos in that, whilst enacting these performances of culture, ‘host society’ youth and migrant youth are often
encouraged take part with disregard to actual national/cultural background. However, in some cases, service providers do encourage young people of a particular cultural background to display or perform their own cultural identity for the ‘host group’. These performances have the capacity to take on a more ‘voyeuristic’ feel and serve to position ‘host’ youth as ‘tourists’ (Permezel and Duffy 2007:369) who consume (potentially) exoticised versions of ‘non-Irish’ cultures (Thoroski 1997; Hage 1998; Dunn 2001). These ‘cultural showcase’ type events can, arguably then, be superficial treatments of difference that present isolated and limited views of ‘non-Irish’ culture(s). In this way, ‘performative’ strategies for ‘doing integration’ in a youth service provision context may do more to conjure fleetingly “imagined multicultural communities” (Permezel and Duffy 2007) than to put migrant youth cultures on equal footing with those of ‘host’ youth.

Despite the afore-identified problematic issues associated with cultural performance as integration strategy, these performances can create important -- but ephemeral -- spaces of inclusion within sites of street-level youth service provision. In these spaces, cultural expression is (perhaps, temporarily) valued and social status and prestige may be elevated for migrant youth ‘performers’ (Bramadat 2001:80). Turner (1969) describes these periods of elevated status as “liminal phases”. However, since cultural performance in youth service settings typically occurs on isolated ‘festival days’, or as part of national/religious holiday commemorations, the ‘spaces of integration’ created through them are similarly ephemeral in nature. This ephemerality is suggested by research to frequently be characteristic of ‘spaces of care’ more generally. These cross-contextual findings add validity to the construction of spaces in which ‘integration’ services are provided as ‘caring spaces’.

Overall, there is valid reason for concern when ‘performative’ strategies are used as the primary (or only) means through which to ‘do integration’ in a youth service context. Just as ‘colour blindness’ should be considered but a step along a continuum toward cultural competence, cultural performance strategies should be considered but an entrée to youth integration. There is merit in using these strategies to provide opportunity for the opening of cultural exchange and dialogue between young people from diverse backgrounds. This breaking down of barriers is useful in early stages of youth programme/curriculum delivery to a diverse population. But, more importantly,
when incorporated with other integration strategies over the longer term, such events and performances can (re)create important spaces within which migrant youth (re)negotiate their identities (Ashkenazi 1987; Piette 1992; Thoroski 1997; Bramadat 2001), and can serve as critical means of perpetuating or recreating parts of those identities by re-enacting or re-experiencing concentrated versions of them in a public way (Bramadat 2001:82).

Ultimately, then -- when used in conjunction with broader-based, long-term strategies -- cultural performance approaches to ‘doing integration’ at the street level can help to create spaces in which the expression of cultural difference is hosted whilst inclusivity in a wider youth community is simultaneously enacted (Permezel and Duffy:368). In these spaces, young people from varying backgrounds can learn about each other, dispel misconceptions about each other, and strengthen ties within and between groups (Bramadat 2001:88). However, service providers and policy-makers alike must remain vigilant in ongoing appraisals of this street-level practice in order to ensure that available resources are also directed toward integration work that strives to weave interculturalism throughout youth curricula and programming for the long term. To fall back to a position wherein ‘once-off’ cultural performance events and activities come to be equated with ‘doing integration’ would be of great detriment to Ireland’s youth now and in the future.

It is important to note that the two broadly identified typologies of local ‘integration’ practice identified in this research are not mutually exclusive amongst local service providers. In fact, many service providers employ both strands of practice at different times. This mixing of strategies is identified as typical amongst street-level diversity workers who, in their everyday practice, tend to choose varying strategies in order to best facilitate the well-being of particular individuals at a given time (Hagelund 2009:85). This alternating of approaches to working with diverse service user populations should not be viewed as a symptom of indecisiveness or lack of consistency amongst service providers. Rather, the use of multiple strategies may provide valuable flexibility in street-level integration work and encourage discussions amongst service providers within and across agencies and sectors regarding integration good practice (ibid:101).
7.5 SCOPE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Through the employment of a novel cross-disciplinary conceptual pathway, this research highlights a significant gap in several extant academic literatures regarding the interrogation of street-level ‘diversity workers’ engaged in the provision integration as a ‘caring’ service. Through the illumination of this role, assimilationist expectations toward a normatised standard of ‘white, Irishness’ and internalised service provider Orientalisms are elaborated. An interrogation of the ways in which these systems of thought -- along with significant resourcing challenges -- shape the spaces in which integration is provided suggests significant scope for future academic inquiry. Given that these spaces are continually (re)shaped by the relationships between actors working and receiving services within them, future interrogations of them will continually produce new observations and analyses. Further, through the ongoing exploration of the spaces in which integration occurs, the dynamism of the phenomenon itself will be more fully illuminated.

In addition to further geographic explorations of ‘spaces of integration’ as sites that are socially (re)produced, there is scope for more cross-disciplinary work focussing on integration as a ‘caring service’. In this future research, it would be valuable to consider service user agency within integration service provision as compared to service user agency within other caring service settings. Perhaps, useful challenges of the ‘needy migrant’ role could be supported by cross-disciplinary explorations of this role as compared to more empowered imaginings of the service user role within the provision of health care. As an example, patient agency and relationships with service providers within health care provision could provide fertile ground for such research.

Lastly, there is meaningful scope for comparative studies of street-level integration service provision practice. These comparisons might consider urban/rural or cross-national variances in practice that could provide useful further insights into street-level processes. This type of research would be particularly useful if conducted comparing Ireland to another country experiencing the influences of recent and rapid demographic change. Also interesting would be a cross-national study comparing integration service delivery in Ireland with that in a country(s) in which more ethnic
minority/migrant individuals are employed in integration and youth service provision. A comparison of these individuals’ practice with that of ‘host society’ member practitioners would likely yield interesting results. In a study focussing only on the Irish context, investigation is limited by the relatively low percentage of non-‘Irish’ practitioners employed in areas such as secondary education and youth work. Further cross-national comparisons focussing on integration service delivery to ‘older youth’ (18-25) would also be valuable.
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# APPENDIX A: Key extant policy pieces impacting youth integration in Ireland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Title</th>
<th>Authoring Agency</th>
<th>Date Published</th>
<th>Key Integration-Related Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Aliens Act</td>
<td>The Houses of the Oireachtas</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>To provide for the control of aliens in relation to property, search warrants, name restrictions, prosecution of offences and appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Refugee Act</td>
<td>The Houses of the Oireachtas</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Governs definitions of refugee status and rights therein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Immigration Act</td>
<td>The Houses of the Oireachtas</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Governs the detention and removal of foreign nationals from the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Illegal Immigrant Trafficking Act</td>
<td>The Houses of the Oireachtas</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Makes trafficking an offence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Immigration Act</td>
<td>The Houses of the Oireachtas</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Introduces carrier sanctions for travel providers if they fail to comply with documentation verification for their travellers Amends Alien Act of 1935, the Refugee Act of 1996 and the Illegal Immigrant Trafficking Act of 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Irish Nationality and Citizenship Act</td>
<td>The Houses of the Oireachtas</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Specifies the residence requirements that non-national parents of Irish-born children must fulfil in order for the child to have Irish citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Immigration, Residence and Protection Bill, 2010</td>
<td>Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>To ‘fast-track’ asylum procedures and appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration: A Two-Way Process</td>
<td>Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>To define ‘integration’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To meet the needs of refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To combat racism and promote tolerance in Irish society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Managing Migration in Ireland: A Social and Economic Analysis

To address issues of employment, language, education, health, accommodation and citizenship in Ireland
To learn from integration policy in other EU countries
To address integration issues for the future

A Report by the International Organization for Migration for the National Economic and Social Council of Ireland (NESC)

2006

To develop a robust capacity to manage conflict and to create a sense of common purpose and cohesion

Migration Nation: Statement on Integration Strategy and Diversity Management

To create prosperity and to improve international competitiveness
To promote personal and state security and to build public confidence in governance structures

Office of the Minister for Integration

2008

To establish a partnership approach between the Government and nongovernmental organisations, as well as civil society bodies, to deepen and enhance the opportunities for Integration
To establish a strong link between integration policy and wider state social inclusion measures, strategies and initiatives
To establish a clear public policy focus that avoids the creation of parallel societies, communities and urban ghettos, i.e. a mainstream approach to service delivery to migrants
To establish a commitment to effective local delivery mechanisms that align services to migrants with those for indigenous communities

Anti-Racism/Equality Policy

To eliminate racism from Galway City
To welcome diversity and promote interculturalism
To enhance the participation of ethnic minorities in Irish society

Toward a City of Equals

Galway City Partnership

2005

National Action Plan Against Racism (NPAR)

To effectively protect against and redress racism, including a focus on combating discrimination, assaults, threatening behaviour and incitement to hatred
To focus on economic inclusion and equality of opportunity for cultural and ethnic minorities, including a focus on employment, the workplace and poverty

Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform (NPAR)

2005-2008
To accommodate cultural diversity in service provision, including a focus on common outcomes related to all forms of service provision and a focus on specific policy areas, including: education; health; social services and childcare; accommodation and the administration of justice

### Education Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Institution and Dates</th>
<th>Provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Education Act</td>
<td>Houses of the Oireachtas 1998</td>
<td>To respect the diversity of values, beliefs, languages and traditions in Irish society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Statuses Act</td>
<td>The Houses of the Oireachtas 2000-2004</td>
<td>To prevent discrimination across all nine grounds under the equality legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Inclusive School</td>
<td>Irish National Teachers’ Organisation and the Equality Authority 2004</td>
<td>To establish that discrimination regarding admission to a school is allowed if it is to ensure the maintenance of the religious ethos of the school and if such discrimination is published in the school’s admission policy (such provisions do not extend to all education settings, such as the youth sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To establish a strong link between integration policy and wider state social inclusion measures, strategies and initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To establish a clear public policy focus that avoids the creation of parallel societies, communities and urban ghettos, i.e. a mainstream approach to service delivery to migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To establish a commitment to effective local delivery mechanisms that align services to migrants with those for indigenous communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards 2016: Ten-Year Framework Social Partnership Agreement 2006-2015</td>
<td>Department of the Taoiseach 2006</td>
<td>To address migrants regarding education provisions at first and second level and support structures for adult migrant English language learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To provide for the development of a comprehensive education strategy for all legally resident immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure that all students experience an education that respects the diversity of values, beliefs, languages and traditions in Irish society and is conducted in a spirit of partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure all education providers are assisted with ensuring that inclusion and integration within an intercultural learning environment become the norm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Education Strategy, 2010-2015</td>
<td>Department of Education and Skills and The Office of the Minister for Integration 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Youth Work/Children’s Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Youth Work Act</th>
<th>The Houses of the Oireachtas</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>To enhance the contribution of youth work to social inclusion, social cohesion and citizenship in a rapidly changing national and global context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The National Youth Work Development Plan</td>
<td>The Department of Education and Science</td>
<td>2003-2007</td>
<td>To play a part in developing a mutually enriching multicultural society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To work with young people from minority ethnic groups and Travellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To devise an intercultural programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To highlight the need for intercultural education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Youth Council of Ireland (NYCI) Strategic Plan</td>
<td>National Youth Council of Ireland</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>To actively promote participation by young people of diverse backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To recognise and respect diversity and to insure youth work opportunities are inclusive of all communities In Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure that all NYCI policies, procedures and practices reflect an awareness of intercultural issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To mainstream an intercultural ethos, policy and practices into the everyday work of youth organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Children’s Strategy</td>
<td>The National Children’s Office</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>To educate children and support social and cultural diversity so that all children, including Travellers and other marginalised groups achieve their full potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To target additional resources and supports to enable marginalised children to participate equally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To learn to appreciate and recognise positively each others’ differences and similarities in childhood and to see them as a critical investment towards Ireland’s new multiculturalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: List of NGOs with an implied integration role by the Department of Justice and Equality, Ireland

**AKIDWA**: (Swahili for ‘sisterhood’) is an authoritative, minority ethnic-led national network of African and migrant women living in Ireland.

**Amnesty International** (Irish Section): The country’s largest human rights organisation and part of a global movement in more than 150 countries around the world.

**Comhlámh**: (Irish for ‘solidarity’) is an Irish organisation focussing on action and organisation for social justice.

**Doras Luimní**: (Irish for ‘door to Limerick’) is an independent non-governmental organisation based in Limerick that works toward promoting and protecting the rights of all migrants.

**European Network of Asylum Reception Organisations** (ENARO): An inter-institutional linkage between 17 European organisations set up to arrange the reception of asylum seekers.

**Focus Ireland**: An organisation that strives to advance the right of people-out-of-home to live in a place they call home through quality services, research, and advocacy.

**Free Legal Advice Centres** (FLAC): An independent human rights organisation dedicated to the realisation of equal access to justice for all.

**Immigrant Council**: An organisation where migrants and Irish work together to provide information, support and legal advice to immigrants and their families.

**Integration Centre**: A non-governmental organisation committed to the integration and inclusion of people from immigrant backgrounds in Ireland. The Centre specializes in planning, monitoring and advocacy at city, local, national and international levels and provides regionalized information, advice and training services.

**IPPA - The Early Childhood Organisation**: An organisation committed to supporting its members in providing quality education, play and care for children.

**Irish Council for Civil Liberties** (ICCL): Ireland’s leading independent human rights watchdog, which monitors, educates and campaigns in order to secure full enjoyment of human rights for everyone.

**Irish Human Rights Commission** (IHRC): An organisation mandated to promote and protect are the rights, liberties and freedoms guaranteed under the Irish Constitution and under international agreements, treaties and conventions to which Ireland is a party.
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**Irish Red Cross**: An organisation that works both at home in Ireland and in countries overseas which have been damaged by wars or natural disasters.

**Irish Refugee Council (IRC)**: An independent non-governmental organisation advocating on behalf of asylum seekers and refugees.


**Money Advice and Budgeting Service (MABS)**: A national, free, confidential and independent service for people in debt or in danger of getting into debt.

**Muintir na Tíre**: (Irish for ‘people of the country’) is a national association for the promotion of community development in Ireland.

**NASC**: (The Irish word for ‘link’) is an immigrant support centre that seeks to respond to the needs of immigrants in Cork.

**National Youth Council of Ireland**: A representative body for national voluntary youth work organisations in Ireland.

**The New Communities Partnership (NCP)**: An independent national network of 117 ethnic minority led groups comprising of 75 nationalities with offices in Dublin, Cork and Limerick.

**OPEN**: A national network of local lone parent self help groups.

**Oxfam Ireland**: A confederation of independent, secular, not-for-profit 14 organisations working with people to overcome poverty and injustice worldwide.

**Spiritan Asylum Services Initiative (SPIRASI)**: A humanitarian, intercultural, non-governmental organisation that works with asylum seekers, refugees and other disadvantaged migrant groups, with special concern for survivors of torture.

**Refugee & Migrant Project (Irish Catholic Bishops)**: This link from the DJE web site is broken, but leads (indirectly) to the **Irish Episcopal Council for Immigrants (IECI)** web page that states they are: An organisation to welcome, support and empower immigrants who live in Ireland.

**United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)**: An agency mandated to lead and co-ordinate international action to protect refugees and resolve refugee problems worldwide.

**The Vincentian Refugee Centre (VRC)**: An organisation that provides services for people seeking asylum, refugees and people with permission to remain in the State.
### APPENDIX C: Profile of interview respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Number</th>
<th>Employer Classification</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Approximate Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinator, Anti-Racism Project</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local Director, National Youth Project</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Director, Pro-Migrant Organisation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coordinator, Pro-Migrant Youth Organisation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Coordinator, Local Youth Club</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Development Education Worker, Anti-Racism Organisation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Community Development Worker, Pro-Migrant Organisation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Regional Outreach Worker, National Pro-Migrant Organisation</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Community Development Director, City Government</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Regional Integration Officer, National Pro-Migrant Organisation</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Teacher, Secondary School</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Teacher, Secondary School</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Head, Ethnic Association</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Coordinator, Community Youth Project</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Worker, Youth Centre</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Worker, Youth Centre</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teacher, Secondary School</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Special Project Coordinator, National Pro-Migrant Organisation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Assistant to Special Project Coordinator, National Pro-Migrant Organisation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Community Development Worker, Pro-Migrant Organisation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Coordinator, Community Youth Project</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Director, Youth Centre</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Coordinator, Community Youth Performance Group</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Liaison, National Youth Work Organisation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Coordinator, Youth Service Organisation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX D: Sampling of events attended for the collection of participant observation data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April, 2008</td>
<td>“Children and Migration”: Identities, Mobilities and Belongings Conference, University College – Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter, 2008</td>
<td>Youth Work Ireland – Child protection training and youth work volunteer training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2009</td>
<td>Galway One World Centre – Anti-racism training workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2009</td>
<td>The Integration Centre (formerly Integrating Ireland) – Stakeholder seminar – “Toward developing an integration toolkit for immigrant youth and parents in Ireland”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2009</td>
<td>Intercultural Health Fair, National University of Ireland – Galway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2010</td>
<td>National Youth Council of Ireland (NYCI) Training - Developing Intercultural Policies and Implementation Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2010</td>
<td>Development and Intercultural Education (DICE) Conference, Mary Immaculate College, Limerick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2010</td>
<td>“Integration and Inclusion”: Doras Luimni 10th Anniversary Conference, Limerick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2011</td>
<td>Conference on Interculturalism in Irish Education, University of Limerick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>