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Overview

• How do issues of health relate – in the understandings of policy-makers, practitioners and migrants themselves – to broader conceptualizations of migrant processes and outcomes, such as ‘integration’?

• Illustrated through reflection on two very distinctive projects:
  – Indicators of Integration, UK Home Office, 2002-2004 (measuring policy and practice impact on integration of refugees settling in UK during ‘dispersal’ policy era)
  – SEFAFU, Christian Childrens Fund/Child Fund International, 2006-2008 (measuring project impact on process of reintegratation of returning abductees following civil conflict in Sierra Leone)

• Common challenges:
  – conceptualization of (re)integration process
  – identification of appropriate indicators
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• ‘There is no single, generally accepted definition, theory or model of immigrant and refugee integration. The concept continues to be controversial and hotly debated’ (Castles et al. 2001)
• ‘integration is a chaotic concept: a word used by many but understood differently by most’ (Robinson 1998)
Indicators of Integration Framework

What is potentially relevant?
• Economic Integration
  – Employment & Income-Generation
  – Vocational Training and Further Education
• Social integration
  – Housing
  – Health and Social Services
  – Education
• Cultural Integration
  – Refugee Participation
  – Relations with Host Communities
• Political Integration
  – Legal Status and Rights
  – Political Representation
  – Law and Order
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What is conceptually meaningful?

What is potentially relevant?

What is relevant for refugees and local communities?
qualitative study: 
the experience of integration

- sites focus of significant refugee settlement (self-settlement [Islington] or dispersal-led [Glasgow])
- preliminary social mapping exercise through CF/ERF projects
- 60 in-depth interviews reflecting diversity of the neighbourhood
Indicators of Integration Framework

What is conceptually meaningful?

What is potentially relevant?

What is relevant for refugees and local communities?

What indicators group together?
key domains of integration?

Markers & Means
- Employment
- Housing
- Education
- Health

Social Connection
- Bridges
- Bonds
- Links

Foundations
- Language & Cultural Knowledge
- Security & Stability

Basis
- Rights & Citizenship
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Overview

• How do issues of health relate – in the understandings of policy-makers, practitioners and migrants themselves – to broader conceptualizations of migrant processes and outcomes, such as ‘integration’?

• Illustrated through reflection on two very distinctive projects:
  – Indicators of Integration, UK Home Office, 2002-2004 (measuring policy and practice impact on integration of refugees settling in UK during ‘dispersal’ policy era)
  – SEFAFU, Christian Childrens Fund/Child Fund International, 2006-2008 (measuring project impact on process of reintegretion of returning abductees following civil conflict in Sierra Leone)

• Common challenges:
  – conceptualization of (re)integration process
  – identification of appropriate indicators
• Used Participative Ranking Methodology (PRM) to elicit and prioritise indicators
• 16 PRM discussions involving 166 formerly abducted girls across Koinadugu, Bombali and Port Loko
• Emerging indicators:
  – Marriage
  – Community involvement
  – Bondo inclusion
  – Drug cessation
  – “Steady head”

qualitative study:
identifying local indicators of successful ‘reintegration’ following return
Community Constructed Timeline

- **Dry 2000**  
  *UN helicopter blows roof off the school building*

- **March 2002**  
  *Construction of the Nyfrando bridge is completed*

- **July 2003**  
  *Woman beat a lizard in the kasava leaves and kills 7 members of her family*

- **March 2004**  
  *CARE builds latrines in the village*

- **June 2005**  
  *A feud between the Fula’s and the Limba’s result in the death of a local farmer at the hands of the herder whose cattle was eating the farmer’s crop*
Time to community acceptance after return from bush
Time to marriage after return from bush

Cumulative percentage

Months

Intervention
Comparison
Ratings of quality of marriage after return from bush

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Provision of clothes by husband</th>
<th>Provision of food by husband</th>
<th>No beating by husband</th>
<th>Provision of medicine by husband</th>
<th>‘Good marriage’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Group (N=52)</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group (N=49)</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Matched Analysis

**Identifying girls who had not attained each outcome by the time intervention began & finding ‘match’ from comparison communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEFAFU</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Odds ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marriage</strong></td>
<td>7/25</td>
<td>10/25</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bondo</strong></td>
<td>15/20</td>
<td>7/20</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>9/20</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>&lt;0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘Steady head’</strong></td>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>4/14</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>&lt;0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

• Common challenges:
  – conceptualization of (re)integration process
  – identification of appropriate indicators

Value of ‘mid-level theory’
Place of structured, rigorous qualitative enquiry to establish grounded concepts and suggest valid quantitative measures

• How do issues of health relate – in the understandings of policy-makers, practitioners and migrants themselves – to broader conceptualizations of migrant processes and outcomes, such as ‘integration’?

Health is best seen not a discrete domain of migrant experience but as inextricably bound up with broader social processes e.g. as a ‘marker’ and ‘means’ of integration